

C/2024/6036

11.10.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 5 LIPCA 2022 R.

(C/2024/6036)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2022-2023

Posiedzenia od 4 do 7 lipca 2022 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
2. Wspólne europejskie działania w dziedzinie opieki (debata)	4
3. Zdrowie psychiczne w cyfrowym świecie pracy (debata)	16
4. To jest Europa – Debata z udziałem premiera Grecji Kyriakosa Mitsotakisa (debata)	24
5. Wznowienie posiedzenia	39
6. Głosowanie	39
6.1. Rosyjska inwazja na Ukrainę – środki tymczasowe dotyczące dokumentów kierowcy wydanych przez Ukrainę (C9-0201/2022) (głosowanie)	39
6.2. Uznanie naruszenia unijnych środków ograniczających za przestępstwa na mocy art. 83 ust. 1 TFUE (C9-0219/2022) (głosowanie)	39
6.3. Udzielenie wyjątkowej pomocy makrofinansowej Ukrainie (C9-0221/2022) (głosowanie)	39
6.4. Akt o usługach cyfrowych (A9-0356/2021 - Christel Schaldemose) (głosowanie)	39

Spis treści	Strona
6.5. Akt o rynkach cyfrowych (A9-0332/2021 - Andreas Schwab) (głosowanie)	40
6.6. Przyjęcie przez Chorwację euro w dniu 1 stycznia 2023 r. (A9-0187/2022 - Siegfried Mureşan) (głosowanie)	40
6.7. Umowa o partnerstwie w sprawie zrównoważonych połowów między UE a Wyspami Cooka – protokół wykonawczy (A9-0197/2022 - Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar) (głosowanie)	40
6.8. Środki tymczasowej liberalizacji handlu dla Mołdawii (A9-0201/2022 - Markéta Gregorová) (głosowanie)	40
6.9. Ubóstwo kobiet w Europie (A9-0194/2022 - Lina Gálvez Muñoz) (głosowanie)	40
6.10. Negocjacje w sprawie umowy o współpracy między UE a Interpolem (A9-0200/2022 - Jadwiga Wiśniewska) (głosowanie)	40
6.11. Strategia dla Indo-Pacyfiku w dziedzinie handlu i inwestycji (A9-0170/2022 - Jan Zahradil) (głosowanie)	40
6.12. Przyszła współpraca handlowo-inwestycyjna między UE a Indiami (A9-0193/2022 - Geert Bourgeois) (głosowanie)	40
6.13. Wspólne europejskie działania w dziedzinie opieki (A9-0189/2022 - Milan Brglez, Sirpa Pietikäinen) (głosowanie)	40
6.14. Zdrowie psychiczne w cyfrowym świecie pracy (A9-0184/2022 - Maria Walsh) (głosowanie)	40
6.15. Unia bankowa – sprawozdanie roczne za 2021 r. (A9-0186/2022 - Bogdan Rzońca) (głosowanie)	40
7. Wznowienie posiedzenia	41
8. Inicjatywy Unii Europejskiej wobec problemu rosnących kosztów życia, w tym wdrożenie Europejskiego filaru praw socjalnych (debata)	41
9. Plan działania UE na rzecz gospodarki społecznej (debata)	59
10. Wznowienie posiedzenia	67
11. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	68
12. Tura pytań (do Komisji) Zwiększyć ambicje UE w dziedzinie różnorodności biologicznej przed COP 15	68
13. Oficjalne powitanie	82
14. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 111 ust. 3 Regulaminu: Zmiana aktu delegowanego w sprawie unijnej systematyki dotyczącej zmiany klimatu i aktu delegowanego w sprawie ujawniania informacji w tej dziedzinie (debata)	82

Spis treści	Strona
15. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Bośni i Hercegowiny (debata)	107
16. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Serbii (debata)	115
17. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Kosowa (debata)	125
18. UE i obrona multilateralizmu (debata)	131
19. Poprawa bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego w krajach rozwijających się (debata)	138
20. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	144
20.1. Akt o usługach cyfrowych (A9-0356/2021 - Christel Schaldemose)	144
20.2. Przyjęcie przez Chorwację euro w dniu 1 stycznia 2023 r. (A9-0187/2022 - Siegfried Mureşan)	145
20.3. Ubóstwo kobiet w Europie (A9-0194/2022 - Lina Gálvez Muñoz)	145
20.4. Wspólne europejskie działania w dziedzinie opieki (A9-0189/2022 - Milan Brglez, Sirpa Pietikäinen)	145
20.5. Zdrowie psychiczne w cyfrowym świecie pracy (A9-0184/2022 - Maria Walsh)	146
21. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół	146
22. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	146
23. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	146
24. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia	146
25. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia	146
26. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	146

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 5 LIPCA 2022 R.

PRESEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Rokovanie sa začalo o 9.00 h.)

2. Wspólne europejskie działania w dziedzinie opieki (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Prvým bodom programu je rozprava o správe, ktorú predkladá Milan Brglez v mene Výboru pre zamestnanosť a sociálne veci a Sirpa Pietikäinen v mene Výboru pre práva žien a rodovú rovnosť, o návrhu správy smerom k spoločným európskym opatreniam v oblasti starostlivosti (2021/2253(INI)) (A9-0189/2022).

Milan Brglez, poročevalec. – Gospod predsednik!

Hvala kolegici soporočevalki Sirpi Pietikäinen za tesno in konstruktívno sodelovanje vse od prvega osnutka poročila do današnje razprave, vsem poročevalkam in poročevalcem v senci ter vsem strokovnimi ekipami in sekretariatoma za intenzívno delo v preteklih mesecih.

Ponosen sem na njegov rezultat, obširno, poglobljeno in celostno, na človekovih pravicah osnovano poročilo, za katerega verjamem, da bo v pomoč Komisiji pri oblikovanju evropske strategije o oskrbi ter nujnih ukrepov po njej.

Posebej se želim zahvaliti ter posvetiti to poročilo tistim, brez katerih ga ne bi bilo. Vsem posameznikom, predvsem pa posameznicam, ki dnevno skrbijo za naše otroke, starše in stare starše ter sorodnike in prijatelje, potrebne pomoči in podpore.

Področje oskrbe po naravi zadeva slehernega izmed nas. Vsak se najmanj enkrat v življenju znajde v vlogi prejemnika oskrbe in tudi tistega, ki to oskrbo nudi drugim. Oskrba ni le najvišji izraz človeške in medgeneracijske solidarnosti, temveč produktivni sektor ter vezívno tkivo naše družbe.

Paradoks njene nepogrešljivosti je, da ostaja njen ogromen gospodarski in družbeni prispevek spregledan, delo na področju oskrbe pa podcenjeno in pogosto neplačano ter posledično neenakomerno porazdeljeno.

Pandemija je ta paradoks dokončno razgalila in odprla oči javnosti ter politike, da je oskrba pravica in javno dobro, ki potrebuje javno podporo ter investicije. Čim prej moramo popraviti veliko napako rezov v ta sektor v času varčevalnih ukrepov ob finančni krizi ter zamujeno priložnost, da bi vlaganje v javno oskrbo postalo obvezni del okrevanja in odpornosti po pandemiji.

Brez javnih investicij v kvalitetno in integrirano javno oskrbo, dostopno vsem, od zgodnjega otroštva do pozne starosti, ne bo mogoče presekatí začaranega kroga odvisnosti od neformalnih oskrbovalcev, med katerimi premočno prevladujejo ženske, ter neenakosti, ki se s tem poglobljajo.

Nezadostne in za marsikoga cenovno ter vsesplošno nedosegljive storitve, ki niso vključene v sistem socialne varnosti, silijo ženske nazaj za domače ognjišče v ekonomsko odvisnost ter socialno izključenost.

Ustvarjanje pogojev za popolnoma svobodno odločitev glede uresničevanja in zagotavljanja pravice do oskrbe je zato bistvo poročila, ki ga imate pred seboj. Poročilo poziva Komisijo in države članice, da omogočijo učinkovit, univerzalen dostop do kakovostne oskrbe, prilagojene potrebam oskrbovancev. S tem povezano je potrebno pospešiti prehod od še vedno pretežno institucionalne na oskrbo v skupnosti brez nedopustnega prelaganja dodatnega bremena na družine oskrbovancev.

Za uresničevanje pravice do oskrbe je ključno okrepiti zaščito pravic tistih, ki opravljajo skrbstveno delo, tako formalno kot neformalno. Večina držav članic se sooča s pomanjkanjem delovne sile v sektorju oskrbe.

Da bi zadržali obstoječe in pritegnili nove zaposlene, tudi več moških ter mlajših oskrbovalcev, moramo predvsem izboljšati delovne pogoje, pokritost sektorja s kolektivnimi pogodбами ter javno podobo skrbstvenih poklicev. Zaščititi moramo pravice pogosto spregledanih mobilnih delavcev in delavcev migrantov ter urediti položaj tistih, ki delajo v sektorju osebnih in gospodinjskih storitev. Vsem zaposlenim, vključno s tistimi v sektorju oskrbe, moramo omogočiti boljše usklajevanje poklicnega in zasebnega življenja.

Univerzalno dostopno zgodnje izobraževanje in varstvo otrok, za katerega si moja politična skupina prizadeva z vztrajanjem pri čimprejšnji implementaciji in nujnih finančni okrepitvi evropskega varstva za otroke, je ključno za razvijanje potenciala vseh otrok, še posebej tistih v najranljivejših položajih.

Oskrba je še vedno primarna skrb in pristojnost držav članic. Skupno ukrepanje na evropski ravni pa je nujno za to, da bi zagotovili enako raven varstva pravic vsem v Evropski uniji ter zaustavili odtekanje usposobljene delovne sile iz držav in regij, ki jim že tako primanjkuje zdravstvenega in skrbstvenega osebja. Med njimi je žal tudi Slovenija. Čakajo nas še izzivi demografskih sprememb in staranje prebivalstva ter zahteve evropskega zelenega in digitalnega prehoda.

Prepričan sem, da Komisijo v poročilu čakajo priporočila, ki upoštevajo širok kontekst ter lahko dopolnijo in okrepijo predloge za strateške ukrepe na področju oskrbe. S tem poročilom pa Komisija dobiva tudi zaveznika za oblikovanje evropskega dogovora o oskrbi, ki mora dodatno dvigniti raven ambicij ter izkoristiti priložnosti, ki jih dokazano ponuja spolno enakopravnejša porazdelitev skrbstvenih obveznosti za posameznike, družbo in gospodarstvo.

Sirpa Pietikäinen, esittelijä. – Arvoisa puhemies, tämä on ensimmäinen kokonaisvaltainen hoivamietintö Euroopan parlamentilta, ja näin myös aika urauurtava. Covid-19 jälkeen kävi aivan selväksi, samalla tavalla kuin terveydenhuollon puolella, että jäsenvaltioiden yksittäiset resurssit ovat liian heikkoja pitämään huolta kansalaisistamme.

Hoivan taso oli monissa jäsenvaltioissa, varsinkin ikäihmisten ja laitshoivan puolella, hyvin puutteellinen. Ei ollut riittävästi varusteita, henkilöstöä eikä henkilöstön tukea. Kuolinluvut, jotka ovat koskeneet nimenomaan ikääntyneitä muistisairaita hoivalaitoksissa, ovat niin dramaattisia, että tämä vaatii syvempää jatkotarkastelua.

Parlamentti lähettääkin voimakkaan viestin siitä, että jokaisella eurooppalaisella on perusoikeus hyvään, saavutettavissa olevaan hoivaan kaikille sitä tarvitseville, oli se sitten lyhytaikaista, pitkäaikaista, yllättävää tai ennakoitavaa. Tämä oikeuslähtöinen näkökulma on toki jo kirjattu sosiaaliseen pilariin, mutta meillä ei ole vielä oikein tehokkaita keinoja sen toteuttamiseen. Siihen, että jonkun oikeus täytyy olla myös jonkun velvollisuus, tässä tapauksessa jäsenvaltioiden velvollisuus pitää huolta tämän hyvän hoivan saavutettavuudesta.

Toinen viesti on se, että hoivan osalta ja hoivakäsityksen osalta on myös tapahduttava muutos. Meidän on suunnattava ihmislähtöiseen, räätälöitävissä olevaan, ihmisen elämäntilanteisiin, tarpeisiin ja toiveisiin perustuvaan hoivaan, pois laitoksista, enemmän yhteisölliseen. Kolmas viesti on se, että tämä kaikki tarvitsee lisää investointeja koko hoivasektorille ja erityisesti pitkäaikaissairaiden ihmisten hoivan puolelle.

Tämä puolestaan tarvitsee, käsitykseni mukaan, myös lainsäädäntöä. Se tarvitsee hyvän hoivan laadun mittareita, jatkuvaa seurantaa jäsenvaltioiden tilanteesta, peruspalkkausta parhaisiin käytäntöihin ja myös sen, että olemassa oleviin ongelmatilanteisiin ja jälkijättöisyyteen puututaan. Parlamentti vaatii komissiolta hoivastrategiaa ja myös sen jatkuvaa seurantaa, jotta se ei jää vain hyväksi tavoitteeksi ja paperiksi pöydälle.

Erityisen tyytyväinen olen myös tähän mietintöön sisältyvästä omaishoitajien hoivaohjelmavaatimuksesta, jonka toivotavasti komissio tuo joko osana hoivastrategiaa tai sen jälkeen. Meidän tulee tunnistaa ja tunnustaa omaishoitajuus, joka vastaa noin 70 prosenttia hoivatarpeesta jäsenvaltioissamme. On pidettävä huolta siitä, että se on sekä taloudellisesti tuettua että myös palveluiltaan tuettua ja että omaishoitajien jaksamisesta, vapaa-ajasta ja terveydentilasta pidetään huolta.

Hoiva on mitä suurimmassa määrin myös naiskysymys, jossa usein alipalkatut naiset pitävät huolta toisista naisista. Siksi on itsestään selvää, että työntekijöiden asemasta on pidettävä parempaa huolta. Ilman hyviä työntekijöitä ei ole myöskään hyvää hoivaa.

Näille saatesanoilla kiitän kaikkia puolueita, varjoesittelijöitä ja kanssaesittelijä Milan Brglezia erittäin hyvästä ja rakentavasta yhteistyöstä, jolla voimme lähettää eteenpäin tämän voimakkaan yhteisen viestin.

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first of all I want to thank Milan Brglez and Sirpa Pietikäinen, both co-rapporteurs, for this initiative and for this report. I really appreciate what you are doing and I appreciate your call on the Commission – although last year during the State of the Union speech, when President von der Leyen addressed this House, she promised that we would come up with a care strategy, which is going to happen on 7 September in the Commission.

All of us know that care is an integral part of our lives and that it affects us all. Some of us are carers of children. Some are carers of older family members, as you said. Some of us are in need of care. What is clear is that we all provide and need care at different moments in our lives. However, at this moment in time, not everyone can access or afford the high-quality care they need. We cannot tolerate the status quo. Inadequate provision of care services has a number of consequences. It takes a heavy toll on the well-being and health of people needing care. It also impacts greatly on gender equality, simply because women continue to bear the bulk of informal care responsibilities across Member States. This hinders the ability of women to engage in paid work. On the other hand, more than 80% of care workers in the European Union are women and a number of them are of migrant background.

Care work is often unevaluated. It's often undervalued. The time has come for us to start caring about care. Many care workers face difficult working conditions, and also limited career prospects. The COVID-19 pandemic was a painful reminder of the multiple structural weaknesses of our long-term care systems. The demographic mega-trend of ageing in the European Union highlights the challenge of ensuring access to high-quality, affordable, long-term care while securing its adequate and sustainable financing.

That is why the Commission, as I already said, is preparing a European Care Strategy. The strategy also responds to the Conference on the Future of Europe. Citizens highlighted during the Conference the importance of addressing health and care issues in the proposal on the demographic transition. Their proposal calls for quality, affordable and accessible childcare across the European Union and for appropriate care for older people.

In responding to the needs of citizens, we must set a framework for policy reforms of our care systems and trigger the necessary investments with the help of European Union funding, including direct technical support. The strategy contributes to implementing the European Pillar of Social Rights, which covers various aspects of care. I know that this House cherishes the Pillar as much as we do. The strategy will address both carers and care-receivers, from the youngest to the oldest members of our society. It takes a comprehensive approach to care, from childcare into long-term care, and covers the challenges of availability, accessibility, affordability and quality, while also stressing the need to ensure fiscal sustainability.

This strategy aims at highlighting the vital contribution of care to society and to the economy. It calls for reinforced action at all levels to counter the challenges exhibited by the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine. The strategy builds on numerous calls for reinforced EU action in this area and previous public consultations.

This House is vocal on the topic of care. I fully agree with your focus on the quality of care across the life cycle, whereby we need to focus on accessibility, availability and affordability of care. Equally important, all users and their carers should have a genuine choice when it comes to care services. We have to be mindful of our responsibilities for care for life. We note that the Parliament calls on Member States to act in a number of areas. We will add our voice to these calls to guide the Member States, to guide their policy reforms in early childhood education and care and long-term care.

The communication on the European Care Strategy will announce European-level supportive actions that build on extensive European acquis and initiatives relevant to the care sector. This includes labour law, health and safety at work, work-life balance skills and the rights of persons with disabilities and gender equality.

Regarding long-term care, the Commission's thinking is in line with the report on a number of points. In particular, we agree that we need to have a holistic life cycle approach, putting the persons in need of care at the centre.

We agree to enable personal choice and a life lived in dignity, to uphold human rights, and a balanced mix of accessible, affordable and high-quality care options should be available, supported by adequate social protection. There is a clear need to strengthen quality standards and quality assurance mechanisms across the European Union.

As regards carers, improving working conditions in the sector requires stronger social dialogue, adequate pay and upskilling and reskilling opportunities. Informal care should be a choice rather than a necessity, driven by lack of quality and affordable services. Support measures should be in place for informal carers. There is a clear social investment case in stepping-up provision of care services, tapping into the job creation potential of this sector, as well as digitalisation and innovation opportunities that can help unlock economic growth, create jobs and allow people with responsibilities to increase their participation on the labour market.

With all the Member States facing a common challenge of providing accessible, affordable and high-quality care to all that need it, the Commission is exploring ways to improve admission of long-term care workers from non-EU countries.

As announced in the upcoming communication on attracting skills and talents to the EU, the so-called 'Brain Drain to Brain Gain', this could benefit both the Member States and countries of origin by guaranteeing high ethical standards of recruitment.

With regard to the revision of Barcelona targets, I am pleased that you advocate further upward convergence across Member States, including further investments in high-quality care for children, paying special attention to those at risk of poverty or social exclusion. This would increase women's participation on the labour market and at the same time support the personal development of children.

The proposal for the revision of the Barcelona targets follows the gender equality strategy and builds upon European Union initiatives such as the Child Guarantee and the recommendation on early childhood education. Care for children does not stop in the nursery or kindergartens. I appreciate that you link formal care with support for parents, including family-friendly working time arrangements and the encouragement of equal sharing of care among parents in line with the Work-Life Balance Directive.

To conclude, I do appreciate your support for an ambitious care package that will improve gender equality across the European Union, allowing both women and men to better combine work with their care responsibilities and providing affordable, accessible and high-quality care services across the European Union.

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συνάδελφοι, είμαι πολύ χαρούμενος σήμερα γιατί το κοινοβούλιό μας με προεξάρχουσα την πολιτική μας ομάδα, το Ευρωπαϊκό Λαϊκό Κόμμα, υιοθετεί μια έκθεση που ανταποκρίνεται στις προσδοκίες των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών· μια έκθεση που αναγνωρίζει έμπρακτα την ανεκτίμητη συνεισφορά των ανεπίσημων φροντιστών· μια έκθεση που δίνει έμφαση στις μεγάλες ευθύνες φροντίδας που αναλαμβάνουν οι γυναίκες, αλλά και που τονίζει τη διάσταση της προσωπικής επιλογής φροντίδας και, φυσικά, την ανάγκη για άμεση αλλαγή, παραδείγματος χάριν με τις δομές φροντίδας να μετατρέπονται σε φροντίδα στην κοινότητα.

Τα κράτη μέλη είναι αναπόσπαστο κομμάτι αυτής της επιλογής και πρέπει να φροντίσουν ώστε οι Ευρωπαίοι να μπορούν να κατευθύνονται σε επιλογές φροντίδας, οι οποίες προωθούν την αποϊδρυματοποίηση και το δικαίωμα της επιλογής. Φυσικά, δεν πρέπει να κλείνουμε τα μάτια σε περιπτώσεις απαράδεκτες διαβίωσης των διαβιούντων σε ιδρύματα —το αντίθετο. Πρέπει να διεξάγονται έρευνες για περιπτώσεις κακοποίησης και να δουλέψουμε εντατικά στον τομέα της ευαισθητοποίησης. Και σε αυτό ακριβώς το μήκος κύματος, ήθελα να χαιρετήσω τις ενέργειες της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης για το κλείσιμο ιδρυμάτων με απαράδεκτες συνθήκες διαβίωσης.

Κλείνοντας, καλώ την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να λάβει την έκθεσή μας σοβαρά υπόψιν και να καταθέσει μια φιλόδοξη στρατηγική που θα θέτει στο επίκεντρο τις ανάγκες των φροντιστών και των επωφελούμενων από υπηρεσίες φροντίδας.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, ao longo da nossa vida quase todos nós vamos cuidar ou ser cuidados por alguém. Está na altura de reconhecermos que esta tarefa é crucial para o bem-estar da sociedade em que vivemos.

No caso europeu, tendo em conta as tendências demográficas, isso será assim cada vez mais e são as mulheres quem presta a larga maioria das tarefas de cuidado. Esperemos que mude esta situação. Estima-se que elas gastem, em média, 3,2 vezes mais horas que os homens em deveres de cuidado não pagos. E tudo isto faz com que 7,7 milhões de mulheres estejam fora do mercado de trabalho.

O nosso desafio, o nosso grande desafio, é como mudar este paradigma, que é também cultural, que começa na família e acaba no mercado de trabalho. Precisamos, por isso, de olhar para a educação, mostrando aos nossos meninos que cuidar dos outros não é apenas coisa de mulher. Devemos, a seguir, valorizar as tarefas de cuidado. Garantir o investimento público, sempre que necessário. Remunerar de forma justa este trabalho e dignificar estas tarefas, reconhecendo os direitos de quem cuida. Em Portugal, por exemplo, foi estabelecido o Estatuto do Cuidador Informal, que garante um subsídio de apoio, períodos de descanso e acesso à formação.

Fico contente por saber que a Comissão será ambiciosa na sua estratégia. Precisamos de um pacto europeu para os cuidados, na certeza que cada um de nós um dia será beneficiário desse esforço.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, impossible en une minute de rendre l'hommage qui convient aux soignants et aux aidants, qui sont le plus souvent des femmes soignantes et aidantes. Impossible en une minute de témoigner de ce que nous constatons dans nos hôpitaux, comme celui où je travaille: manque de reconnaissance, pesanteur administrative, insuffisance des effectifs.

Alors une minute, c'est juste le temps de lancer un cri d'alarme. Aucun progrès dans les soins n'est possible si on perd de vue l'intérêt des patients. Aucune organisation de soins n'est efficace si on ne l'articule pas avec prévention, éducation, accompagnement à la réinsertion et maintien de l'autonomie. Aucun pays ne peut considérer qu'il peut faire mieux tout seul. C'est pourquoi nous nous félicitons d'une stratégie européenne commune pour les soins.

Sara Matthieu, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, als jonge mama ben ik bezorgd om de veiligheid van onze kinderen. Helaas is die bezorgdheid vandaag terecht. Nergens in Europa zijn er zo veel kinderen per verzorger als in Vlaanderen. Ook voor de verzorgers zelf is de werkdruk onhoudbaar. We investeren te weinig in de kinderopvang en dat leidt tot onveilige situaties. Nochtans, kwalitatieve en warme zorg, dat is echt waar Europa het verschil kan maken. Met dit verslag wil het Parlement de Commissie en de lidstaten oproepen om te investeren in meer veilige en kwalitatieve kinderopvang.

Maar er moet ook aandacht zijn voor onze ouderen. Daarom vragen we af te stappen van de grote zorginstellingen en in te zetten op de buurtgerichte en kleinschalige zorg. Na de schandalen in de private ouderenzorg en de drama's als gevolg van corona zijn er ook dringend meer publieke investeringen nodig. Ook de mantelzorgers moeten we beter ondersteunen en omkaderen. Wie voor anderen zorgt, verdient meer dan een applaus. Goede zorg betekent voor mij meer handen op de werkvloer, betere lonen, een lagere werkdruk en meer tijd voor de mensen die echt zorg nodig hebben. Veilige en warme zorg voor onze kinderen, voor de ouderen, voor iedereen die dat nodig heeft, dat is wat we met dit verslag willen bereiken.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, la pandémie a démontré l'état de saccage de notre système de santé, rongé par le manque de moyens et la précarité dans laquelle sont plongés les professionnels du secteur. Ni une ni deux, la Commission européenne, visiblement très fière de sa gestion de la dernière crise, se sent pousser des ailes au point de se porter volontaire pour devenir directrice de l'hôpital Europe afin de gérer la suivante. On croit rêver. Ce rapport accomplit l'exploit inouï de franchir toutes les lignes rouges, piétinant la souveraineté des États avec la fameuse stratégie européenne de la santé, que nous refusons résolument.

Nous pensions avoir tout vu: voilà que les migrants sans papiers devraient pouvoir, selon le rapport, bénéficier des soins comme tous les autres. Nous refusons toutes ces dérives. Les Français n'en peuvent plus de l'appel d'air que constituent les aides pour les étrangers arrivés sur notre sol, d'autant plus qu'à l'heure où nous parlons, un de mes compatriotes sur deux a déjà renoncé à se faire soigner, faute de moyens ou de médecins.

Face à ce rapport inacceptable, nous avons cosigné, avec le groupe ECR, une résolution alternative afin de porter ensemble un autre modèle où la seule piqûre de rappel que nous acceptons est celle de la défense de nos nations. Pour prendre soin de la santé, évitons de suivre les malheureuses prescriptions de la Commission.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señorías, ponentes, conseguir unos cuidados que garanticen la dignidad de cada persona es una responsabilidad esencial de nuestra sociedad. Todos los hemos recibido y todos los ofreceremos. Conseguirlo todavía es un reto.

Esta estrategia era la oportunidad de diseñar un marco serio y ambicioso para quienes necesitan cuidados, comprometido con quienes los brindan y respetuoso con las competencias nacionales, pero no aporta toda la claridad que necesitábamos. Carece de estructura, mezcla conceptos relativos al mundo laboral regular, al irregular y al informal, que son los familiares, pero que evita nombrarlos. De hecho, se propone como objetivo externalizar los cuidados a través de una infraestructura artificial que sustituya a la familia, valora los cuidados exclusivamente desde una perspectiva económica y poco humana, y desprestigia estas ocupaciones abundando en la supuesta victimización de la mujer por tener una mayor presencia, obviando nuestra vocación natural.

A través de un texto alternativo, proponemos dar prioridad al apoyo a la familia, que es el entorno natural insustituible donde transcurren la vida y los afectos; dar opciones para elegir soluciones adaptadas a cada momento y cada situación; proponer ideas creativas, ofrecer recursos económicos y favorecer ventajas fiscales que permitan contar con la dedicación de un familiar o con servicios profesionales que sean de calidad y cualificados sobre la base de una especialidad, ya sea doméstica, educativa o terapéutica; reconocer el valor incalculable e indispensable de quien ofrece su dedicación. No hay labor más honrosa, cuidar a otro trasciende el mero acto material. Devolver el prestigio y procurar buenas condiciones es una prioridad, tanto si es un familiar como si es un profesional.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhor Presidente, o relatório tem referências importantes ao investimento em serviços públicos de cuidados e aos direitos dos cuidadores formais e informais, com particular atenção à esmagadora maioria que são mulheres e, em muitos casos, migrantes.

A principal limitação deste relatório é não tirar consequências para as regras de governação económica e consequências suficientemente fortes para a transformação do semestre europeu. A Comissão dos Assuntos Sociais continua a manter-se ao largo destes assuntos, que são da maior importância e sem os quais este relatório se arrisca a ser um conjunto de declarações de intenção com pouca consequência política.

Mas também nas intenções temos diferenças, e é importante olhar para aquilo que a direita propõe nas suas alterações e votos separados que saiam deste relatório: a referência a quaisquer propostas legislativas, a referência à desigualdade salarial de género, a referência à linha de financiamento europeu ou até à importância de financiar serviços públicos, e a referência à não mercantilização dos cuidados. E é importante para percebermos que não estamos todos de acordo. Há quem queira serviços públicos de cuidados para apoiar toda a gente e há quem só queira cuidar da indústria.

Ádám Kósa (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Az ápolás-gondozás kérdése nem tartozik az Európai Unió hatáskörébe. A tagállamoknak kell kialakítani a rendszereket, figyelembe véve a megelőző egészségügyi ellátás, rehabilitáció, továbbá a független életvitel lehetőségének biztosítását. Kiemelném a családi ápolás-gondozás meghatározó szerepét. Ez biztosítja a legmegfelelőbb környezetet a gondozottak számára, amihez az államnak minden feltételt és segítséget meg kell adnia. Azonban ez nem mindig lehetséges az otthonápolás tekintetében. Tehát az ellátottak érdekében szükségszerűen igazodva jónak, észszerű megközelítésre van szükség az intézményi ellátás körében is. Kedves kollégák! 12 éve harcolok a fogyatékkal élők, ellátottak nagy létszámú intézményi kiváltásáért. Országosan és az Európai Unió számos országában is komoly előrelépés történt. Amit megtanultam mindez idő alatt, hogy a megfelelő és közösségalapú intézményi ellátás és a családi ápolás-gondozás egymást tökéletesen kiegészíti, ebbe az irányba kell elmozdulni. Nem lehet minden gondozást végző intézményt bezárni.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, I thank Commissioner Šuica for his work. And I'd also like to pay tribute to Sirpa Pietikäinen and Dennis Radtke from my own group who worked so hard on this.

It is about time that Europe took action on care. We all know what a European perspective, action means. It means a greater focus on the harsh realities of care as it stands at present in the European Union, the harsh realities of what we saw during COVID-19.

Who amongst us can forget the appalling tragedies that we saw in relation to long-term care? Who amongst us can forget the lack of carers, the lack of pay, the lack of proper training? Surely it is time that we took a European perspective on care issues. Every Member State will gain from this. Every Member State must be involved, because this goes to the heart of our communities. It goes to the heart of the quality of our lives, of our parents' lives, of our children's lives.

Europe has much to offer. That care has long gone unnoticed and undervalued, and why? Because it is mostly women who have done it. It is beyond time to take action and make a difference in this area. We need EU money to build better care facilities. We need proper care workers with proper pay. We need to create eight million jobs in this area and we need to boost gender equality.

It's finally time for a Europe for carers and a Europe that cares.

Thank you. The Queen on picking a dolce vita to pee on Drago's bistro. Not so much a slow. Thank you, Chair. Commissioner Schuchat. Dear colleagues, the past couple of years show how the pandemic exacerbated the challenges faced by the care sector. And it is been a stark reminder of the importance of the care sector, the access to care and the efficiency of our Social Security systems. We have witnessed a lack of accessible and affordable quality long term care services and unacceptable stress put on the millions of care professionals, especially women, during a period of stress and crisis in an understaffed and underfunded sector. Existing challenges led also to a substantial share of informal care and outdated services not suited for the purpose. We need the necessary investment to give our citizens with the workers who are beneficiaries of the sector, the tools to face the existing challenges and the increased demand of care services due to an ageing population.

Dragoș Pîslaru (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner Šuica, dear colleagues, the past couple of years show how the pandemic exacerbated the challenges faced by the care sector.

This has been a stark reminder of the importance of the care sector, access to care and the efficiency of our social security systems. We have witnessed a lack of accessible and affordable, quality long-term care services, and unacceptable stress put on the millions of care professionals, especially women, during a period of stress and crisis in an understaffed and underfunded sector. Existing challenges have led also to a substantial share of informal care and outdated services not fit for the purpose.

We need the necessary investment to give our citizens, who are the workers and beneficiaries of the sector, the tools to face the existing challenges and the increased demand on care services due to an ageing population. We must put forward the necessary responses to create more quality jobs in the care sector and care industry and ensure our citizens, without any discrimination, have access to quality formal care services in all their forms.

The European care strategy stands as a pillar for the resilience of our social security systems. I would like to thank the rapporteurs and wish we have good cooperation with the Commission on this.

Stefania Zambelli (ID). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, quando parliamo di assistenza e prestatori di assistenza i numeri sono molto chiari: in tutta l'Unione europea ci sono 6 milioni di prestatori di assistenza professionali e 50 milioni sono invece i prestatori di assistenza «informali», non riconosciuti da un contratto di lavoro. Quasi l'80 per cento sono donne che, oltre a dare assistenza, devono anche lavorare.

Purtroppo, ci sono ancora enormi disparità tra gli Stati membri per la tutela di queste figure. Penso alle donne che devono assistere un figlio disabile o un genitore anziano e malato. La legge non riconosce per queste persone nessun tipo di assistenza, se non per piccoli o brevi periodi.

Molte donne si trovano così costrette a scegliere tra il lavoro e la cura di un familiare malato. Ritengo che siano scelte che nessuno nella vita dovrebbe mai fare.

Molto spesso le famiglie sono lasciate sole, serve un confronto più costruttivo in materia di assistenza, perché è la famiglia che per prima si fa carico di queste situazioni. Questo servirà a tutelare sia chi riceve le cure, ma anche chi le presta.

Elżbieta Rafalska (ECR). – Pani Komisarz! Panie Przewodniczący! Kwestia opieki, w szczególności opieki nad osobami starszymi, jest trudnym, może nawet najtrudniejszym i pilnym problemem społecznym. Przyczyny tej sytuacji wynikają ze zmian demograficznych, starzenia się społeczeństw, niskich wskaźników dzietności oraz wysokich wskaźników obciążenia demograficznego, często też dłuższego wieku życia, ale w niepełnosprawności i w niesamodzielności.

Kolejną przyczyną jest brak kadry opiekuńczej – nisko wynagradzanej, często zatrudnianej nielegalnie – i zróżnicowania systemów opieki zdrowotnej, w tym w rehabilitacji.

Odniosę się do rozwiązań z tej wspólnej rezolucji. Moim zdaniem szybka deinstytucjonalizacja może służyć wyłącznie prywatyzacji sektora, a także brakowi usług publicznych. Pogłębi to niedobory kadrowe i wbrew pozorom może obniżyć, a nie podwyższać – co jest naszym celem – standardy opiekuńcze.

Również mierzenie wartości każdej opieki wskaźnikiem jest myśleniem życzeniowym i technicznym. Musimy też pamiętać o krajowych kompetencjach. Musimy łączyć różne formy opieki (instytucjonalnej, środowiskowej, dziennej, całodobowej) i proponować rozwiązania systemowe.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, todos somos seres necesitados e inacabados, todos hemos sido niños y, con suerte, todos seremos ancianos. Es el momento de asumir que tenemos una deuda de vínculo con quienes nos cuidan y nos han cuidado. Una deuda que no es solo material, sino también afectiva, y de la que son acreedoras fundamentalmente las mujeres.

En Europa, más de siete millones y medio de mujeres han salido del mercado laboral para cuidar, frente a 450 000 hombres y, por cuidar, casi nueve millones de mujeres trabajan a tiempo parcial, frente a 560 000 hombres. Después nos quejamos de la falta de empatía que exhiben muchos varones: a cuidar y a querer se aprende cuidando y queriendo.

He abogado durante años por un pacto europeo de cuidados y estoy contenta porque este informe avanza hacia un modelo en el que los varones y las instituciones ocupan el lugar que les corresponde. Tenemos que prestar servicios de calidad que garanticen el bienestar y la autonomía de quienes los necesitan. Pero eso no puede lograrse si no se valora y se paga el cuidado lo que vale. Las mujeres dejan de percibir 287 000 millones de euros anuales por cuidados no remunerados. No lo olvidemos: a cuidar y a querer se aprende cuidando y queriendo.

Dennis Radtke (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist wie eigentlich immer, wenn wir Berichte aus dem Sozialausschuss diskutieren: Da gibt es immer großes Wehklagen, Europa überschreite seine Kompetenzen, ein Angriff auf nationale Zuständigkeiten. Ja, natürlich, beim Thema Gesundheit, beim Thema Pflege ist es in erster Linie eine nationalstaatliche Verantwortung. Aber wir als Europäische Union können doch bei einem Thema, das zutiefst europäisch ist und wo wir überall, oder nahezu überall, vor den gleichen Herausforderungen stehen, nicht einfach sagen: Ja, dann kümmert euch mal, und wir legen in der Zeit die Beine hoch.

Wenn man sich den europäischen Arbeitsmarkt ansieht, wenn man sich ansieht, was auf dem Pflegemarkt los ist – es gibt kaum einen zweiten Sektor, der so hochmobil ist. Welches deutsche Pflegeheim könnte eigentlich existieren, wenn wir dort nur noch deutsche Pflegekräfte hätten? Deswegen finde ich es elementar wichtig, dass wir einen Beitrag dazu leisten, Standards zu verbessern, Pflege aus dem Schattendasein, teilweise aus der Illegalität, aus der Schwarzarbeit herauszuholen und unseren Beitrag dazu zu leisten, dass die Standards besser werden und dass wir vor allen Dingen den Fachkräftemangel auch wirksam bekämpfen können. Dazu leisten wir einen Beitrag. Dafür möchte ich den Berichterstattern ganz herzlich danken.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia o solov zdvinutím ruky

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, hace dos años, después de la pandemia, en el discurso sobre el Estado de la Unión, la presidenta Ursula von der Leyen anunció que presentaría una estrategia europea de cuidados, porque habíamos podido poner en valor la importancia de los cuidados, de los cuidadores y de los beneficiarios de estos cuidados durante la pandemia. Nos ha dicho la comisaria que el 7 de septiembre se presenta esta estrategia.

Cada hombre y cada mujer puede recibir, y debe recibir, los mejores cuidados posibles y alcanzar así el mejor equilibrio de vida. Tiene que ser una prioridad europea y también nacional. Es una inversión necesaria y fundamental. Tenemos que reforzar, por lo tanto, este sistema de cuidados, aplicando lo que decía el pilar europeo de derechos sociales. Estos cuidados tienen que ser accesibles, asequibles y de calidad. Nos afectan a todos. El 80 % de los cuidados los proporcionan mujeres. Por lo tanto, lo tendremos que hacer combinando la estrategia de igualdad de género y la estrategia de discapacidad.

Una Europa que cuida a los suyos es una Europa que presta mayor atención, tanto a los beneficiarios de estos cuidados, como a sus cuidadores. Por lo tanto, apoyo totalmente esta estrategia, porque significa que estaremos a la altura de los valores europeos.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, în problema îngrijirii cred că sunt trei mari direcții în care trebuie să acționăm. Sigur, e de competența statelor membre. Cunosc foarte bine problema în țara mea și în țările din Est.

Avem o problemă, pe de o parte, cu cei care fac actul de îngrijire, de foarte multe ori sunt tratați fără demnitate, nu au un contract de muncă. Știm bine că din Est au plecat spre Vest foarte multe persoane pentru a lua mai mulți bani și a face acest act de îngrijire.

Pe de altă parte, avem problema celor îngrijiți. De foarte multe ori, actul de îngrijire nu este de calitate, și avem problema infrastructurii.

Doamnă comisar, dacă în strategia europeană nu vom cuprinde și buget pentru a aloca bani pentru infrastructură, pentru că, de exemplu, în țara mea, nu avem capacități pentru persoanele în vârstă, care nu pot fi îngrijite în familie și care au nevoie de aceste centre, cămine pentru persoane în vârstă, unde să fie îngrijiți corespunzător, nu vom putea rezolva situația.

Mă străduiesc de câțiva ani să conving Comisia că trebuie alocat și răspunsul pe care îl primim sistematic de la Comisie, că persoanele în vârstă trebuie să fie îngrijite în familie, este absolut absurd, pentru că sunt persoane care nu au loc în familie, nu mai au familii și pentru acest lucru trebuie să alocăm bugete de la bugetul social, de la Fondul Social, pentru a putea să avem locuri pentru aceste persoane care merită respectul nostru până în ultima zi de viață.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, durante décadas as opções de política de direita e a prevalência dos critérios do défice e da dívida sobre a justiça social têm ditado o desinvestimento público nas funções sociais do Estado, a desresponsabilização do Estado na promoção do bem-estar e na proteção das populações e a mercantilização dos cuidados, quer na saúde, quer na educação.

A ausência ou carência de uma resposta pública adequada, universal e gratuita nestas matérias tem levado a que milhares de pessoas, maioritariamente mulheres, assumam informal e individualmente a prestação de cuidados a familiares próximos, transferindo para as suas costas toda a responsabilidade pelas pessoas de que cuidam, sujeitando-se a uma brutal sobrecarga física e psicológica e privando-as da sua vida pessoal e profissional.

Defendemos o reforço ou a criação de redes públicas robustas, de proximidade, devidamente dotadas de meios financeiros, técnicos, materiais, infraestruturais e humanos, condições dignas de trabalho, perspetivas de evolução na carreira e salários justos, proteção e apoio aos cuidadores informais com apoio psicossocial e proteção social, formação e capacitação.

Está na hora de os Estados tomarem nas suas mãos os cuidados dos cuidadores e das pessoas cuidadas.

Helmut Geuking (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Eines ist klar: Bei diesem Bericht – also ich muss ehrlich gestehen, ich komme aus der Pflege – da klopfen zwei Herzen in meiner Brust. Auf der einen Seite erkenne ich natürlich die Notwendigkeit an, dass wir hier die Pflege europaweit stärken. Auf der anderen Seite erkenne ich aber auch an, dass die Defizite zwischen den einzelnen Ländern im Bereich der Pflege enorm groß sind und dass hier das Subsidiaritätsprinzip greifen muss.

Dieser Bericht ist wenig dazu geeignet. Ich habe Sorge, dass dieser Bericht die Pflege zementiert in einer Form, die wir nicht gebrauchen können. Pflege unterliegt einem ständig werdenden Anpassungsprozess. Pflege ist ein Entwicklungsprozess, den wir ständig überprüfen, überarbeiten müssen. Pflege ist eine eigene Wissenschaft für sich, und dem wird dieser Bericht einfach nicht gerecht, das muss man so deutlich sagen.

Ich wünsche mir mehr Innovation, mehr Forschung in dem Bereich Pflege. Ich wünsche mir endlich die Anerkennung der Pflege, und dieser Bericht wird europaweit an der Pflege nicht viel ändern. Ich möchte Änderungen bewirken. Ich möchte, dass die Menschen diesen Beruf wählen können, ohne einen sozialen Abstieg hinzunehmen, ohne verbraucht zu sein nach zehn, 20 Jahren. Jawohl, wir müssen im Bereich der Pflege Rahmenbedingungen schaffen, aber nicht so, wie dieser Bericht es vorgibt. Ich wünsche mir, dass wir diesen Bericht quasi vielleicht doch ablehnen, aber damit wir die Chancen dafür eröffnen, neue Wege zu gehen, sprich einen neuen Bericht, der der Pflege und den Menschen in ganz Europa auch gerecht wird.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Voorzitter! U spreekt over de noodtoestand en het belang van zorg in Europa. En dat klopt natuurlijk. Maar laten we niet blind zijn, laten we hier niet verzwijgen dat dat wel het gevolg is van concreet beleid. Eerst en vooral het besparingsbeleid dat u jarenlang hebt opgelegd aan de lidstaten. En vandaag de marktwerking die steeds meer geïntroduceerd wordt in de zorg.

Marktwerking staat haaks op goede publieke zorgverlening, want daarbij gaat het erom om kosten te besparen en winsten te maximaliseren. Dan moet het personeel het doen met steeds minder middelen en met steeds minder personeel. En dan mogen de mensen die verzorgd moeten worden nog maar één keer per week onder de douche en krijgen ze niet genoeg hygiënisch materiaal enzovoorts. Dus we moeten breken met die marktwerking.

De oplossing daarvoor is meer publieke investeringen en duidelijk breken met het beleid dat u tot nu toe hebt gevoerd. Dat verwacht ik van elke Europese zorgstrategie: breken met de privatiseringslogica en massaal goede publieke zorg garanderen.

(Konec vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia o solov zdvihnutím ruky)

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all, I want to thank you very much for your contributions. I was listening carefully and I'm really very grateful for the support of the European Parliament in putting care high on the European agenda. I was listening carefully and what I heard is that all of you agreed that there is demographic change, that there is a change in family structure, and that we need the infrastructure, budget, public infrastructure. So this is what all of you said.

A number of speakers referred to care not being an EU competence. This is what you said. There is no idea and there is no reason to interfere in the sovereignty of Member States. But what we are trying to do, we do not question the sovereignty of Member States. We are not planning to organise care at the European Union level with a care strategy. We are only setting a policy framework to better structure mutual exchanges and to better structure the EU level, so that Member States can learn from each other and the Commission supports them with EU funding and research. Nobody said that you don't want funding, at the same time you don't want to interfere into sovereignty, so nobody is interfering into sovereignty. But at the same time we are ready to invest in this.

A few speakers also asked for care to be left for the families. Yes, all of us know that care has traditionally been a family matter, but all of us also know that family structures are changing. Families have fewer children. This is what some of you said. Family members live further apart. Women want a normal job – a normal and formal job, a normal career. And it's not possible because of labour shortages. Therefore, we can no longer rely on family care and we need to adapt our public services. This is what we are doing.

So the European care strategy will call for better working conditions and wages, supported by strong dialogue and education and training to make care jobs more attractive. And as all of you know, we do not start from scratch. Many European Union initiatives you mentioned also already address the situation of care workers. And this strategy will call for better implementation and enforcement of this *acquis* to the care sector, and it will aim to trigger actions identifying specific implementation gaps.

At the same time, the European care strategy will also aim to highlight the specific challenges of particularly vulnerable care workers, such as migrant workers, domestic workers and live-in carers.

We will follow up on your report in finalising the care package and thank the European Parliament for the work already done on putting the spotlight on the different aspects of care. We count on your continued active cooperation in ensuring that the strategy brings concrete benefits to the lives of all in the European Union, making sure we leave no one and nowhere behind. And once again, I want to particularly thank our rapporteurs, Milan Brglez and Sirpa Pietikäinen.

Milan Brglez, *poročevalec*. – Gospod predsednik, komisarka, spoštovane kolegice, spoštovani kolegi!

Najprej se še enkrat zahvaljujem za tudi to razpravo poleg vsega dela, ki je bilo opravljeno na poročilu. Pravzaprav mi je res v čast biti soporočevalec na tem področju.

Tisto, kar je nekako izhajalo iz vsega, kar smo povedali, je, da je oskrba človekova pravica. Najprej človekova pravica oskrbovancev, torej tistih, ki pomoč potrebujejo, potem pa tudi človekova pravica kot pravica tistih, ki delajo.

Delovni pogoji tistih, ki delajo – tako v formalni kot neformalni oskrbi – so pomembni za nas. In znotraj tega je potrebno spodbuditi proces dezinstytucionalizacije, ki pravzaprav zagotavlja neodvisno življenje vsakega na način, ki mu je prilagojen, seveda. Zdaj gre za vključitev vseh, človekove pravice vseh, in v tem je razlika med tem poročilom in alternativnim poročilom, ki zanika človekove pravice vseh.

V osnovi je oskrba temelj evropskega načina življenja. Brez tega ni evropskega načina življenja, zato moramo na drugačen način vrednotiti sam sektor oskrbe in zagotoviti spolno enakost in enakopravnost. Brez ženskega dela ta sektor ne deluje. Ampak ne more na trajnostni način delovati naprej, zato ga je treba prevrednotiti. Vrednote – potrebna je solidarnost med generacijami, da bo lahko prišlo do bolj vzdržnega načina življenja.

Tudi v osnovi odpornosti in trajnosti je pravzaprav skrbstvo. Brez posvečanja skrbstvu in zlasti javnemu dobru in javnim investicijam skrbstvu ne bo te trajnosti. In zaradi tega pravim, da je to področje tako pomembno, vse od otroškega varstva, na kar smo že pozorni, dolgotrajne oskrbe, skrbi za tiste s posebnimi potrebami, za vse oblike oskrbe, ki jo pravzaprav potrebujemo. Brez tega Evropa obstane ali pade.

Sirpa Pietikäinen, rapporteur. – Mr President, thank you for the debate and thank you to the Commissioner for the preparation about an EU care strategy. We just would like to encourage you to raise the ambition level, with this Parliament's support – which you can hear very strongly – and as I said, to take the informal carers' situation into account.

Commissioner Šuica, you quite rightly said that at the Conference on the Future of Europe, citizens' first priority was the care and social sector and the EU's improvements there. And it is true that access to care is a human right. It is a constitutional right and it is the EU's duty to take care of that. And so, no, it does not touch with the subsidiarity. We demand and we ensure that there is universal access to care when it is needed. Then it is up to the Member States how they organise it – public or private, informal/formal, community-based, personal budgeting – there are millions of ways and this is clearly said in the report. We do not touch with the subsidiarity. It is in no way threatened and there is no pressure on it. But if the quality and human rights is a pressure to the subsidiarity of Member States, then I really do wonder.

Then, yes, I agree that it would be wonderful to also encourage the better use of digitalisation, research and innovation and the benefit of this knowledge at European level. This is the right place for the EU to support the Member States and to create programmes and platforms, as it is called in this report, to support Member States' development.

Last but not least, if Member States, by themselves, could solve the care issues, they would have done so already. And if they could take care of the cross-border needs of 8 million new people to be demanded in the sector, it would have happened already.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční v utorok 05. 07. 2022.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Cindy Franssen (PPE), schriftelijk. – De voorbije twee jaar stonden onze zorgverleners met veel engagement, professionalisme en volharding paraat om iedereen de best mogelijke zorg aan te bieden. Het is duidelijk dat kwaliteitsvolle zorg, zowel voor de zorgverleners als voor de zorgbehoevenden, een absolute prioriteit moet zijn. De sector verdient meer dan alleen maar applaus.

Het aantal personen in de EU dat langdurige zorg nodig heeft, zal naar verwachting stijgen van 30,8 miljoen in 2019 tot 38,1 miljoen in 2050. Het Europees Parlement keurde daarom dit ambitieuze verslag goed dat ijvert voor een langetermijnstrategie voor onze zorgsector.

Ik steun dit verslag volledig, met bijzondere aandacht voor het aantrekkelijker maken van de banen in de zorgsector: meer Europese steun voor infrastructuur, betere arbeidsomstandigheden en een betere bescherming tegen schadelijke stoffen op de werkvloer. Dit verslag is ook baanbrekend omdat het mantelzorg erkent. 80 % van alle langdurige zorg in Europa wordt verleend door onbetaalde mantelzorgers. Dit zijn 40 tot 50 miljoen Europeanen die zorgen voor familie of vrienden. Ze doen dit vaak zonder officieel statuut, zonder een vast aantal verlofdagen, een zorgpremie of duidelijke pensioenregels. Ik ben dan ook heel tevreden dat dit verslag voorziet in een statuut op basis van ambitieuze Europese normen.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE), par écrit. – Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, il est urgent de soutenir l'ensemble du secteur des soins. La santé n'a pas de prix!

Or, la crise sanitaire a montré la faiblesse de nos systèmes de soins, en partie due à des sous-investissements chroniques. Le problème est double. On assiste, d'une part, à un manque de services de soins de longue durée de qualité, accessibles et abordables et, d'autre part, à un manque de reconnaissance des travailleurs du secteur, qui sont sujets à de l'absentéisme et à une fuite des travailleurs.

Or, l'évolution démographique, le vieillissement de la population, ainsi que le réchauffement climatique et les réformes d'atténuation vont exacerber la pression sur le secteur.

Je soutiens donc le rapport vers une action européenne commune en matière de soins, et j'appelle la Commission à prendre des mesures rapidement, d'autant plus qu'elles iraient dans le sens des conclusions de la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe. En définitive, il faut garantir un accès rapide et égal à des services de soins de haute qualité aux personnes de toutes les générations et soutenir les aidants grâce notamment à des revalorisations salariales, des régularisations des contrats et une reconnaissance de la pénibilité physique et psychologique du milieu.

Guido Reil (ID), *schriftlich*. – Pflegekräfte werden verheizt. Sie haben so viele Patienten zu versorgen, dass ihnen keine Zeit für Pausen bleibt. Sie leiden darunter, ihren eigenen Ansprüchen nicht gerecht zu werden. Die meisten von ihnen sind Pfleger geworden, um Menschen zu helfen. Stattdessen sehen sie, wie sich moderne Medizin gegen Menschen richtet, wie überflüssige Operationen durchgeführt werden, weil sie gut bezahlt werden und wie Patienten zu früh aus dem Krankenhaus entlassen werden, weil ihr Aufenthalt nur pauschal bezahlt wird. Sie sehen, wie der Tod hinausgezögert und das Leid verlängert wird, weil sich beides für ein Krankenhaus rentiert.

Pflegekräfte werden nicht ernst genommen, weder von Ärzten und erst recht nicht von der Politik. Sie machen Überstunden und arbeiten die Wochenenden durch. Solange, bis sie selbst Gesundheitsprobleme bekommen: Schlafstörungen, Bandscheibenvorfälle, Burnouts. So sieht es aus. Und all das ist politisch gewollt, weil für einige wenige finanziell lohnend.

Es gibt aber Bereiche des menschlichen Lebens, die nicht kommerziell geregelt sein sollten, weil für sie andere Regeln gelten: moralisch-ethische Regeln, die keine materielle Entsprechung haben. Das sind die Probleme der Pflege, die nicht dadurch gelöst werden, dass Sie, nachdem sie alle heimischen Pflegekräfte verheizt und krankgemacht haben, noch mehr ausländische Pflegekräfte importieren, um diese genauso zu verheizen.

3. Zdrowie psychiczne w cyfrowym świecie pracy (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je rozprava o správe, ktorú predkladá Maria Walsh v mene Výboru pre zamestnanosť a sociálne veci, o návrhu o duševnom zdraví v digitálnom svete práce (2021/2098(INI)) (A9-0184-2022).

Maria Walsh, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, it is great to be standing here this morning and talking about the mental health of our communities. Colleagues, last year UNICEF reported that suicide is the second leading cause of death among our young Europeans. That same report outlined that, here in Europe, 9 million of our adolescents aged 10 to 19 years are living with mental disorders – 9 million.

A joint OECD and EU Commission report, dated four years ago, found that one in six across our European Union suffered negatively with their mental health. The report also noted that the total economic impact of our citizens' mental ill health is over EUR 6 billion. That is more than 4% of GDP across our 27 Member States.

And what are we doing?

There is a silent belief that we, as EU policymakers, do not have a role or competency to deliver change for the mental health and well-being of our citizens, and this, colleagues, this silent belief, is utter fabrication. There can be no debate or policy discussion on health, on care, on the future of our European Union, without the mental health of our citizens at its very core.

To deliver better mental health services, we, as policymakers, across committees and countries, must wake up and learn to communicate with one another and work together. A cross-sectional approach to mental health is critical if we are to shift the dreadful imbalance our citizens face in accessing healthcare, education and employment opportunities.

Our citizens – especially our young people – cannot continue to live in an EU where people must hit rock bottom before they receive support for their mental health. Early intervention is key. Reintegration and tackling mental health among our young working population is also vital. Both of these aspects are crucial if we are to develop and strengthen our labour market and social policies for our EU for generations to come.

This report on mental health in the digital world of work examines benefits and the risks of digitalisation, drawing from the experiences of our employees and employers over the past two and a half years that they faced of the COVID-19 pandemic. By supporting this report, you will join our call to update current EU legislation to respond to the new realities of the digital way of working, thus enabling companies and countries to really facilitate positive mental health practices for themselves and their workforce.

I really look forward to today's discussion, hearing from my shadow rapporteurs, my colleagues, and of course, Commissioner Schmit. I hope from this we don't continue to talk only about mental health; we actually start putting these things into practice.

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the Parliament, dear Ms Walsh as rapporteur, dear shadow rapporteurs, I welcome this occasion to discuss your comprehensive report on mental health in the digital world of work. I agree with you, it's not just about discussion – it's about preparing actions.

Mental health is indeed a growing concern in all the Member States of the EU. This has also been recognised by the Commission in its recent communication on the Conference on the Future of Europe.

Already before the pandemic, mental health problems affected about 84 million people in the EU. This means, in concrete terms, an enormous personal suffering of people. Linked to that, there is an enormous cost for our societies in terms of well-being. But also, from a purely economic point of view, from the point of view of the labour market, these mental health problems are estimated to be about EUR 600 billion annually, which is roughly 4% of the EU GDP.

The pandemic has particularly affected the mental health of young people, people with less secure employment, people with less education or lower income. Young people deserve particular attention as the pandemic has had a heavy toll. According to the OECD, most countries' mental health issues among the age group 15 to 24 have doubled or even more.

Young people need to be able to access support at an early stage in education as well as at work. This is also a matter of improving the quality of work, including telework.

On 22 June, the Commission presented its new initiative 'Healthier Together: EU non-communicable diseases'. One of the initiative strands focuses on mental health and neurological disorders. It will promote mental well-being and address mental health disorders, improving timely and equitable access to high-quality mental health services and enhancing social inclusion of people living with a mental health problem.

With a budget of more than EUR 5.3 billion, the EU for Health programme will support these efforts. This includes two specific calls for proposals on the mental health of children, young people and their families. This will contribute to the European Year of Youth with a new budget contribution of EUR 4 billion each. A call for projects is also under way to tackle mental health challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic and to meet young people's mental health needs.

The EU contribution here is EUR 750 000. Moreover, we have also mobilised EUR 9 million to help people fleeing Ukraine that are in urgent need of mental health and trauma support.

Mental health is also a growing concern in the context of the labour market and the new world of work. Telework has the potential to deliver many benefits to people and society. We saw this during the pandemic when telework proved essential to preserving economic activity and employment. Going forward, telework can contribute to reconciling private and professional life, to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and to reversing population decline in smaller cities and rural areas.

However, telework also carries some important risks, as some workers report feeling isolated or being unable to disconnect or find the right work-life balance and, I must say, mainly women are affected by this overburden which sometimes has been created by telework.

I want to stress that the EU legal framework on safety and health at work aims at protecting workers from all occupational health and safety risks, and this includes psycho-social risks. It is essential to fully apply these provisions on the ground.

In this regard, and as pointed out in your report, we also need better awareness and training, and the next Healthy Workplaces Campaign of the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work for 2325 will therefore also address these psycho-social risks.

In addition, the EU OSH strategic framework has already announced a non-legislative initiative related to mental health at work. The aim is to work towards a joint commitment for addressing psycho-social risks and preventing mental health problems by all relevant actors including, in particular, the social partners, Member States and labour inspectors. The Occupational Safety and Health Summit in May 2023 will provide a unique opportunity to generate momentum and concrete commitments.

We all acknowledge the importance of digitalisation of the world of work while respecting working time arrangements, upholding sound working conditions, health and safety, as well as the boundaries between professional and private life. The Commission is currently working on a possible review of the Workplace and Display Screen Directives, and this review would address issues related to changes in the world of work and digitalisation, including also psycho-social risks.

In parallel, analytical work on artificial intelligence, telework and the right to disconnect is ongoing. We are collecting evidence and looking into the future development of telework and the right to disconnect through a fact-finding study. We also co-hosted a conference with the European Parliament on these issues.

The social partners play a central role, so I am very pleased that the EU cross-industry social partners agreed last week to work towards commonly agreed solutions and review and update their 2002 autonomous agreement on telework, with a view to it being transformed into EU law. This will also address the right to disconnect.

A final word on care workers, because you just had an important debate on care. The pandemic has had significant impacts on their physical and mental health. As discussed earlier in September, the Commission will come forward with a European care strategy. Its aim is not only to boost access to quality, affordable and accessible care services, but also to improve working conditions and work-life balance for carers.

Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank again the rapporteur for her remarkable work and the many valuable elements in this report. I am sure that together we can tackle this issue of mental health, which destroys so many lives in our society.

Sara Skyttedal, för PPE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Det vi nu diskuterar är ett betänkande om psykisk ohälsa. Det är tveklöst ett viktigt område där många kämpar, ofta i det fördolda. Vissa gör det under perioder, för andra är det en livslång kamp. I området som handlar om balansen mellan arbete och familjeliv, står det att många, ofta kvinnor, känner en stress över att få livspusslet att gå ihop.

Tyvärr har vänstergruppen i parlamentet föreslagit en lösning på detta som skulle göra det ännu svårare att uppnå denna balans i vardagen, nämligen en helt kvoterad föräldraförsäkring, utan möjlighet att fördela dagarna med barnen så som man själv önskar. Det om något skulle skapa ännu mer psykisk ohälsa. Vänstern tror alltså på fullaste allvar att det blir mindre stressigt för familjerna om politiker på detaljnivå styr över enskilda familjers schema och bestämmer över hur de ska fördela tiden med barnen och lista ut hur det bäst planeras ihop med föräldrarnas arbeten.

Jag är tacksam över de generösa system för föräldradidighet som finns i många av våra länder. Det gör det lättare att få ihop vardagen. Vänsterns klåfingrighet mot familjerna riskerar dock att få fler mammor och pappor att känna att de inte räcker till, vare sig på jobbet eller hemma. Dessutom minskar den värdefulla tid som barn får med sina föräldrar. Det är det sista vi behöver för att bekämpa psykisk ohälsa i Europa.

Estrella Durá Ferrandis, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, desgraciadamente hemos tenido que pasar una crisis sanitaria sin precedentes para darnos cuenta de una problemática que llevaba tiempo gestándose en Europa. Otro tipo de pandemia, más silenciosa, que afecta a la salud mental de las personas, especialmente a colectivos más vulnerables, como mujeres y jóvenes, y que está directamente relacionada con la precariedad en el trabajo, la inestabilidad laboral y la digitalización. Y es que, cuando hablamos de transición digital, tenemos también que hablar de las consecuencias que tienen un mal uso de los sistemas de inteligencia artificial y la automatización sobre la salud y la seguridad de los trabajadores, incluida su salud mental.

El control y la vigilancia masivos, el incremento de las horas trabajadas, la falta de claridad y transparencia en las relaciones laborales, la ausencia de separación entre la vida profesional y la vida privada o la clara violación de los derechos de privacidad son solo algunos de los ejemplos que incrementan los riesgos psicosociales y repercuten negativamente en la salud mental de los trabajadores y trabajadoras, pero también en la sociedad en general, debido al alto coste de gasto público que ocasionan y a un incremento del riesgo de exclusión social y pobreza a medio plazo. Es para estos riesgos psicosociales para cuya prevención y manejo llevamos ya tiempo exigiendo una directiva, así como el reconocimiento de que determinados trastornos mentales, como la ansiedad, la depresión y el *burnout*, están asociados a condiciones laborales y deben ser reconocidos como enfermedades ocupacionales.

Es el momento de actuar. Estoy segura, señor comisario, de que comparte la opinión de que es necesario legislar y garantizar que el empleador asuma la responsabilidad que le corresponde en la protección de la salud mental de los trabajadores. El acuerdo alcanzado la semana pasada sobre el teletrabajo y el derecho a la desconexión es un paso adelante. Esperamos que los firmantes estén a la altura y que encontremos próximamente nuevos marcos regulatorios sobre la inteligencia artificial en los lugares de trabajo y sobre la prevención y el manejo de los riesgos psicosociales.

Jordi Cañas, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, en primer lugar, quería agradecer a la ponente, la señora Walsh, su excelente trabajo, porque este es un informe sobre la salud mental en el mundo del trabajo digital necesario, porque está apegado a la realidad de un mundo laboral redefinido por la pandemia de COVID-19.

La pandemia ha cambiado las condiciones de trabajo de millones de trabajadores en Europa con consecuencias positivas, pero también con consecuencias negativas, como la excesiva conexión, la difuminación de las líneas entre la vida laboral y la vida privada, una mayor intensidad en el trabajo y el estrés tecnológico que puede tener, que tiene, consecuencias psicológicas, físicas y sociales negativas, como la ansiedad relacionada con el trabajo, el agotamiento profesional — *burnout*— o la depresión.

Por lo tanto, tenemos la obligación, como legisladores, de salvaguardar y promover el derecho a la salud física y mental de los trabajadores en este contexto. Pero la salud mental ha sido y es la gran olvidada en los sistemas sanitarios y también en las políticas de seguridad y salud en el trabajo. Por ello, esta nueva situación requiere una nueva y más amplia definición de la salud y seguridad en el trabajo. Y también requiere de marcos legislativos que sean capaces de abordar de una forma holística los problemas que el mundo digital significa para los trabajadores.

Por ello, señor comisario, quiero insistir una vez más en la necesidad de impulsar una normativa europea sobre el teletrabajo que sea capaz de abordar de una forma integral y holística los problemas que suponen para los trabajadores este nuevo mundo vinculado al trabajo digital.

Kim Van Sparrentak, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear rapporteur, dear Commissioner, imagine going to work at Zara. You enter the shop in the morning, pick up a tablet, put an earpiece in and, for hours on end, you are tracked and have an algorithm tell you exactly what you need to do. And if you don't do it fast enough, because a customer asks you something, this might lead to not getting your contract renewed. It might sound futuristic, but this is already the reality for a growing group of workers. Bosses are treating them like robots and new technologies allow them to constantly surveil them and micro-manage people, under huge time pressure.

But constant monitoring also happens to office workers and civil servants. With the help of software, your boss can know exactly how many emails you send, how many keystrokes you make per hour, and even where your gaze is fixed. In a world like this, workers can't thrive. The stress of being surveyed and the loss of autonomy leads to lower wellbeing of workers and impacts their mental health.

We urgently need rules for the entire labour market to ban surveillance and constant monitoring of workers and regulate algorithmic management for all. And I'm happy to report calls for this. I'm now looking at the Commission to take action and make our workplaces safer, healthier and happier again.

Elena Lizzi, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ringraziare la relatrice Maria Walsh per il suo progetto di relazione e anche il suo ufficio per il lavoro svolto insieme.

Come sostiene la relazione, è giunto il momento di affrontare seriamente la questione del riconoscimento politico della crisi legata alla salute mentale dei cittadini degli Stati membri dell'Unione europea e di valutare quali siano le possibili azioni da intraprendere a livello europeo e degli Stati membri. Ignorando l'invito ad agire, metteremmo a repentaglio soprattutto le nuove generazioni, che rappresentano i lavoratori del futuro e la futura società.

La pandemia ha avuto un impatto decisamente drammatico sulle vite di milioni di cittadini, aggravando gli effetti della salute mentale, con conseguente peggioramento dei tassi di stress, ansia e depressione.

Nel testo vengono affrontati temi quali il diritto alla disconnessione, il telelavoro e l'automazione, ponendo sufficientemente in rilievo la competenza nazionale in materia, cioè chiarendo le parti, nonché la necessità di iniziative appropriate di educazione e sensibilizzazione alla salute mentale, di formazione dei datori di lavoro e anche migliori attività di ricerca e raccolta dei dati a livello europeo.

Sebbene non tutti i passaggi siano scritti come li avremmo voluti, la relatrice si è dimostrata disponibile all'ascolto, la ringraziamo per questo e per aver dimostrato che il buon senso non ha colore politico.

Elżbieta Rafalska, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Komisarzu! Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! To sprawozdanie jest poniekąd połączeniem dwóch tematów, które uwypukliła pandemia Covid-19, a więc przyspieszającej cyfryzacji oraz zdrowia psychicznego. Przyspieszeniu cyfryzacji sprzyja powszechna dzisiaj praca zdalna czy praca za pośrednictwem platform. Natomiast skutki uboczne nowych realiów, wykluczenie społeczne, samotność, trudności na dynamicznie rozwijającym się rynku pracy pogłębiają problemy z zakresu zdrowia psychicznego.

Sprawozdawczyni w wyważony sposób przedstawiła zarówno zalety i szanse niesione przez postępującą cyfryzację, jak i zagrożenia oraz potrzebę utrzymania odpowiedniej kultury pracy. Dzięki poprawkom mojej frakcji ECR zachowano równowagę między problemami ludzi młodych, czyli między depresją i problemami ze znalezieniem pracy, a problemami ludzi starszych, czyli wykluczeniem społecznym czy brakiem odpowiednich umiejętności i narzędzi do funkcjonowania w przestrzeni cyfrowej.

José Gusmão, em nome do Grupo The Left. – Senhor Presidente, a pandemia mostrou que o mundo digital do trabalho está longe de ser o paraíso que a determinada altura era prometido. A realidade da diluição dos horários de trabalho, da separação entre trabalho e vida familiar, a realidade dos abusos, do assédio e da pressão sobre trabalhadores que estão envolvidos em relações digitais de trabalho mostra a importância de conseguir a responsabilização, preventiva e após os incidentes, das entidades empregadoras. E é muito importante, e foi difícil, que essa responsabilização ficasse neste relatório.

E é por isso que é também fundamental que sejam rejeitadas as propostas da direita para retirar do relatório as referências à necessidade de regular o direito a desligar, à necessidade de regular o teletrabalho e à necessidade de reatualizar a lista de doenças profissionais.

Se estas alterações que a direita propõe passassem, este relatório, que já é um relatório modesto, passaria a ser um recuo na luta pela saúde mental no mundo do trabalho, e é por isso que é importante que sejam chumbadas.

Ádám Kósa (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! A világvárvány alatt elterjedt a távmunka, amelynek vannak pozitív következményei, mint a nagyfokú rugalmasság és az önállóság. Ugyanakkor ezzel szemben ott van a hosszú munkaidő vagy a túlzott összekapcsoltság, a munka intenzitásának a növekedése és a stressz. Egyértelmű, hogy a mentális egészséget prioritásként kell kezelni. Akkor mi lehet a megoldás? A digitális készségek fejlesztése, amely enyhítheti a munkával kapcsolatos stresszt. Kulcsfontosságú a digitális akadálymentesítés is a fogyatékkal élő személyek és bennük, köztük a mentális egészségi problémákkal küzdő személyek egyenlő munkafeltételeihez.

Európában az öngyilkosság a fiatalok körében a második leggyakoribb halálok. A fiatalok körében kiemelkedő a mentális egészségi problémák kezelése, és ennek legjobb eszköze a jó minőségű oktatás, a foglalkoztatás, a családalapítás és a lakáshoz való jutás támogatása, hogy legyen egy pozitív jövőképük. Magyarország jó példa: a 25 év alatti munkavállaló fiatalok SZJA-mentessége, a családalapítást és a gyermekvállalást ösztönző otthonteremtési támogatási rendszer kiépült az elmúlt években, amelynek már látszanak a kedvező eredményei.

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αρχικά θέλω να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια, Maria Walsh, για την πολύ τεκμηριωμένη έκθεσή της σε αυτό το σημαντικό θέμα. Συνάδελφοι, το 11% των ενηλίκων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει συμπτώματα ψυχολογικής δυσφορίας, ενώ το κόστος της εργασιακής κατάθλιψης ανέρχεται σε 620 δισεκατομμύρια ετησίως. Οι αριθμοί είναι αμείλικτοι και μας φέρνουν αντιμέτωπους με μια σιωπηλή επιδημία. Για να την αντιμετωπίσουμε, επιβάλλεται να δράσουμε άμεσα με μια ολιστική προσέγγιση που να αποδίδει στην ψυχική υγεία την ίδια σημασία που δίνεται στη σωματική υγεία, με έμφαση στην πρόληψη προβλημάτων ψυχικής υγείας, τη βελτίωση της ισορροπίας μεταξύ επαγγελματικής και ιδιωτικής ζωής, σαφείς ρυθμίσεις για την τηλεργασία, αλλά και ουσιαστική στήριξη και συστηματική αντιμετώπιση του ζητήματος.

Αρκεί μόνο να κατανοήσουμε ότι είναι προς όφελος όλων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών με ζητήματα ψυχικής υγείας, των συστημάτων υγείας, αλλά και των επιχειρήσεων. Γιατί τελικά εργαζόμενοι με ψυχική ευεξία σημαίνει αυξημένη παραγωγικότητα και συμμετοχή στον χώρο εργασίας. Και αυτή η έκθεση είναι το πρώτο βήμα για να ζητήσουμε μια ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική για την ψυχική υγεία που θα αφορά όλους τους τομείς. Ας δράσουμε όλοι προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Voorzitter. Negen op de tien werknemers ervaren stress op de werkvloer. De mentale gezondheidscrisis is een sluipmoordenaar die in Europa al vele jaren ongestoord zijn gang kan gaan. En de pandemie heeft de situatie alleen nog maar verslechterd. De grens tussen werk en privé is vervaagd, met meer stress, meer burn-outs en meer depressies als gevolg.

Ik denk dat we moeten zeggen dat we in een gezondheidscrisis verkeren, en dat er niets gebeurt. Europees ingrijpen is noodzakelijk. Woorden zijn niet meer genoeg. De Commissie moet aan de bak: kom met een richtlijn, bescherm de werknemers tegen stress en beëindig de gezondheidscrisis! Mentale gezondheid is een mensenrecht. Laten we het de prioriteit geven die het verdient.

Sylvie Brunet (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, cher Commissaire Nicolas Schmit, chers collègues, les problématiques de santé mentale au travail se sont accrues avec la crise de la COVID-19 – j'allais dire toutes les crises, y compris la transition numérique. Ces crises ne sont pas une fatalité et nous devons les prendre en compte, notamment par le dialogue social à tous niveaux.

Je voudrais vraiment remercier Maria Walsh pour cet excellent rapport qui donne des pistes concrètes, comme le renforcement de l'accès à des services de soutien ou encore à des services d'intermédiation en matière de risques psychosociaux. Et je voudrais aussi insister et donner tout mon soutien, dans ce contexte, à une directive sur le droit à la déconnexion, d'autant que les partenaires sociaux européens viennent de s'accorder sur la nécessité d'un cadre contraignant sur la déconnexion dans leur programme de travail 2022-2024. Je pense que c'est un sujet majeur, particulièrement pour notre jeunesse, très éprouvée par ces différentes crises.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auf den ersten Blick scheint Homeoffice eine praktische Alternative zu sein. Auf den zweiten jedoch hat das viele Von-Zuhause-Arbeiten während der COVID-19-Pandemie große Auswirkungen auf die psychische Gesundheit vieler gehabt. Diese Monate haben gezeigt, wie wichtig soziale Kontakte, Work-Life-Balance und das Recht auf Abschalten sind.

Zur digitalen Arbeitswelt zählt auch die Gruppe der *platform workers*, deren Arbeit durch Algorithmen und Fernmanagement geregelt wird. Das Ergebnis: prekäre Arbeitsaufträge, die zu Leistungsdruck und finanziellen Ängsten führen, und ein Gefühl der dauerhaften Überwachung. All das kann zu Depressionen oder psychischen Krankheiten führen.

Es ist daher höchste Zeit, dass die EU-Kommission eine europäische Strategie für mentale Gesundheit vorschlägt, die den vielen Facetten der psychischen Gesundheit gerecht wird und die Herausforderungen der digitalen Arbeitswelt beachtet.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani kolege, poštovani građani, mentalno zdravlje je usko povezano, prema brojnim studijama koje su obavljene u protekle dvije godine, s fizičkim zdravljem.

Mentalno zdravlje koje je narušeno teškim strahom dovodi do teških oboljenja, a u ekstremnim slučajevima dovodi i direktni je uzročnik smrti. U Hrvatskoj imamo dokazanu preminulu jednu osobu od posljedica iskustva teškog straha.

Prije dvije i pol godine pozvao sam ovaj dom da ne pokleknemo pred kampanjom straha koja je sami temelj tzv. pandemije COVID-a 19, da se bavimo činjenicama jer u suprotnosti nestat će svijet kakvog poznajemo.

Danas je ogroman broj ljudi, kako u Europi tako i u svijetu, pod teškom psihozom straha, a najesen nas čeka i rat i pandemija.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Miriám Lexmann (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, pandémia, dlhodobá neistota a k tomu ruská invázia na Ukrajinu ešte viac znásobili to, čo prieskumy ukazovali už dlhodo. Duševné zdravie je zanedbávanou, ale pritom neustále sa zhoršujúcou oblasťou. A to sa týka dospelých, ale ešte viac aj detí. Tieto závery rovnako vyplývajú z mojich stretnutí s odborníkmi, ktoré som absolvovala a ktoré mi potvrdili, že denne čelíme nedostatku kapacít špecializovaných oddelení, nedostatku odborníkov, a tým aj veľmi dlhým čakacím dobám. Niekedy žiaľ, až život ohrozujúcim.

Mali by sme preto mobilizovať všetky sily, aby sme túto pandémiu duševných problémov zvládli. A k tomu nám treba, môže poslúžiť, aj balík finančnej pomoci z plánu obnovy. Zoberme tieto bezprecedentné prostriedky ako príležitosť, ktorú musíme správne použiť. Na to musíme vyhodnotiť situáciu a potreby, stanoviť ciele a v neposlednom rade mať možnosť flexibilne reagovať na vývoj prostriedkami a prostredníctvom zmien plánu obnovy. Tak, aby sme tieto finančné prostriedky využili tam, kde ich najviac potrebujeme, a to vrátane ochrany duševného zdravia detí a dospelých.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, problematica sănătății mentale a fost considerată prea mult timp un subiect tabu, deși milioane de persoane se confruntă cu astfel de situații.

Izolarea generată de pandemie, trecerea la o dimensiune digitală și multiplele crize pe care le traversăm au accentuat multe din aceste tendințe.

Absența unor măsuri reale de prevenție și lipsa unei alfabetizări digitale au condus la noi probleme pe care trebuie, și pentru care trebuie, să găsim noi răspunsuri.

Dependența digitală, bullying-ul online, știrile false, born-out-ul, telemunca nenormată și violența în mediul digital sunt doar câteva din aceste noi aspecte.

Cel mai grav lucru este că tot mai mulți tineri și copii se confruntă cu astfel de dificultăți, unii ajungând chiar să-și ia viața. În rândul tinerilor din România, sinuciderea este a doua principală cauză de mortalitate, iar circa 10% dintre aceștia se confruntă cu depresie ca urmare a pandemiei.

În acest sens, am propus un proiect pilot pentru dezvoltarea rețelei de consilieri școlari și psihologici în școli și dezvoltarea unor programe menite să asigure o asistență integrată tinerilor și familiilor. Avem nevoie de soluții și trebuie să găsim un echilibru la nivel european pentru a face față acestei situații.

(Konec vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Nicolas Schmit, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you all for this very inspiring debate.

When more than 80 million Europeans are suffering from mental disorders, mental problems, it's really a European problem we have to take care of. And I think the debate shows that there's a strong willingness to take care of this also at a European level. And I think we have an obligation, especially at the level of companies, at the level of employers, to protect employees' health – physical and mental health. We have to work on stress, and we know that a lot of people are suffering from stress.

There is an agreement, which was concluded in 2004 by social partners on stress. And I think we have one big issue. We can adopt a lot of new directives. The problem is prevention and implementation – to convince everybody, to convince mainly also employers, that stress at the working place is not good for the company. It's not good for competitiveness. You cannot have a healthy company with sick people. And I think this is the work we now have to pursue collectively.

Maria Walsh, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, thank you, Commissioner, and thank you, colleagues. There has never been a more fitting time to put mental health on the agenda. And I want to thank the many colleagues who highlighted young people, highlighted our ever-growing European community, particularly our Ukrainian citizens who are finding their home and safety in the European Union.

We so desperately need to ensure that collective EU mental health policies are put in place. Each of us are here today speaking about something like solidarity, and we've seen that it has worked. We've experienced the impact of working together in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the sharing of best practices between Member States, which resulted in sharing of medicines, and also an EU-wide financial support for all. We have the blueprint to get this right and it is essential now that we use this information collectively at EU level.

By supporting this report, you will join our call to the Commission to adopt an EU mental health strategy and deliver a European year dedicated to mental health next year in 2023. The EU year and mental health strategy will raise awareness of mental health policy. It will ensure debate in our institutions and across our Member States. And perhaps most importantly, it will change the prevailing attitudes towards mental health and well-being across our European Union.

I appeal to each and every one of you to join my group, the EPP, our online petition to further support our call to the Commission to dedicate a European year to mental health next year.

Colleagues, our citizens are dying in silence. We heard from many today, and that statistic cannot be put aside any more. For once and for all, we must remove the stigma around mental health. We must be the voice for each and every citizen. And we must bring about real and meaningful change for this and future generations.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční v utorok 05. 07. 2022.

Za pár chvíľ budeme pokračovať debatou, diskusiou s gréckym predsedom vlády.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Bartosz Arłukowicz (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Jako lekarz cieszę się, że w sprawozdaniu poruszono szerokie spektrum kwestii oddziaływania odizolowania na zdrowie zarówno młodych osób, wkraczających na rynek pracy, jak i osób z doświadczeniem, które podobnej sytuacji nie mogły nigdy wcześniej doświadczyć.

Chcę zwrócić uwagę na fakt, że COVID-19 uświadomił nam wszystkim, iż praca zdalna w żadnym razie nie rzutuje na jej wyniki – co zresztą zostało udowodnione w wielu badaniach. To jednak tylko przednia strona medalu...

Z drugiej strony mamy straty na poziomie zdrowia psychicznego. Depresja, wypalenie zawodowe, brak bodźców motywujących – a raczej przewaga bodźców ograniczających kreatywność, samorealizację i zwyczajnie chęć do pracy.

Dziękuję sprawozdawcy za położenie nacisku na ogromne konsekwencje pandemii na zdrowie psychiczne obywateli i jednocześnie zwracam wszystkim uwagę na fakt, że z tymi konsekwencjami będziemy zmagać się nie przez najbliższe miesiące, ale lata, a może nawet dziesiątki lat.

Wspólna polityka zdrowotna staje się w tych okolicznościach koniecznością! Razem możemy więcej i musimy więcej! Apeluje o wzmoczenie wysiłków naszej Izby w celu zbudowania spójnej i efektywnej polityki zdrowotnej na poziomie UE, która realnie pomoże naszym obywatelom – tym cierpiącym na choroby o podłożu psychicznym, ale i tym ze schorzeniami rzadkimi, onkologicznymi, itd. Po to tu jesteśmy!

Milan Brglez (S&D), *pisno*. – Od izbruha pandemije smo priča naraščajočemu trendu števila delavcev, ki so zaradi dela na daljavo podvrženi težavam v duševnem zdravju, na ravni EU pa še ni ustrezne zakonodajne podlage, ki bi obravnavala duševno zdravje v digitalnem svetu.

Prvi korak predstavlja priznanje pravice do odklopa, ki bo bistveno prispevala k zaščiti duševnega zdravja, ravnotežju med poklicnim in zasebnim življenjem ter krepila pravice delavcev.

Zato podpiram poziv Komisiji, naj predlaga zakonodajni okvir o minimalnih standardih in pogojih za učinkovito uveljavljanje pravice do odklopa ter o minimalnih zahtevah za delo na daljavo po vsej Uniji.

Za Evropo, odpornejšo na kolektivne izzive, ki smo jim bili in jim še bomo priča, je ključnega pomena, da Unija v celoti izkoristi svoje pristojnosti, ki so ji dodeljene z ustanovnimi pogodbami. Tudi pri naslavljanju izzivov duševnega zdravja. Le s konkretnimi ukrepi bomo namreč sposobni preprečiti, da bi kriza na področju duševnega zdravja postala naslednja zdravstvena kriza.

Jarosław Duda (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Wyrażam satysfakcję, że Parlament Europejski ponownie podjął kwestię zdrowia psychicznego, tym razem w kontekście cyfryzacji pracy. Pogarszający się stan zdrowia psychicznego Europejczyków, dodatkowo nasilony przez pandemię, niesie ze sobą poważne konsekwencje społeczne i ekonomiczne.

Szczególnie drastycznie przedstawia się sytuacja młodzieży. Dziewięć milionów nastolatków w Europie jest dotkniętych zaburzeniami psychicznymi, lękami i depresją. Samobójstwa są drugą najczęstszą przyczyną śmierci młodzieży. To pokazuje skalę zagrożeń dla przyszłości Europy.

Zbyt małą wagę przywiązuje się do problemów psychicznych związanych z miejscem pracy, choć co czwarty pracownik UE odczuwa negatywny wpływ pracy na zdrowie. Pandemia upowszechniła pracę zdalną i przyczyniła się do przyspieszenia cyfryzacji pracy. Niesie to szanse, ale też poważne zagrożenia. Problemem jest postawienie jasnych granic pomiędzy życiem prywatnym a pracą, presja stałej dyspozycyjności i bycia online, nadmierny monitoring pracowników, naruszający ich godność i prywatność oraz izolacja i stres technologiczny.

Konieczne są nowe uregulowania, uwzględniające aspekt zdrowia psychicznego oraz upowszechnienie dobrych praktyk. Europa potrzebuje kompleksowej strategii w dziedzinie zdrowia psychicznego, obejmującej zarówno nowe normy BHP, jak i edukację, profilaktykę, dostęp do diagnostyki, terapii, rehabilitacji i reintegracji oraz przeciwdziałanie dyskryminacji i stygmatyzacji. Ogłoszenie roku 2023 Europejskim Rokiem Dobrego Zdrowia Psychicznego może przyczynić się do wypracowania narzędzi na rzecz poprawy zdrowia psychicznego obywateli.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

4. To jest Europa – Debata z udziałem premiera Grecji Kyriakosa Mitsotakisa (debata)

President. – Dear colleagues, we have with us today the Prime Minister of Greece, Kyriakos Mitsotakis. καλώς ήρθατε.

Prime Minister, thank you for accepting our invitation to address the Parliament and the people of Europe as part of our 'This is Europe' debates.

Europe is after all a Greek word, and the birth of democracy in Ancient Greece gave an impetus to a creative spirit that produced the architecture, the art and the philosophy that have shaped western civilisation as we know it.

No society before the Greeks dared to believe that order and freedom were compatible and with the return of war on our continent and power politics on the global stage, we are reminded of the importance of safeguarding democracy, hand-in-hand with our rules-based order, to preserve freedom over autocracy.

In over 40 years of membership, Greece has given the European Union influence and stability in the South-east Mediterranean. And no doubt, Greece's importance will continue to grow as a new geopolitical reality unfolds.

Greece will become an energy hub. Connecting the Greek electricity grid with the Middle East and Africa will soon accommodate imports of lower-cost renewable energy into Europe, and this signals a new age for Greece.

This summer will also see Greece exit the Eurogroup's enhanced surveillance framework, which helped steer Greece's economy out a crisis which began 12 years ago. It was not easy. This year marks the end of a cycle of restrictions and close monitoring. A new era of sustainable economic growth and prosperity is opening up for Greece and its people.

So today, we salute Greece and every Greek citizen for this important milestone achieved. Thank you Prime Minister for being with us to mark this success. Dear Kyriakos, the floor is yours.

Κυριάκος Μητσοτάκης, *Πρωθυπουργός της Ελλάδας*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρίες και κύριοι μέλη του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, σας ευχαριστώ θερμά για την τιμητική πρόσκληση να μιλήσω ενώπιον των αιρετών εκπροσώπων των 27 κρατών της Ένωσης μας, σε μια στιγμή μάλιστα που συμπίπτει με το τέλος ενός δύσκολου κεφαλαίου για την Ελλάδα και την Ευρώπη, αλλά και με την αρχή των νέων, κοινών προσπαθειών μας απέναντι στις μεγάλες προκλήσεις του μέλλοντος που ήδη χτυπούν την πόρτα της ευρωπαϊκής μας οικογένειας. Γιατί τώρα είναι η ώρα να σχεδιάσουμε με τόλμη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση των επόμενων δεκαετιών.

Τέτοιες μέρες, το 2015, η Ελλάδα βρέθηκε ένα βήμα από τον γκρεμό της εξόδου από το ευρώ. Την κοινωνία της, τότε, χτυπούσαν αλληπάλληλα κύματα τυφλού και διχαστικού λαϊκισμού. Μάλιστα, σαν σήμερα στις 5 Ιουλίου 2015, διεξαγόταν ένα δημοψήφισμα, το οποίο λίγο έλειψε να δώσει τη χαριστική βολή. Και μόνο μπροστά στο φάσμα της άτακτης χρεοκοπίας, η τότε κυβέρνηση έκανε πίσω. Αλλά το τίμημα υπήρξε βαρύ: κλειστές τράπεζες, capital controls και τελικά ένα νέο, τρίτο, αχρειαστο μνημόνιο που μας οδήγησε σε νέο κύκλο λιτότητας. Καμία ευρωπαϊκή κοινωνία δεν υπέφερε περισσότερο από την ελληνική, την περασμένη δεκαετία.

Ευτυχώς για την πατρίδα μου, η Ελλάδα του 2022 δεν έχει σχέση με την Ελλάδα του 2015. Επτά χρόνια μετά, βρίσκομαι εδώ, σε αυτό το βήμα, να σας πω ότι εκείνες οι εικόνες έσβησαν οριστικά. Εδώ και τρία χρόνια ο τόπος μου έχει μια νέα κυβέρνηση, που οδηγεί την πατρίδα μας σε μια νέα εποχή: αυτήν που τη θέλει να πρωταγωνιστεί στην ανάπτυξη, στη μείωση της ανεργίας, στην αύξηση των επενδύσεων· αποδεσμευμένη πια, από τον Αύγουστο —σε έναν μήνα από τώρα—, από το καθεστώς της εισχυμένης εποπτείας· έτοιμη πλέον, μέσα στον επόμενο χρόνο —εντός του 2023—, να ανακτήσει την επενδυτική βαθμίδα· και με τους πολίτες πλέον πιο ενωμένους, πιο αισιόδοξους, παρά τις μεγάλες δυσκολίες που ακόμα αντιμετωπίζουμε.

Βρίσκομαι, όμως, σε αυτό το βήμα για να εκφράσω και ένα μεγάλο ευχαριστώ στην Ευρώπη που στήριξε τη χώρα μου, όταν άλλοι πειραματιζόνταν με την ίδια την ευρωπαϊκή της υπόσταση. Όλους εσάς που συμβάλατε ώστε να παραμείνει, τελικά, η γενέτειρα της δημοκρατίας στην πιο δημοκρατική, διακρατική οικογένεια. Αυτήν την έμπρακτη αλληλεγγύη ανταποδίδει τώρα η Ελλάδα στην Ευρώπη, καταθέτοντας τη δική της εθνική πρόοδο στην υπηρεσία των κοινών ευρωπαϊκών μας στοχεύσεων. Η γκριζα παρένθεση που προηγήθηκε, ναι, υπήρξε τραυματική, αλλά ταυτόχρονα και διδακτική. Ποιος, αλήθεια, θα πίστευε πριν από κάποια χρόνια ότι η Ελλάδα, που για μια δεκαετία σχεδόν ήταν ουραγός στην ανάπτυξη στην Ευρώπη, θα εμφανίζε σήμερα την τρίτη μεγαλύτερη ανάπτυξη στην ευρωζώνη; Ποιος θα υπολόγιζε πριν από κάποια χρόνια ότι θα μπορούσε να φτάσει εκεί μειώνοντας φόρους και εισφορές, αλλά ταυτόχρονα χωρίς να θέσει σε κίνδυνο τη δημοσιονομική σταθερότητα; Και ποιος θα πρόβλεπε πριν από κάποια χρόνια ότι το ελληνικό δημόσιο, το οποίο υπήρξε σύμβολο της γραφειοκρατίας, θα ήταν σήμερα πολύ πιο ψηφιακό, πολύ πιο φιλικό προς τον πολίτη;

Η Ελλάδα, λοιπόν, κυρίες και κύριοι, γύρισε σελίδα, άλλαξε, καθώς την αλλάζουν καθημερινά οι ίδιοι οι Έλληνες που δεν πιστεύουν πλέον στα ψεύτικα συνθήματα, αλλά μόνο στην αλήθεια της πράξης, γιατί βλέπουν το αποτέλεσμα των τολμηρών τομών τις οποίες υλοποιεί μια μεταρρυθμιστική κυβέρνηση. Παράλληλα, ενίσχυσε την ποιότητα της δημοκρατίας μας και απάλλαξε το πολιτικό μας σύστημα από την κηλίδα της νεοαριστοκρατικής Χρυσής Αυγής. Έτσι, μπορώ πια να δηλώνω υπερήφανος ως Έλληνας, που ο τόπος μου ανέταξε την οικονομία και ένωσε την κοινωνία, ενώ ταυτόχρονα πήρε ξανά τη θέση του ως ισότιμος και ενεργός εταίρος στην ευρωπαϊκή οικογένεια. Να θυμίσω ότι η Αθήνα πρωτοστάτησε στην κοινή ευρωπαϊκή αντίδραση κατά της COVID-19, στην εκστρατεία του εμβολιασμού. Το Ψηφιακό Πιστοποιητικό COVID της ΕΕ αποτέλεσε ελληνική πρόταση, η οποία υιοθετήθηκε στη συνέχεια από τους ευρωπαϊκούς θεσμούς. Ήταν επίσης μία από τις πρώτες χώρες που ανέδειξε την ανάγκη ίδρυσης ενός νέου κοινού ευρωπαϊκού ταμείου για την ανάκαμψη των οικονομιών μας μετά την COVID-19· μία από τις πρώτες χώρες που κατήρτισαν εθνικό σχέδιο στα πλαίσια του Next Generation EU. Και όχι μόνο,

γιατί παράλληλα η Ελλάδα αναδειχθηκε και φρουρός της Ευρώπης, όταν το 2020 —τον Μάρτιο συγκεκριμένα—, τα ανατολικά της σύνορα δέχθηκαν συνεχείς απόπειρες εισβολών δεκάδων χιλιάδων παράνομων μεταναστών από την Τουρκία. Τότε, μάλιστα, θυμάμαι, σε μια κίνηση έμπρακτης αλληλεγγύης βρέθηκαν αμέσως, εντός 48 ωρών, στα σύνορά μας στον Έβρο, ο Πρόεδρος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, ο αγαπημένος μας David Sassoli, ο Πρόεδρος του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου και η Πρόεδρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής. Πρόκειται για ένα ζήτημα το οποίο παραμένει δραματικά επίκαιρο, όπως δηλώνουν και τα πρόσφατα τραγικά γεγονότα στην Ισπανία, αλλά και διαρκές, όπως αποτυπώνεται στις επιχειρήσεις των δουλεμπόρων οι οποίες συνεχίζονται και στη θάλασσα και στην ξηρά με μεθόδους, δυστυχώς, ολοένα και πιο σύγχρονες.

Υπερήφανος, ωστόσο, δηλώνω και ως Ευρωπαίος, γιατί στα χρόνια που πέρασαν, με αιχμή την ελληνική δοκιμασία, οι θεσμοί της Ευρώπης κινητοποιήθηκαν και πέτυχαν να βρουν νέες λύσεις σε νέα προβλήματα. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας εξελίχθηκε σε Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Σταθερότητας. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα άνοιξε την πόρτα για αγορά κρατικών ομολόγων. Καθιερώθηκε το Ευρωπαϊκό Εξάμηνο. Αποφασίστηκε ο ενιαίος εποπτικός μηχανισμός και το Ενιαίο Συμβούλιο Εξυγίανσης, αλλά και η σταθερή τεχνική βοήθεια της Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Στήριξης Διαρθρωτικών Μεταρρυθμίσεων. Με άλλα λόγια, η Ευρώπη στήριξε την Ελλάδα συμβαδίζοντας μαζί της στον δρόμο των μεγάλων αλλαγών. Έναν δρόμο με βασική του σήμανση το συμπέρασμα πως οι εθνικές προκλήσεις είναι συχνά και κοινοτικές. Στην αντιμετώπισή τους, λοιπόν, δεν έχουν θέση οι τοπικοί εγωισμοί. Από την άλλη πλευρά —και θα επιμείνω σε αυτό—, δεν νοείται ενωσιακή αλληλεγγύη χωρίς την ανάλογη συνέπεια του κράτους προς το οποίο αυτή απευθύνεται. Αυτά, λοιπόν, είναι τα δίδυμα θεμέλια του νέου ευρωπαϊκού οικοδομήματος.

Κυρίες και κύριοι βουλευτές, μίλησα στην αρχή για τη μεγάλη πρόοδο που πέτυχε τα τελευταία χρόνια η χώρα μας. Το 2021 εμφανίσαμε πολύ υψηλό ρυθμό ανάπτυξης, πολύ μεγαλύτερο από τα προβλεπόμενα —ξεπέρασε το 8%· διαρκή πτώση της ανεργίας· σημαντικότερη αύξηση των ξένων επενδύσεων. Αποκλιμακώθηκε το δημόσιο χρέος ως ποσοστό του ΑΕΠ και η Ελλάδα αποπλήρωσε τις τελευταίες της υποχρεώσεις στο Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο, δύο χρόνια νωρίτερα από ό,τι είχαμε προγραμματίσει· ανόρθωσε και το τραπεζικό της σύστημα, μειώνοντας δραστικά τον επισφαλή δανεισμό των ελληνικών τραπεζών. Όλα αυτά τεκμηριώνονται με δείκτες και αριθμούς. Απευθυνόμενος, όμως, σε κατ' εξοχήν πολιτικά στελέχη, εκλεγμένα, επιτρέψτε μου να επισημάνω δύο στοιχεία που συνιστούν ένα άυλο δημόσιο κεφάλαιο, το οποίο κατακτήθηκε στη διάρκεια αυτής της διαδρομής: πρώτον, τις συνθήκες υπό τις οποίες κινήθηκε η ελληνική πολιτεία, και δεύτερον, τις ριζικές τομές που προωθήθηκαν παράλληλα στο πεδίο της κοινωνίας, ώστε και η δική της πρόοδος να συγχρονίζεται με εκείνη της οικονομίας και της χώρας.

Σε ό,τι αφορά το περιβάλλον στο οποίο κλήθηκε να ενεργήσει η κυβέρνησή μου, αρκεί μια αναδρομή στο ημερολόγιο: υβριδική μεταναστευτική επίθεση —αυτήν τη διαδέχθηκαν οι εθνικές απειλές της Τουρκίας στο Αιγαίο και στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο, που έφτασαν στην έξαρσή τους το καλοκαίρι του 2020—, φυσικές καταστροφές, καταστροφικές πυρκαγιές από την κλιματική κρίση, τις οποίες ακολούθησε η καταγίδα της πανδημίας. Σε όλα αυτά τα μέτωπα, προσπαθήσαμε πάντα να μετατρέψουμε τις κρίσεις σε ευκαιρίες. Με τη βοήθεια της Ευρώπης, οργανώσαμε καλύτερα τη φύλαξη των ανατολικών μας συνόρων. Η διπλωματία μας υπέγραψε συμφωνίες για οριοθέτηση θαλασσιών ζωνών με την Ιταλία και την Αίγυπτο, συμπράξεις με το Ισραήλ, στρατηγικές σχέσεις με τον αραβικό κόσμο, ενώ τη θωράκιση της άμυνάς μας πλαισιώνουν πλέον ισχυρές συνθήκες αμοιβαίας συνδρομής με τη Γαλλία και αμυντική συνεργασία με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες.

Κι αν υπάρχει, πάντως, ένα παράδειγμα αντιστροφής μιας δοκιμασίας σε κινητήριο μοχλό, αυτή ήταν, κατά την άποψή μου, η διαχείριση της πανδημίας. Όχι μόνο γιατί οδήγησε στο να διπλασιάσουμε τις μονάδες εντατικής θεραπείας, στον εξοπλισμό των νοσοκομείων, στις προσλήψεις χιλιάδων νέων υγειονομικών, αλλά διότι αποτέλεσε το εφελτήριο για να εργαστούμε, να θεμελιώσουμε ένα νέο δημόσιο εθνικό σύστημα υγείας. Ήδη στη χώρα μου δρομολογείται ο θεσμός του δωρεάν προσωπικού γιατρού για όλους και αναδιοργανώνονται όλες οι δομές πρωτοβάθμιας και δευτεροβάθμιας φροντίδας. Τα παραπάνω αναδεικνύουν και τη δεύτερη παρατήρηση που καταθέτω ενώπιόν σας, δηλαδή, τον κοινωνικό προσανατολισμό της δράσης μας, παρά τις δυσμενείς παγκόσμιες αλλά και εθνικές συνθήκες. Γιατί, πράγματι, δεν είναι σύνηθες μια χώρα η οποία εξέρχεται από μια μεγάλη, επώδυνη, τραυματική δεκαετή οικονομική περιπέτεια να δέχεται αλληπαλλήλες προκλήσεις· ταυτόχρονα, όμως, να προσπαθεί πάντα να μένει εστιασμένη στον στόχο της, που προφανώς δεν είναι άλλος από την ευημερία της κοινωνίας της.

Στη διάρκεια της πανδημίας, διαθέσαμε δεκάδες δισεκατομμύρια για να στηρίξουμε επιχειρήσεις και εργαζόμενους. Κάναμε διαδοχικές ελαφρύνσεις σε φόρους και εισφορές που απελευθέρωσαν τις επενδύσεις και τόνωσαν το διαθέσιμο εισόδημα. Κυρίως, όμως, υλοποιήσαμε σημαντικές αλλαγές στο περιβάλλον της εργασίας. Μια πολιτική που συνοψίζεται σε έξι λέξεις: λιγότεροι φόροι, περισσότερες δουλειές, καλύτερη ζωή. Αυτή τη χρονιά, η αύξηση του κατώτατου μισθού αθροιστικά συμπλήρωσε έναν ακόμα μισθό ετησίως. Καθιερώσαμε την ψηφιακή κάρτα εργασίας ως ασπίδα απέναντι σε κάθε εργοδοτική αυθαιρεσία και ο εργαζόμενος σήμερα μπορεί να καθορίζει με διαφάνεια τον χρόνο της απασχόλησής του και της άδειάς του. Αλλά και οι συνθήκες στους χώρους εργασίας προσαρμόστηκαν, επιτέλους, στα ευρωπαϊκά δεδομένα. Και εκεί δεν ισχύει πια κανενός είδους διάκριση και παντού ισχύουν ειδικές μέριμνες για τους εργαζόμενους γονείς.

Προφανώς και μπροστά στις ανάγκες, η όποια πρόοδος έχουμε πετύχει δεν μπορεί να μας ικανοποιεί. Δίνει, όμως, το μέτρο της προσπάθειας: πολύ περισσότερο όταν στην εξασφάλιση πολλών καλοπληρωμένων θέσεων εργασίας συντείνουν όλες οι κυβερνητικές πολιτικές, από τη διευκόλυνση των επενδύσεων μέχρι την πλήρη αναδιάρθρωση του συστήματος εκπαίδευσης και κατάρτισης, σε μία ενιαία αντίληψη που, επαναλαμβάνω, θέλει την πρόοδο της οικονομίας να συμβαδίζει με εκείνη της κοινωνίας.

Αγαπητές και αγαπητοί ευρωβουλευτές, ξεκίνησα λέγοντας ότι τίποτα στην Ευρώπη αλλά και στην Ελλάδα δεν είναι το ίδιο ύστερα από τη δεύτερη δεκαετία του 21ου αιώνα. Τίποτα, όμως, δεν θυμίζει ούτε τον 20ό αιώνα, καθώς πρωτόγνωρες αλλαγές συντελούνται σε ολόκληρο τον πλανήτη, με πυροδότη την απρόκλητη ρωσική εισβολή στην Ουκρανία. Ο πόλεμος επέστρεψε ξανά στην ήπειρό μας. Η ενεργειακή αναταραχή και οι πληθωριστικές ανατιμήσεις πολιορκούν όλες τις ευρωπαϊκές κοινωνίες. Για πολλές χώρες στον κόσμο ξυπνά ξανά ο εφιάλτης της έλλειψης τροφίμων. Όλα αυτά διαμορφώνουν ένα σκηνικό με μόνη σταθερά την αστάθεια. Μαζί του, όμως, εγείρουν και για κάθε οργανισμό, για κάθε χώρα, ένα ερώτημα ταυτοτικό: με ποια πλευρά των μετακινούμενων πλακών συμφερόντων θα ταχθού. Γιατί οι αποκαλούμενες ίσες αποστάσεις δεν οδηγούν παρά στο χαώδες κενό που δημιουργείται ανάμεσά τους. Ενώ ο ρόλος του επιτήδειου ουδέτερου ξέρετε ότι έχει καταδικαστεί πολλές φορές στην ιστορία, από την Ευρώπη, από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο αλλά και από την Ελλάδα. Αυτό το ερώτημα έχει απαντηθεί από την πρώτη στιγμή: είμαστε με την ειρήνη και το διεθνές δίκαιο, για αυτό και στεκόμαστε απέναντι στον εισβολέα που παραβίασε τη νομιμότητα και τα υφιστάμενα σύνορα. Είμαστε με τη δημοκρατία και τον δυτικό πολιτισμό, για αυτό και αρνούμαστε τον αυταρχικό νεοδεσποτισμό. Τέλος, είμαστε με τη δικαιοσύνη, για αυτό και δεν εξισώνουμε τον θύτη με το θύμα και ενισχύουμε πάντα τον αμυνόμενο. Γιατί η μάχη της Ουκρανίας δεν αποτελεί ένα ακόμα συμβάν στη διεθνή σκηνή: είναι μια καμπή στη διαδρομή της Ευρώπης, η σημασία της οποίας γίνεται ορατή μόνο αν κάθε κράτος κάνει την προσομοίωση στα δικά του εθνικά δεδομένα. Με άλλα λόγια, οφείλουμε σήμερα στην Ουκρανία να αποτρέψουμε κάθε είδους τετελεσμένα, τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να μιμηθούν αύριο νέοι επίδοξοι ταραχοποιοί. Και αυτό έχει ξεχωριστό βάρος για δύο χώρες μέλη της Ένωσης, την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο.

Αναφέρομαι, προφανώς, στη διαρκή επιθετική συμπεριφορά της Τουρκίας, που διεκδικεί μάλιστα να προσεγγίσει την Ευρώπη. Απέναντί της ορθώνονται ήδη οι ξεκάθαρες αποφάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου. Στους εώλους ισχυρισμούς της απαντά η πραγματικότητα αλλά και το διεθνές δίκαιο, ενώ στη δική της προκλητικότητα αντιτάσσουμε τη δική μας ετοιμότητα. Στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο, την ώρα που αντιμετωπίζουμε τη μεγάλη πρόκληση του πολέμου στην Ουκρανία, ένα είναι σίγουρο: δεν χρειαζόμαστε νέους αναθεωρητισμούς και αναβιώσεις αυτοκρατορικών φαντασιώσεων. Και ένα επίσης είναι βέβαιο: η Ελλάδα δεν πρόκειται να ανεχθεί καμία αμφισβήτηση της εθνικής της κυριαρχίας και της εδαφικής της ακεραιότητας. Και είμαι σίγουρος ότι σε αυτόν τον διαρκή αγώνα θα σας έχουμε όλους συμπορευτές. Η θέση μου, λοιπόν, είναι σαφής από καιρό: κρατάμε κλειστές τις πόρτες μας στις απειλές, κρατάμε ανοιχτά τα παράθυρα στις ειρηνικές επαφές. Οι διαφορές μεταξύ των κρατών λύνονται με γνώμονα το διεθνές δίκαιο και όχι με νταηλίκια.

Η συγκυρία, ωστόσο, δεν έχει συνέπειες μόνο γεωπολιτικές αλλά και οικονομικές και κοινωνικές. Η διεθνής ενεργειακή αναταραχή φέρνει αυξήσεις στις τιμές όλων των προϊόντων, οι οποίες με τη σειρά τους προκαλούν λογική, αναμενόμενη λαϊκή δυσαρέσκεια σε όλες τις κοινωνίες μας. Δημιουργείται, έτσι, η εύφλεκτη ύλη για να φουντώσει και πάλι ο λαϊκισμός, διαλαλώντας απλοϊκές λύσεις σε σύνθετα προβλήματα. Και απέναντί του, όπως γνωρίζετε, δεν υπάρχουν μαγικές λύσεις. Συνεπώς, η Ευρώπη καλείται σήμερα να υπερβεί νικηφόρα πολλαπλές προκλήσεις: να χαράξει την κοινή πολιτική απεξάρτησης από τις ρωσικές πηγές ενέργειας, προωθώντας πιο γρήγορα την πράσινη μετάβαση, αλλά ταυτόχρονα να διαχειριστεί και την έκρηξη των τιμών ενέργειας: να οικοδομήσει ταχύτερα τη στρατηγική της αυτονομία ως ένας ισχυρός πόλος στην παγκόσμια σκακιέρα και, ασφαλώς, να βαθύνει τη δημοκρατία στη λειτουργία της και στο εσωτερικό των κρατών μελών, γιατί οι ανισότητες και οι αποστάσεις από τον πολίτη, δυστυχώς, παραμένουν. Και σε αυτές ακριβώς επενδύει με εύχητα—όμως απατηλά και ανέξοδα—συνθήματα η δημαγωγία.

Καθήκον μας, λοιπόν, είναι να μιλήσουμε στον καθημερινό Ευρωπαίο σε γλώσσα απλή δίχως εξωραϊσμούς, αντιτάσσοντας στο ακραίο το αναγκαίο, επιστρατεύοντας την παιδεία απέναντι στα fake news. Αυτός είναι ο δρόμος για να δείξουμε ότι οι εθνικές κυβερνήσεις, οι ευρωπαϊκοί θεσμοί δεν συνιστούν μια ψυχρή, μια απρόσωπη γραφειοκρατία, αλλά ένα συνεκτικό σύστημα που αφορά, τελικά, κάθε Ευρωπαίο πολίτη. Σε όλες τις παραπάνω προκλήσεις, η Ελλάδα σήμερα θέλει να είναι παρούσα. Είμαστε μια από τις πρώτες χώρες που εισηγηθήκαμε ένα ευρωπαϊκό ενεργειακό σχέδιο. Σε εθνικό επίπεδο, όπως είπε και η κυρία Πρόεδρος, αποτελούμε μια ακέραια πηγή-πύλη εισόδου υγροποιημένου φυσικού αερίου, το οποίο καλύπτει όχι μόνο τις ανάγκες της Ελλάδας, των Βαλκανίων, αύριο της ανατολικής Ευρώπης. Προωθούμε την ηλεκτρική μας διασύνδεση με την Κύπρο και την Αίγυπτο, από την Κύπρο και με το Ισραήλ, ώστε ολόκληρη η ήπειρός μας σύντομα να εφοδιάζεται με καθαρό και φτηνό ρεύμα από τον ήλιο της Αφρικής και της Μέσης Ανατολής.

Στο μέτωπο της ευρωπαϊκής στρατηγικής αυτονομίας, η Αθήνα και πάλι πρωτοστατεί αναλαμβάνοντας έναν ρόλο γέφυρας προς τα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια, αλλά έχοντας εντάξει και το αμυντικό της δόγμα στα πλαίσια ασφάλειας, της κοινής ασφάλειας της νοτιοανατολικής πτέρυγας του ΝΑΤΟ —κάτι που αφορά, όμως, και το μεταναστευτικό με τους δουλεμπόρους. Μόνο τους τελευταίους μήνες διασώσαμε 6.000 ναυαγούς στο Αιγαίο, όλοι τους προερχόμενοι από την Τουρκία. Πίση, συνεπώς, διαρκής που απαιτεί νέα σχέδια για να αντιμετωπιστεί.

Σε ό,τι αφορά, τέλος, τη δημοκρατία, την πορεία της χώρας μας απεικονίζουν συγκεκριμένα γεγονότα: αποκτήσαμε νέο Σύνταγμα με τεράστια πλειοψηφία· εκλέξαμε την πρώτη γυναίκα στο ανώτατο πολιτειακό αξίωμα της Προέδρου της Δημοκρατίας· η Βουλή μας λειτουργεί απρόσκοπτα —έχουμε ψηφίσει 331 νομοσχέδια τα τελευταία τρία χρόνια, μεταξύ των οποίων είναι και αυτό το οποίο αποδίδει δικαίωμα ψήφου στους Έλληνες οι οποίοι διαμένουν στο εξωτερικό για να μπορούν να ψηφίζουν από τον μόνιμο τόπο διαμονής τους· και, βέβαια, θεσμοθετήσαμε ρυθμίσεις για τα δικαιώματα που δεν είχαν προηγούμενο στην ελληνική έννομη τάξη.

Κυρίες και κύριοι βουλευτές, το ενδιαφέρον μου, ωστόσο, δεν αφορά μόνο όσα έγιναν και γίνονται στην ήπειρο και στην πατρίδα μου, αλλά κυρίως όσα οφείλουν να συμβούν για την Ευρώπη του μέλλοντός μας. Αυτή που πρέπει να απλωθεί και σε επικράτεια αλλά να βαθύνει και σε συνεργασία· να αποκτήσει τη δική της αμυντική και ενεργειακή πολιτική, πρωτοστατώντας, όπως το έχουμε κάνει μέχρι σήμερα στην πράσινη μετάβαση. Και, βέβαια, την Ευρώπη του πολιτισμού με τον οποίον θα πρέπει να συνεχίσει να τροφοδοτεί ολόκληρο τον κόσμο. Θα πρέπει να πω ότι παρά τη δύσκολη συγκυρία, διαβάζω αισιόδοξα τα δεδομένα. Η ενωμένη Ευρώπη ανταποκρίθηκε αποτελεσματικότερα από άλλες ηπείρους στην επίθεση της COVID-19. Κράτη πολύ μεγάλα με ισχυρές οικονομίες, όπως η Κίνα, ακόμα δεν την έχουν τίθασεσει. Αποτέλεσε μεγάλη τομή για την Ευρώπη η απόφαση για κοινή αγορά εμβολίων, όπως αποτέλεσε και μεγάλη τομή για την Ευρώπη η μεγάλη υπέρβαση που κάνουμε να δημιουργήσουμε το Next Generation EU, να δανειστούμε σε υπερεθνικό επίπεδο και να διοχετεύσουμε πόρους μέσα από επιδοτήσεις και δάνεια σε όλες τις ευρωπαϊκές χώρες για να στηριχθούν οι οικονομίες μας, να μπορέσουν να ξεπεράσουν τη μεγάλη κρίση του κορονοϊού. Όλα αυτά έμοιαζαν απίθανο να συμβούν πριν από τρία χρόνια.

Η Ευρώπη αποτελεί ανερχόμενη δύναμη στην τεχνολογία, αποτελεί παγκόσμια δύναμη σε ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας. Έχουμε συγκεκριμένο σχέδιο για την κλιματική αλλαγή και ξέρω πόσο ενδιαφέρουσα και πόσο δύσκολη, κυρία Πρόεδρε, θα είναι η συζήτηση που θα έχετε αύριο για τα θέματα της ταξινόμησης, ενώ, παρά τις δυσκολίες, η αύρα της δημοκρατίας κυκλοφορεί πάντα ανάμεσα στις χώρες μας. Έχουμε την παράδοση, τη θέληση αλλά και την κουλτούρα των λαών μας ως εφόδια για να προχωρήσουμε. Το τελευταίο δεν είναι καθόλου ασήμαντο, αν σκεφτείτε ότι μεγάλες φιλελεύθερες δυνάμεις, όπως οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, διχάζονται σήμερα για το ζήτημα των αμβλώσεων, ένα θέμα το οποίο έχει επιλυθεί στην Ευρώπη εδώ και δεκαετίες. Η πρόοδος, συνεπώς, είναι στο χέρι μας. Τα 750 δισεκατομμύρια του νέου ταμείου, το οποίο δημιουργήσαμε, ζητούν να υπηρετήσουν τον τίτλο και τον ρόλο τους, να χρηματοδοτήσουν δηλαδή την ανάκαμψη αλλά και την ανθεκτικότητα των κρατών μας.

Οδηγός μας πρέπει να είναι η εμπειρία και τα συμπεράσματα από τις τέσσερις μεγάλες δοκιμασίες που βιώσαμε την τελευταία δεκαετία: την κρίση χρέους, το προσφυγικό, την πανδημία και, τώρα, την ενεργειακή κρίση. Τι μάθαμε από αυτές: πρώτον, ότι σε έναν διασυνδεδεμένο κόσμο κανένα κράτος δεν μπορεί να χειριστεί μόνο του κρίσεις τέτοιων διαστάσεων, όσο μεγάλο κι αν είναι· και, δεύτερον, όπως σας είπα, όταν η Ευρώπη κινήθηκε γρήγορα με κοινούς μηχανισμούς και αποφάσεις αποδείχθηκε τελικά ανθεκτική. Και αυτά τα δύο διδάγματα καλούμαστε να αξιοποιήσουμε τώρα απέναντι στη μεγάλη ενεργειακή αναστάτωση. Γιατί η μεμονωμένη πολιτική κάθε χώρας υπονομεύει την ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική και ανταγωνιστικότητα.

Συνεπώς, ενωμένη Ευρώπη σημαίνει και ενεργειακά ενιαία Ευρώπη. Πρέπει να έχουμε την ισχύ, πρέπει να έχουμε το θάρρος να μπορούμε να παρεμβαίνουμε στις αγορές όταν αυτές έχουν σταματήσει ουσιαστικά να λειτουργούν. Πρέπει να σπάσουμε αυτήν τη διασύνδεση μεταξύ των τιμών φυσικής ενέργειας και των τιμών ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας —είναι κάτι το οποίο έχω ζητήσει επανειλημμένως στο Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο και, ευτυχώς, βλέπω ότι υπάρχει πια μια κινητικότητα από πλευράς Επιτροπής να εξετάσει τον τρόπο με τον οποίον τιμολογούμε την ηλεκτρική ενέργεια στην ήπειρό μας. Και αυτά τα λέω ως φιλελεύθερος πολιτικός, που έχω όμως τη δυνατότητα να βλέπω κατάματα το μέλλον και να ζητώ δημόσια ευρωπαϊκή παρέμβαση, όταν οι αγορές σταματούν να λειτουργούν προς όφελος των πολιτών.

Η πράσινη οικονομία μηδενικών εκπομπών θα έρθει. Το ερώτημα είναι πώς θα φτάσουμε εκεί και πώς στο μεσοδιάστημα θα κάνουμε πράξη τη γρήγορη πράσινη μετάβαση, χωρίς ταυτόχρονα να καταρρεύσουν οι προϋπολογισμοί των νοικοκυριών και των επιχειρήσεών μας. Αυτή είναι η μεγάλη πρόκληση την οποία θα κληθούμε να διαχειριστούμε τους επόμενους μήνες, σίγουρα ενόψει του δύσκολου χειμώνα που έρχεται μπροστά μας. Ξέρουμε ότι πρέπει να επιταχύνουμε τη διείσδυση των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας —δεν το αμφισβητεί κανείς αυτό. Η χώρα μου θα προσδέσει μόλις φέτος σχεδόν 2.000 μεγαβάτ, νέας δυνατότητας, ηλιακής και αιολικής ενέργειας. Ξέρουμε ότι χρειαζόμαστε περισσότερες διασυνδέσεις ώστε κανένα κράτος μέλος της Ένωσης να μην είναι αποκομμένη νησίδα από τα ευρωπαϊκά δίκτυα. Αυτές είναι οι μεγάλες προκλήσεις που θα κληθούμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε. Και πρόκειται για μία μοναδική ατζέντα αντοχής και ανάπτυξης όλης της

ευρωπαϊκής οικογένειας.

Έξι είναι για μένα —και θα κλείσω με αυτήν τη σκέψη για να μπορέσω να απαντήσω και στις ερωτήσεις σας— οι μεγάλες προκλήσεις τις οποίες θα χρειαστεί να αντιμετωπίσουμε τα επόμενα χρόνια: ευρωπαϊκή άμυνα και κοινή πολιτική ασφάλειας, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη και τις προκλήσεις του μεταναστευτικού· τραπεζική ενοποίηση και προστασία των καταθέσεων· ένα ευρωπαϊκό αποτελεσματικό σχέδιο ενέργειας· μια μόνιμα συντονισμένη δράση με βάση τον μηχανισμό ανάκαμψης και ανθεκτικότητας· εμπάυωση της δημοκρατίας και αντιμετώπιση της δημαγωγίας· και αντιμετώπιση της μάστιγας των fake news, αλλά και νέα διεύρυνση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια, τα οποία δεν πρέπει να ξεχνάμε και σε αυτή την αίσθηση, μια διεύρυνση την οποία η Ελλάδα ως βαλκανική χώρα στηρίζει ενεργά. Θέλουμε την Ευρώπη στα Βαλκάνια και θέλουμε και τα Βαλκάνια στην Ευρώπη.

Όλοι γνωρίζουμε, κυρίες και κύριοι ευρωβουλευτές, ότι οι μάχες αυτές είναι διαρκείς. Μας προειδοποίησε, άλλωστε, για αυτό πριν από πέντε χρόνια ο ιστορικός Ian Kershaw, ο οποίος έγραφε στο βιβλίο του, *Η Ευρώπη σε δίνη*: «Η Ευρώπη πολέμησε για ελευθερία και την κέρδισε, μαζί με ευημερία που ζηλεύει ολόκληρος ο κόσμος. Η αναζήτησή της για ενότητα και για μια σαφή αίσθηση ταυτότητας συνεχίζεται. Όμως, η μόνη της βεβαιότητα είναι η αβεβαιότητα που χαρακτηρίζει τη σύγχρονη ζωή».

Και με αυτά τα λόγια κλείνω, προσθέτοντας ότι έχουμε ένα χρέος: να προστατεύσουμε την ελευθερία και την ευημερία που κέρδισαμε, που κέρδισαν οι προηγούμενες γενιές για λογαριασμό μας, αλλά να κατακτήσουμε και την ευρωπαϊκή ταυτότητα που θελήσαμε. Το πρώτο μας καθήκον, όμως, είναι να κάνουμε βεβαιότητα τη σταθερότητα. Γιατί, στις σημερινές συνθήκες, ισχυρά κράτη είναι τα σταθερά κράτη. Και σε έναν κόσμο που αλλάζει, ισχυρή Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι η σταθερή, η αυτοδύναμη Ένωση που θα ενώνει τους λαούς της και θα πρωταγωνιστεί στην υφήλιο.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, on 7 July 2019, almost exactly three years ago, the Prime Minister won the Greek elections in a landslide victory. The Greek people sent a strong message of support and trust to you, Prime Minister, and to Nea Demokratia to steer the future of Greece and turn a page on the failed policies of Alexis Tsipras and Syriza.

When you came into office, Greece was in bad shape, I think that was obvious. After painful years of poor leadership by Tsipras, you put Greece back on track – and thank you for this remarkable and excellent work. Thanks to you and thanks to your government, Greece is back in Europe and that is good news.

It is important for Europe to have Greece back. First of all, everybody, I think, should and must underline that Greece is in a way not a normal country because democracy was born in Greece. Our western civilization was born in Greece. Europe was born in Greece, not to mention the princess taken away by Zeus to beautiful Crete, the princess who gave her name to our old joint project, Europa. There is No Europe without Greece.

Greece is back on economic issues. Last year, even in crisis times, the Greek economy grew by more than 8%. When it comes to growth, Greece is among Europe's top five countries. You managed to reduce unemployment in Greece. In Greece, in the quarter from summer 2019 to February 2022, more than any other country, you did it and the people feel the success in their daily life. Thanks to your efforts and to the determination of the government, Greece is finally also on the way to exiting the surveillance programme.

On another aspect, Greece is back and that is about the security issues. Since you took over, Greece seriously cares about security again. Greece, due to its geographic position, is key when it comes to European security. Europe is not to be criticised but to thank Greece for protecting and defending our common external borders.

And I want to be very clear on this, and I see that each and every single event on the border between Turkey and Greece is in this European Parliament an issue, and it's okay that we discuss the issues. But on the other hand we saw in Spain, on the Spanish-Moroccan border, an event where more than 20 people died. And I have to tell you that the Socialists and the Greens didn't initiate a debate about the events in Spain, but they initiate always a debate when it is about Greece. So we should care about the migrants and not about party political issues when it is about migrants.

I have to be clear on this, that the PPE is strongly on the side of our Greek authorities. Erdoğan is misusing migrants as a political weapon like Lukashenko did. For us that's clear. Our border guards, who are doing everyday the job of protecting people and the border, we trust them, we are respecting their work every day in the interests of all of us. What we have to do is to strengthen Frontex and what we have to do is also to clarify the rules for pushbacks, and I want to thank Margaritis Schinas for his work in this clarification process.

Greece is back also on geopolitical issues. Tsipras, I have to say, mainly cared about Maduro. You care about the European interests in the Mediterranean, and that is good. Not only in the last years do we witness an increasingly destabilising role played by Turkey, dangerously raising the tensions in the region. What Turkey is doing is unacceptable. It is not a problem between Greece and Turkey, but a problem between Europe and Turkey. Greece's interests are European interests in this border conflict. And we all have to ask ourselves, and probably, Mr Prime Minister, you can reflect a little bit in your final statement, how do we best deal with Erdoğan's Turkey, a Turkey that is becoming more and more provocative and aggressive?

And Greece is back on foreign and defence issues. Putin and Erdoğan tell us one lesson – Europe must grow up when it comes to foreign and security policy. It is great news that Finland and Sweden have finally joined NATO. And as PPE, our parties in Finland and Sweden always fought for becoming NATO members. The Socialists finally also supported this approach. The PPE is fully supporting NATO, but we also think that Europe has to grow up. We must abolish the unanimous vote principle in the Council side when it comes to foreign affairs, and within NATO we have to build a true common European defence with concrete projects like a cyber-brigade or a European missile defence system. Europeans have to be capable of defending themselves if it is needed.

And if you will allow me, I want to finalise with a more general consideration, because you delivered, Mr Prime Minister, a great speech in the US Congress and in the Senate a few weeks ago. It was a big honour for you to be there as one of the European leaders. And when we look to the US and we also look to our European democracies, we have to see that these democracies are under stress. We are facing populism and extremism, and probably most fundamental question is, can we agree still in our societies about what is true, what is the reality? Because we have fake news discussions – you mentioned this – we have propaganda from China, from Russia, which tried to change what is true, the reality which we are based on. And without the common understanding in our societies about what is true, what is the reality, you cannot build up a lively democratic discussion between Greens, Socialists, the PPE and so on and so forth, and people cannot decide. That's why the idea to strengthen this common base is so important. The fight against propaganda, too often this is unanswered. We have to strengthen good and serious journalism, and we have to make clear that the tech giants have a responsibility.

We will vote this week on the DMA and the DSA, which would give and will give an answer on these challenges. So thank you, dear Kyriakos, thanks to you Greece is back in Europe. The Greek people can be proud about these achievements.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, την τελευταία δεκαετία η Ευρώπη βρίσκεται αντιμέτωπη με αλληπάλληλες κρίσεις που έχουν οξύνει σε ακραίο βαθμό τις ανισότητες. Η αδυναμία συνεννόησης, σύνδεσης και ολοκληρωμένων απαντήσεων σε αυτές τις προκλήσεις έκανε την εποχή της σύγκλισης να φαντάζει μακρινό παρελθόν. Όσο μειώνονται για τα εκατομμύρια Ευρωπαίων πολιτών οι ευκαιρίες για μια καλύτερη ζωή, όσο αυξάνεται ότι νιώθουν εκτός των τειχών μιας κοινωνίας ίσων ευκαιριών, τόσο θα αυξάνονται οι απειλές για τη φιλελεύθερη δημοκρατία.

Η στασιμότητα που επέβαλαν στο σχέδιο πολιτικής ενοποίησης οι συντηρητικές δυνάμεις της Ευρώπης έδωσε το περιθώριο στους αρνητές του ευρωπαϊκού οράματος να την εκμεταλλευτούν προς όφελός τους. Αυτό είναι το ντουέτο που ευθύνεται για να παραμένουμε, κύριε πρωθυπουργέ, ένα αργοκίνητο καράβι, όπως είπατε πριν από μερικές εβδομάδες. Οι μεν μιλάνε στο όνομα της Ευρώπης, χωρίς να κάνουν τίποτα —και μιλώ για τις συντηρητικές δυνάμεις— και οι δε την πετροβολούν με μανιχαϊστικά επιχειρήματα σε κάθε ευκαιρία. Ελιτισμός και λαϊκισμός είναι το ίδιο καταστροφικοί για το ευρωπαϊκό όραμα.

Ο κόσμος, όμως, αλλάζει και πρέπει να σταθούμε στο ύψος των περιστάσεων. Έχουμε χρέος να κάνουμε περισσότερα και να τα κάνουμε τώρα. Να υπερασπιστούμε, μέσα από ένα προοδευτικό πολιτικό σχέδιο, την κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη, την αλληλεγγύη, τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος. Οφείλουμε να κάνουμε τους πολίτες να νιώσουν ξανά ασφαλείς απέναντι στις γεωπολιτικές, κλιματικές και οικονομικές προκλήσεις της εποχής μας. Θετικά βήματα, όπως το Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης και Ανθεκτικότητας, πρέπει να αποκτήσουν μόνιμα χαρακτηριστικά, ειδικά για τον ελληνικό λαό που βίωσε σκληρές οικονομικές πολιτικές. Θα πρέπει να αξιοποιηθεί ως εργαλείο κοινωνικής συνοχής και ενίσχυσης της ανθεκτικότητας της κοινωνίας και της οικονομίας μας.

Θέλω να κάνω μια παρένθεση. Καλό είναι να θυμόμαστε το ταπεινωτικό δημοψήφισμα του 2015, αλλά ας είμαστε δίκαιοι. Και να θυμάστε πολύ καλά και την ταπεινωτική εποχή του 2009 που οδηγήσατε τη χώρα σε 15,6% εξωτερικό έλλειμμα και στη χρεοκοπία, όπως πιστοποιεί και το ψήφισμα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, διότι αυτές οι επιλογές συντηρητικής παράταξης ήταν που άνοιξαν το κουτί της Πανδώρας στην Ελλάδα. Οφείλουμε, λοιπόν, να μιλήσουμε για τους νέους ανθρώπους και να δημιουργήσουμε νέες ευκαιρίες ώστε να μειωθεί η μετανάστευση, να ενισχύσουμε την αγοραστική δύναμη των Ελλήνων που είναι η δεύτερη χαμηλότερη στην Ευρώπη. Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία της Eurostat, οι Έλληνες πολίτες επιβαρύνονται αναλογικά πολύ περισσότερο από τους υπόλοιπους Ευρωπαίους. Δεν υπάρχει καμία πρόβλεψη στο Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης για την κατασκευή κοινωνικών κατοικιών προς ενοίκιαση σε χαμηλό αντίτιμο, όπως έκαναν άλλες ευρωπαϊκές χώρες με ανάλογα προβλήματα.

Στον τομέα της υγείας, το γεγονός ότι οι Έλληνες είναι τρίτοι στην Ευρώπη στις ιδιωτικές δαπάνες είναι αποκαλυπτικό των πραγματικών αναγκών που υπάρχουν και πρέπει να ενισχυθεί περαιτέρω το Εθνικό Σύστημα Υγείας και η πρωτοβάθμια περίθαλψη.

Για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής κρίσης, το Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης θα μπορούσε να αποτελέσει τον βασικό μοχλό διάχυσης των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας μέσω των οικιακών φωτοβολταϊκών και των ενεργειακών κοινοτήτων. Έχουμε την παράξενη πρωτοτυπία, ενώ σε όλη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ο στόχος είναι η ολική απανθρακοποίηση την οικονομίας, εσείς να περιορίζετε μόνο στην απολιγνιτοποίηση, όπως φάνηκε στον πρόσφατο κλιματικό νόμο που ψηφίσατε, κάνοντας τη χώρα ευάλωτη στο πανάκριβο και εισαγόμενο φυσικό αέριο.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δίνει τη δυνατότητα αναθεώρησης των εθνικών σχεδίων ώστε να ενταχθούν σε αυτά τώρα επενδύσεις, όπως η αναβάθμιση του ηλεκτρικού δικτύου της χώρας μέσω αποθήκευσης και όλων των αναγκαίων που χρειαζόμαστε ώστε να ενισχύσουμε την ενεργειακή αυτονομία και τη δίκαιη μετάβαση.

Όμως θέλω να αναφερθώ και στην ανάγκη γεωπολιτικής ασφάλειας. Η παράνομη και καταστροφική εισβολή του Ρούτιν στην Ουκρανία είναι ένα τραγικό γεγονός για τον ουκρανικό λαό και ένα πολύ ακριβό μάθημα για τις ευρωπαϊκές ελίτ για το πώς οφείλουν να αντιμετωπίζουν τους αυταρχικούς αναθεωρητές ηγέτες. Ο κατευνασμός, όπως αποδείχθηκε, δεν φέρνει αποτελέσματα. Χρειάζονται ισχυρά μέτρα αποτροπής. Δεν υπάρχει άλλος δρόμος για μια ισχυρή και αυτοδύναμη Ευρώπη που δεν θα είναι παρακολούθημα της εξωτερικής πολιτικής των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών.

Για αυτό σας καλώ να πάρετε θέση. Ο ελληνικός λαός μέσα από δέκα χρόνια συνεχών κρίσεων έχει χάσει σχεδόν 25% του ΑΕΠ του και αναγκάζεται να πληρώνει δισεκατομμύρια για να θωρακίσει την κυριαρχία της πατρίδας μας σε εξοπλιστικά προγράμματα, ενώ συγχρόνως ευρωπαϊκά κράτη συνεχίζουν να εξοπλίζουν αυτόν που απειλεί τα κυριαρχικά μας δικαιώματα. Εδώ πρέπει, λοιπόν, να παρθεί απόφαση για εμπάργκο όπλων προς την Τουρκία και για όποιον δεν σέβεται το διεθνές δίκαιο. Και χαίρομαι πολύ που ο κύριος Weber, σε μια πρόσφατη συνέντευξή του, είπε ότι το υποστηρίζει. Τώρα το υποστηρίζετε. Όταν, όμως, ήρθε η τροπολογία από τους σοσιαλιστές, εσείς προσωπικά την καταψήφισατε.

Επίσης, είναι αδιανόητο να υιοθετείται από αρχηγούς ευρωπαϊκών κρατών το αφήγημα του Ερντογάν για την τρομοκρατία, όταν στην Τουρκία όποιος διαφωνεί με τις αυταρχικές του πρακτικές, όπως ο Kavala και ο Demirtaş, χαρακτηρίζεται αυτομάτως τρομοκράτης και εχθρός του έθνους.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, η αντιμετώπιση ηγετών που παραβιάζουν κατάφωρα το διεθνές δίκαιο δεν είναι υπόθεση μίας ή δύο χωρών, αλλά είναι υπόθεση όλων μας. Έχουμε χρέος όλοι οι πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να νιώθουν, όπου και αν μένουν, το ίδιο ασφαλείς, από τη Σουηδία και τη Φιλανδία μέχρι την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο. Χρειάζεται, λοιπόν, να προχωρήσουμε στις αναγκαίες θεσμικές αλλαγές ώστε να υπάρξει επιτέλους κοινή εξωτερική πολιτική άμυνας και ασφάλειας.

Σε μια κρίσιμη στιγμή της ιστορίας, όπου εφιαλτικά σενάρια αποκαλύπτουν τα όριά μας και τις λανθασμένες επιλογές του παρελθόντος όλων, οφείλουμε να δώσουμε νέα πνοή στο ευρωπαϊκό όραμα, κάνοντάς το ξανά γοητευτικό και ελπιδοφόρο για όλους τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς.

Malik Azmani, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Madam President, Prime Minister, honourable Members, we face a series of alarming challenges that deserve the attention of the solidarity of all of us. The unjust and uncalled for war of aggression raged by Russia in Ukraine is triggering new crises – an energy crisis, food shortages – and these two combined will lead to an economic and perhaps migration crisis. This continent needs to get ready for all of this, doing so while helping the Ukrainians fight their good fight.

It's quite simple: Mr Putin must fail. Therefore, we must stand by the Ukrainian people with determination, and sanctions alone are not enough to ensure Putin's failure. Ukraine needs our heavy weapons and here all of us have a duty to back our words with actions.

There is one man responsible for the food crisis – that's Vladimir Putin. Food shortages risk many vulnerable adults and children. And they are also a risk of a migration crisis for Europe. And I'm quite certain that a new migration crisis would seem very attractive to Mr Putin, but we cannot let him succeed. We need to finalise a new European migration and asylum pact. We need a strict and fair system for the whole Union to work but we need the whole Union to take its responsibility, and we need to do it now. We have waited for too long and the next migration crisis might be on our doorstep already. The Council needs to move and this House needs to engage in pragmatic negotiating with them to reach a deal before the end of this year.

I'm worried when I read some of the reports of violent deportations. Yes, we must uphold EU law and yes, we must protect EU borders, and yes, we must ensure Turkey abides by its obligations to us. But we say no to illegal pushbacks of any kind – in Spain, in Greece or anywhere else.

Mr Prime Minister, I hope you can agree with us in Renew Europe that the Europe of today needs to be bold so we can address the cost of living crisis facing Europeans. Like the common solutions we found for the pandemic, innovative thinking is needed to address our energy challenges. We need to boost our economic credentials by signing the free trade deals that are frozen. The deal with New Zealand last week shows us the way. Protectionism is no antidote to inflation. By investing in the modernisation of our economies, by embracing competition, by improving our entrepreneurial and investment climate, we can continue to sail the ship of prosperity. Let us be bold and fight back against global economic headwinds.

And then, finally, we see that in many countries, even within the European Union, the values and principles that breathe life into our democracies are under attack. And I will be frank, Prime Minister, as always. We are worried about the decline in press freedom and media pluralism in Greece. The warning lights are flashing. Greece now has the worst performance in the EU27 as far as media freedom is concerned.

Mr Prime Minister, I hope you agree with me that media freedom is central to our European way of life. Renew Europe has added a distinguished Greek MEP, Mr Georgios Kyrtzos, to its ranks. He is sitting over there on the first row. Our family expects the voice of its representative to be heard, according to European media rules and standards.

We do not want to see another EU government leader slandering the free press because, as you know, it was Socrates who said, 'When the debate is over, slander becomes the tool of the loser' and we are aware that some in your political family have set a bad example, but please, Prime Minister, don't follow in their destructive footsteps. Stop it, Prime Minister, and stop silencing Mr Kyrtzos and stop it now. Hold the pride of the Greek tradition of public debate alive and you will continue to find Renew at your side, facing the crisis ahead together in unity.

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I thank you and the Commissioners. Dear Prime Minister, welcome in our House and I also welcome the Minister of European Affairs.

During the eurozone crisis, we have painfully witnessed in Greece how citizens suffer if the EU fails to act in unity and solidarity, and citizens should never any more pay the price of a functioning monetary and economic union. Greece should be able to count on the Union to fully reap the benefits of the green transition.

But we also count on Greece to defend the fundamentals of the Union: a Europe based on democracy, rule of law, media freedom and non-discrimination. A Europe that respects fundamental rights, including human dignity and the right to apply for asylum.

And I wonder is this Europe as well, Prime Minister, if asylum seekers try to enter this Europe through your country, their rights are brutally trampled? They are pushed into the Turkish waters and land. Migrants are even forced to push back other migrants and the border guards – masked men putting lives at risk – enjoy impunity. But those who save lives are convicted.

And therefore, I ask you, Mr Mitsotakis, is this Europe? You're closing down the most humane camps and have forced asylum seekers to live in remote and closed hotspots. You lose thousands of asylum seekers from Syria and Afghanistan in a legal limbo, using the fiction that they could return to Turkey, which they can't. And the lucky refugees that do get a status have to survive on the streets. Yet, those helping refugees are restricted and criminalised; those who speak up, including media, are silenced.

But, Prime Minister, covering up evidence doesn't help, because the reality is recorded and reported time and time again by all relevant bodies of the UN, Council of Europe, by ombudsmen, NGOs and investigative journalists. And European judges refuse to accept this reality as it violates EU asylum law.

That, Mr Mitsotakis, is Europe. And let me be clear: other Member States have put Greece in an unfair position. They breached the principle of solidarity by refusing a common responsibility for asylum seekers. We could be allies in combating these selfish policies and to have geopolitical answers to geopolitical conflicts. But sealing off the borders, deterring and pushing back refugees is not the European answer.

And, instead of trying to demonstrate a shield for Europe, I urge you to solve the many problems in your society. People are suffering from it: the 36.8% of young people unemployed; the high level of poverty; the increasing use of fossil fuel riding this global crisis, instead of investments in renewable energy. Use the EU funds to create innovative green and social jobs to transform your country into an inclusive, modern and sustainable state.

Prime Minister, we count on Greece to honour the fundamental rights on which true European solidarity can be built, both for the Greek citizens and for the refugees. Because there is No Europe left to protect or to defend if its core values are undermined.

Gunnar Beck, *on behalf of the ID Group*. – Madam President, I wish to welcome Prime Minister Mitsotakis to the European Parliament.

I would like to congratulate you, Mr Mitsotakis, more than once. First, on paying off your debt to the IMF two years ahead of schedule. However, the euro is quite another matter. It has not served Greece well. Greek inflation stands at 12%. Rents in Athens are up about 17% and petrol prices are approaching EUR 3 per litre. Almost 30% of Greeks are at risk of poverty or social exclusion. One million Greeks work in the tourist sector, but the rental costs of sunbeds in exclusive resorts in Mykonos now equal the monthly minimum wage in Greece. Price rises of up to 110% for Greek hotel rooms far exceed those in other holiday destinations. Lay-offs in the Greek tourist sector therefore seem inevitable.

Second, I would like to thank you for your efforts in protecting Europe against the ongoing migrant invasion. Last week you decided to triple the length of the border fence with Turkey and you prevented smugglers from offloading over 1 000 illegal migrants on Greek islands.

Third, I applaud your resolve in resisting aggressive posturing from Ankara. Greece's territorial integrity should be sacrosanct to the EU, more self-evidently so than that of neighbouring non-EU countries.

On the other hand, Prime Minister, I firmly disagree with you on the expansion of the European Empire. With the highest inflation rate since the 1970s, this is not the time to waste energy and money on making the Western Balkans 'fit for 55'. Rather, we should focus on the Greek pension of EUR 384 per month and the 14 million Germans who live near or below the poverty line.

Further, your government recently decided to follow Germany in ordering F-35 American fighter jets. Instead, you could have favoured European options to protect European, not American, workers and jobs.

Finally, at a recent press conference on demographic change, you seemed to adopt the logic of replacement migration, commending the integration of populations from Asia and Africa as a viable alternative, or as a viable solution to low fertility rates, instead of favouring imaginative family policies, Hungarian style.

The truth is that European governments have failed us for 40 years. Even Europe's richest countries were never rich enough to allow most families to raise two or three children in modest comfort. They are now importing millions of migrants which will rarely work and usually live on welfare. Sadly, our EU leaders are destroying our welfare state through the back door – and European culture and civilisation with it.

Prime Minister, I implore you to resist von der Leyen's 'great replacement'. Greece was under Ottoman rule for centuries. You have no reason to adopt Germany's guilt complex.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε πρωθυπουργέ, σας ευχαριστούμε θερμά για την παρουσία σας. Από την πλευρά μου, ως νέος Έλληνας που μου δίνεται το βήμα, θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ στο συγκεκριμένο πρόβλημα του brain drain, ένα φαινόμενο φυγής νέων επιστημόνων στο εξωτερικό για εύρεση εργασίας και ένα καλύτερο μέλλον, με βεβαίως αρνητικότερα αποτελέσματα για τον τόπο μας.

Έχοντας ολοκληρώσει πρόσφατα τις σπουδές μου στο Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, διαπίστωσα πως η φυγή στο εξωτερικό αποτελεί ελκυστική επιλογή για 8 στους 10 συναδέλφους μου. Ενδεικτικά, κατά την οκταετία 2008 με 2016 υπολογίζεται ότι έφυγαν περίπου μισό εκατομμύριο νέοι Έλληνες φοιτητές και απόφοιτοι με κόστος περίπου 15 δισ. ευρώ, όπως αναφέρει η Εθνική Ανώτατη Αρχή Εκπαίδευσης.

Πού οφείλεται όμως; Πρώτον, στην ανεργία. Με βάση την μηνιαία έρευνα της Eurostat, η Ελλάδα είναι πρώτη στην ανεργία των νέων με ποσοστό που ξεπερνά το 30%. Είμαστε στις τελευταίες θέσεις των χωρών του ΟΟΣΑ στην απασχόληση νέων αποφοίτων ηλικίας 25-34 ετών, απέχοντας δεκατέσσερις ποσοστιαίες μονάδες από τον μέσο όρο. Δεύτερον, οι χαμηλοί μισθοί καθιστούν δύσκολο τον βιοπορισμό. Δυστυχώς, συχνά οι νέοι Έλληνες για να παραμείνουν στη χώρα μας αναγκάζονται να κάνουν κάτι τελείως διαφορετικό από αυτό που σπούδασαν.

Βεβαίως, η παιδεία δεν είναι δωρεάν. Το κόστος για το ελληνικό κράτος υπολογίζεται σε 33.000 ευρώ ανά απόφοιτο, όμως τελικά αξιοποιούνται από μια άλλη χώρα. Μπορούμε να καταλάβουμε πως η Ελλάδα από αυτή την κατάσταση βγαίνει μόνο ζημιωμένη. Αναγκάζονται οι νέοι μας, λοιπόν, να φύγουν από την Ελλάδα για να βρουν μια εργασία καλά πληρωμένη και πάνω σε αυτό που ξέρουν και σε αυτό που σπούδασαν.

Τα πανεπιστήμια, λοιπόν, δεν έχουν διασυνδεθεί επαρκώς στην Ελλάδα και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με την αγορά εργασίας. Δεν υπάρχει αυτό που ονομάζουμε οικοσύστημα που οδηγεί τον νέο να επιχειρήσει και να καινοτομήσει και, κυρίως, να χρησιμοποιήσει τις γνώσεις του. Όπως γνωρίζουμε, όμως, η εργασία μπορεί να κάνει τους νέους μας πραγματικά ανεξάρτητους ώστε να θέλουν να παραμείνουν στην Ελλάδα —να μην είναι πελάτες, αλλά πολίτες— και, βεβαίως, να μπορούν να δημιουργήσουν οικογένεια, ώστε να αντιμετωπίσουμε το τεράστιο πρόβλημα του δημογραφικού.

Εκτός, λοιπόν, από τη μη αξιοποίηση των εξεχόντων επιστημόνων μας, οφείλουμε να εξετάσουμε και ένα επιγενόμενο πρόβλημα. Αυτό δεν είναι άλλο από το δημογραφικό. Θυμίζω ότι, πλέον, σε κάθε δύο ενήλικους Έλληνες αντιστοιχούν περίπου 1,2 παιδιά, ενώ χρειαζόμαστε περισσότερα από 2 για να διατηρηθούμε ως έθνος. Το έθνος μας, όμως, σβήνει και η ελληνική οικογένεια χάνεται. Οι νέοι μας, λαμπρά μυαλά, εξαιρετικοί επιστήμονες και απαραίτητοι για τη χώρα μας, πρέπει να γυρίσουν πίσω. Βλέπουμε συχνά στις ειδήσεις νέους Έλληνες να καινοτομούν, να επιχειρούν και να διαπρέπουν σε ξένες χώρες, αλλά απορούμε γιατί δεν γίνεται αυτό στην Ελλάδα.

Στις προεκλογικές σας ομιλίες αναφερθήκατε εκτενώς στην αντιμετώπιση του brain drain. Μετεκλογικά, ορίσατε τη ρίζα του προβλήματος στα πανεπιστήμια, και στην πραγματικότητα έγιναν ελάχιστα πράγματα. Θέλω, λοιπόν, να σας θέσω δύο βασικά ερωτήματα για το συγκεκριμένο ζήτημα: πρώτον, αν μπορεί η Ελλάδα να φέρει πίσω ξανά όλους αυτούς τους Έλληνες που έφυγαν την τελευταία δεκαετία της κρίσης και, δεύτερον, πώς σχεδιάζετε να αντιστρέψετε το συγκεκριμένο φαινόμενο.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Μητσοτάκη, καλωσορίσατε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, αλλά θέλω να σας πω εξ αρχής ότι η αποτυχία της κυβέρνησής σας είναι αδύνατον να κρυφτεί με επιθέσεις και συκοφαντίες από τα πρώτα δευτερόλεπτα της ομιλίας σας εναντίον της προηγούμενης ελληνικής κυβέρνησης. Κύριε Weber και κύριε Μητσοτάκη —γιατί και εσείς κύριε Weber ξεκινήσατε με επιθέσεις και προσωπικές συκοφαντίες στον προηγούμενο Έλληνα πρωθυπουργό, τον Αλέξη Τσίπρα—, θέλω να σας πω ότι τέτοιες εμμονές δείχνουν ότι ενδεχομένως να τον βλέπετε και στον ύπνο σας ακόμη τον Τσίπρα!

Στη δημοκρατία, οι πολίτες αποφασίζουν. Χθες ήταν πρωθυπουργός ο Τσίπρας, σήμερα είναι ο Μητσοτάκης, αύριο, αν το θελήσει ο ελληνικός λαός, μπορεί να είναι πάλι ο Τσίπρας. Πρέπει να σεβόμαστε την αλήθεια· και η αλήθεια λέει ότι το κόμμα της Νέας Δημοκρατίας έχει τεράστια ευθύνη για τη χρεοκοπία της χώρας, γιατί την άφησε το 2009 με έλλειμμα 15,4% και τεράστιο δημόσιο χρέος και πελαταιακό κράτος και διαφθορά και ολιγάρχες και κολλητικιλίκια. Την έβαλε στα μνημόνια, και η κυβέρνηση Σαμαρά-Βενιζέλου —στην οποία ήταν κορυφαίος υπουργός ο κύριος Μητσοτάκης—, τίναξε τη μπάγκα στον αέρα: ανεργία 27%, τεράστιες κοινωνικές ανισότητες, τεράστια οπισθοδρόμηση. Και, αντί για τη σύγκλιση που ήταν η προσδοκία των Ελλήνων όταν μπήκαμε στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, 40 χρόνια πριν, με βάση αυτά που υποσχέθηκε ο Κωνσταντίνος Καραμανλής και ο Ανδρέας Παπανδρέου, έχουμε απόκλιση. Και για αυτά έπρεπε να μας μιλήσετε, κύριε Μητσοτάκη.

Η Ελλάδα έχει τον μεγαλύτερο πληθωρισμό σε όλη την Ευρώπη: 12% —40% πάνω από το μέσο όρο της Ευρωζώνης—, τη δεύτερη ακριβότερη τιμή βενζίνης στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Σύμφωνα με τη Eurostat, με όρους αγοραστικής δύναμης των πολιτών είναι 26η στους 27. Και έχετε μεγάλο μερίδιο ευθύνης για αυτό, γιατί πέρα από τον εισαγόμενο πληθωρισμό έχουμε πάρτι αισχροκέρδειας και κερδοσκοπίας. Η Ελλάδα παραμένει πρώτη σε δημόσιο χρέος και κατακύληση, στα χρόνια της δικής σας διακυβέρνησης: 27η στους 27 στην ελευθερία του Τύπου και στον Παγκόσμιο Δείκτη 43 θέσεις, σε 3 χρόνια, στη θέση 108.

Επιμένετε, κύριε Μητσοτάκη, ότι οι Δημοσιογράφοι χωρίς Σύνορα είναι μια αναξιόπιστη μη κυβερνητική οργάνωση; Γιατί θέλω να σας δώσω μια είδηση: εμείς, στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, τη θεωρούμε πάρα πολύ αξιόπιστη, είναι θεσμικός μας συνεργάτης, όπως είναι και της Επιτροπής και του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης και του ΟΗΕ, και σε λίγες ώρες μαζί με την κυρία Metsola, την Πρόεδρο του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, θα συναντηθούμε με τους Δημοσιογράφους χωρίς Σύνορα, που εσείς συκοφαντείτε, για να ενισχύσουμε τη συνεργασία μας.

Πείτε μας, λοιπόν, γιατί η Ελλάδα παραμένει πρώτη στους 27 στην ανεργία των νέων και 27η στους 27 στην ισότητα των φύλων; Γιατί στα τρία χρόνια της δικής σας διακυβέρνησης έχουμε τον μεγαλύτερο αριθμό θανάτων από την πανδημία ανά εκατομμύριο κατοίκων σε όλη τη δυτική Ευρώπη; Και κάτι ακόμη: όσα σας είπαν ο κύριος Azmani εκ μέρους της Ομάδας Renew Europe και η κυρία Strik εκ μέρους της Ομάδας των Πρασίνων, για την ανάγκη να ελεγχθούν οι παράνομες επαναπροωθήσεις, τα λέει και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο με την Επιτροπή Πολιτικών Ελευθεριών, Δικαιοσύνης και Εσωτερικών Υποθέσεων, τα λέει και η Επίτροπος Johansson, και πρέπει να ελεγχθούν γιατί δεν κάνουν καλό στην πατρίδα μας αυτά τα πράγματα —όπως και η υποχώρηση του κράτους δικαίου.

Και επειδή μαθαίνω ότι η κυρία Vestager σας ζήτησε εκσυγχρονισμό και μεταρρυθμίσεις για την ταχύτερη απονομή της δικαιοσύνης στην Ελλάδα —καθώς η αργή απονομή της δικαιοσύνης αποτελεί και εμπόδιο για τις επενδύσεις και την αξιοποίηση των κονδυλίων του Ταμείου Ανάκαμψης—, θα ήθελα, κύριε Μητσοτάκη, και κάτι ακόμη από εσάς στη δευτερολογία σας: τον Ιανουάριο στη Βουλή, χαρακτηρίσατε κορυφαίους Έλληνες δημοσιογράφους και ερευνητές, «υπόκοσμο» και «συμμορία». Το Ανώτατο Ελληνικό Δικαστικό Συμβούλιο —δικαστές που επελέγησαν από ηγεσία της δικαιοσύνης, την οποία εσείς διορίσατε—, ομόφωνα και πανηγυρικά απάλλαξε από κάθε κατηγορία αυτούς τους δημοσιογράφους. Σκοπεύετε για τους βαρείς χαρακτηρισμούς «υπόκοσμο» και «συμμορία» να ζητήσετε έστω μία συγγνώμη;

Και κάτι τελευταίο για το ταμείο ανάκαμψης: η Πορτογαλία θα φτιάξει με τα λεφτά του Ταμείου Ανάκαμψης δεκάδες χιλιάδες κλίνες και διαμερίσματα για νεαρά ζευγάρια, σπουδαστές και φοιτητές. Εσείς πώς θα τα φτιάξετε με τα λεφτά του Ταμείου Ανάκαμψης;

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (ΝΙ). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το μέλλον που ετοιμάζει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στους λαούς, το ζουν ήδη με ανεργία, ενεργειακή φτώχεια, εκτίναξη της ακρίβειας, του πληθωρισμού και με πράσινους φόρους που χρηματοδοτούν τις πράσινες και ψηφιακές business. Αυτό το μαύρο μέλλον έχει την υπογραφή της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και όλων των κυβερνήσεων στην Ελλάδα, όπως και της σημερινής, της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, που προώθησαν την εγκληματική στρατηγική της πράσινης μετάβασης, της απολιγνιτοποίησης και του χρηματιστηρίου της ενέργειας.

Τώρα, χύνετε κροκοδείλια δάκρυα για την ακρίβεια που θα καλύπτει κι άλλο, όσο επεκτείνονται οι συνέπειες των κυρώσεων σε βάρος της Ρωσίας που πληρώνει ο λαός, όσο αυξάνονται οι εισαγωγές πανάκριβου αμερικανικού υδροποιημένου φυσικού αερίου που είναι επίζημιο για το περιβάλλον, όμως ευεργετικό για τα κέρδη των Ελλήνων εφοπλιστών. Αυτός ο αντιλαϊκός σχεδιασμός προϋποθέτει επίσης το τσάκισμα των εργασιακών σχέσεων, την κατάρριψη των συλλογικών συμβάσεων με διαλυμένο δημόσιο σύστημα υγείας, εκτεθειμένο στην πανδημία.

Την ίδια ώρα, η κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας ζητά από τον λαό να συμβιβαστεί με τη χαμοζωή με τα επιδόματα-ψίχουλα που σε καμία περίπτωση δεν καλύπτουν τις τεράστιες απώλειες στο λαϊκό εισόδημα από την εκτίναξη της ακρίβειας. Αυτά τα κρίσιμα προβλήματα προσπάθησε να ξεπεράσει στην ομιλία του ο Έλληνας πρωθυπουργός, παρουσιάζοντας μια εικονική πραγματικότητα. Τα περί εξόδου από την ενισχυμένη εποπτεία δεν έχουν καμία βάση γιατί ζουν και βασιλεύουν οι μηχανισμοί εποπτείας του Ευρωπαϊκού Εξαμήνου, τα ματωμένα πλεονάσματα και το υπερμνημόνιο του Ταμείου Ανάκαμψης με σκληρά αντεργατικά μέτρα και πριμοδότηση των ομίλων.

Ταυτόχρονα, μεγαλώνει ο κίνδυνος της κλιμάκωσης της ιμπεριαλιστικής σύγκρουσης στην Ουκρανία που σηματοδοτούν οι αποφάσεις-φωτιά σε βάρος των λαών που η ελληνική κυβέρνηση συνυπέγραψε και χαιρέτισε στη σύνοδο του ΝΑΤΟ. Η εμπλοκή της Ελλάδας βθαίνει με στρατιωτικές βάσεις, αποστολή στρατευμάτων και οπλισμού, με δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για τις νατοϊκές ανάγκες, με καταστολή σε βάρος των προσφύγων και επαναπροωθήσεις. Αποδείχθηκε μύθος ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, το ΝΑΤΟ προστατεύουν από την τουρκική επιθετικότητα, η οποία αμφισβητεί την κυριαρχία ελληνικών νησιών και ανοίγει τον δρόμο για την οδυνηρή συνεκμετάλλευση στο Αιγαίο.

Ο ελληνικός λαός έζησε την εναλλαγή της αντιλαϊκής διακυβέρνησης από Νέα Δημοκρατία/ΠΑΣΟΚ σε ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, από ΣΥΡΙΖΑ σε Νέα Δημοκρατία, και πάντα ζημιωμένος βγαίνει. Μόνο ο λαός μπορεί να σώσει τον λαό. Η λύση βρίσκεται στην κλιμάκωση των εργατικών λαϊκών αγώνων για άμεσα μέτρα, κατάργηση του ΦΠΑ, του ειδικού φόρου στα καύσιμα, της ρήτρας αναπροσαρμογής, με συλλογικές συμβάσεις, αυξήσεις στους μισθούς και τις συντάξεις, ενάντια στο βάρβαρο εκμεταλλευτικό σύστημα, τους ιμπεριαλιστικούς πολέμους και την εμπλοκή με αποδέσμευση από το ΝΑΤΟ και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, με την εξουσία στα χέρια των πολλών, των παραγωγών του πλούτου.

Kyriakos Mitsotakis, Prime Minister of Greece. – Madam President, let me quickly address some of the points raised by your colleagues.

First of all, thank you, Mr Weber, for making the observation – which I think is fair – that Greece is indeed ‘back’, because the country today objectively bears no resemblance to the country that we took over when the Greek people placed their confidence in us in July 2019. I think the progress that we have made is rather objective in terms of the performance of our economy and in terms of the intensity of the reforms that we have implemented.

I would like to very much take note of what you said regarding the importance of structuring our democratic debate, be that at the European Parliament or within our national governments, based on true facts rather than rumours or fake news, because it is impossible to have a proper debate if we continue to question the basic facts.

Let me take note of a point raised by Mr Papadimoulis, when he falsely claimed that Greece has been the leader in the European Union in terms of COVID deaths per million people. This is a lie, Mr Papadimoulis. It is plain false, and it is unacceptable that you show up in this House and replicate this type of misinformation. So let us at least get our facts straight when it comes to the issues pertaining to the public debate. I think it is very important to make sure that we can have a public discourse based on facts that are mutually acceptable.

Let me switch to Greek to quickly respond to Mr Androulakis. I will switch back to English for the rest of my answers.

Κύριε Ανδρουλάκη, άκουσα με προσοχή τις παρατηρήσεις σας σχετικά με το Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης. Μπορώ να σας διαβεβαιώσω, όπως έχετε ήδη διαπιστώσει, ότι οι προτάσεις μας στο Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης, οι οποίες έχουν εγκριθεί από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, έχουν ένα πολύ έντονο κοινωνικό πρόσημο. Ενδεικτικά, η αναφέρω τα σημαντικά κονδύλια τα οποία κατευθύνουμε σε δράσεις, όπως η κατάρτιση των ανέργων, η στήριξη των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων προκειμένου να μπορέσουν να βελτιώσουν τις ψηφιακές τους δεξιότητες, ή προγράμματα οριζόντιας εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας, όπως το πρόγραμμα ‘Εξοικονομώ’, από το οποίο ωφελούνται όλα τα ελληνικά νοικοκυριά, αλλά κυρίως νοικοκυριά τα οποία είναι μη προνομιούχα, καθώς αυτά έχουν προνομιακή πρόσβαση σε αυτό το πρόγραμμα.

Ός προς το ζήτημα το οποίο θέσατε σχετικά με το εμπάργκο όπλων όσον αφορά την Τουρκία, θα πω μόνο το εξής: προφανώς, κάθε ευρωπαϊκή χώρα είναι ελεύθερη να κινείται στον τομέα των εξαγωγών όπλων όπως αυτή νομίζει, πλην, όμως, θα πρέπει να λάβουν πολύ σοβαρά υπόψη τους όλες οι ευρωπαϊκές χώρες την πραγματικότητα η οποία υπάρχει αυτή τη στιγμή στη νοτιοανατολική Μεσόγειο. Η αλήθεια είναι ότι σήμερα μια χώρα η οποία φιλοδοξεί να γίνει μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η Τουρκία, ανοιχτά αμφισβητεί την κυριαρχία μιας άλλης χώρας, η οποία τυχαίνει να είναι μέλος της ευρωπαϊκής οικογένειας. Αυτό είναι κάτι το οποίο οι ευρωπαϊκές χώρες πρέπει να το λάβουν σοβαρά υπόψη τους στις αποφάσεις τις οποίες λαμβάνουν σχετικά με τις επιλογές τους για τις πωλήσεις οπλικών συστημάτων σε τρίτες χώρες.

Let me switch back to English to respond to some of the points made by Mr Azmani. I took note, Mr Azmani, of your observations regarding press freedom in Greece. I can assure you Greece is a country where everyone can write and publish anything about anyone without any censorship or any control by the government.

Just take a look – and I have printed them here – these are just two indicative front pages from today’s newspapers which accuse me of being a liar, a sycophant. These are daily front pages from at least four daily newspapers in Greece.

The same media freedom applies to TV, to radio and, of course, the Internet, where everyone is free to write anything about anyone. I would urge you to take some of these rankings which are published by non-governmental organisations with a grain of salt. Does one really believe in this House that countries such as Chad in Africa have more media freedom than Greece? Because this is exactly what was presented in the rankings, which you claim.

So when you get advice from your Renew colleagues, I suggest you dig a little bit deeper in terms of the reality of the Greek public discourse. We are a very dynamic and vibrant democracy, and I can assure you that freedom of the press is an accepted reality in Greece for many decades now. The Commission is going to publish its recommendations regarding rule of law, we expect them and we will look very carefully at what the Commission has to say. At the end of the day, I think we can trust the Commission to properly assess the state of the rule of law in all European countries.

Ms Strik, thank you for your comments. I think you’ve raised some valid points, first of all regarding the lack of solidarity offered to Greece, but also to other countries which are on the external borders of the European Union. When it comes to the migration issue, I would however like to point out that it is the right of every European Member State to protect its borders with full respect for fundamental rights. This is exactly what Greece has been doing for the past three years, and we have been successful in protecting our borders and we have been successful in terms of breaking down the smuggler networks that have really exploited the desperation of weak and traumatised people by encouraging them to embark on a very dangerous journey. When you speak about pushbacks, I would urge you to think more in terms of ‘push-forwards’ rather than pushbacks.

We have a statement between the European Union and Turkey, which requests Turkey to cooperate in terms of managing migration flows across the Aegean. When a sailing boat leaves a Turkish marina with 100 or 200 people on board, I think we need to be naive to believe that this is happening without the knowledge of the Turkish authorities.

We know very well that Turkey, back in March 2020, weaponised the migration issue and tried to push tens of thousands of desperate people across the Greek border – exactly the same practice that Lukashenko did in Ukraine. There was nothing different. The playbook was written already by Turkey back in March 2020. So please, when you look at these issues, which are sensitive issues, let us not repeat the Turkish propaganda that they have no role in what is happening and that it is the Greeks who are behaving inhumanely in terms of not protecting fundamental rights.

We have an independent anti-corruption agency which is looking at allegations. Some of the allegations, yes, are concerning and they need to be further explored. Having said that, I would like to point out that the reception facilities – because you made the point of the reception facilities today – bear no comparison to the reception facilities under the previous, Leftist government. Take a look at the islands now. Go visit Samos or Chios and you will find state of the art reception facilities that were funded by the European Union which have no comparison to the disgrace of Moria, which was a creation of the previous Leftist and very ‘sensitive’ – quote unquote – government when it came to human rights issues. This reality no longer exists.

One last point in terms of integration. I think you will find this interesting. Yesterday, I welcomed to my office a 19-year-old Iranian boy. His name is Kourosh. Kourosh made it to Lesbos in 2019. He entered a Greek school. He learned Greek. He gave his entrance exams to a Greek university. He will now be admitted to the best school in Greece when it comes to electrical engineering, having aced his national entrance exams. This is how this government looks at the integration process of people who have reached European shores and have a right to be integrated into European society.

Now, when it comes to the point raised by Mr Beck, very quickly, I assure you that when it comes to our purchases of weapon systems, all the important weapon systems that we have purchased over the past three years have been European – and I do believe that we need to purchase more European systems when we have that option, and I believe we need more integration of our defence industry in order to make it more competitive.

When it comes to the issues raised by Mr Fragkos regarding the brain drain, I can assure you that, for the first time, many young Greeks who left the country over the past decade in search of a better job are seriously contemplating returning to the country, for two reasons – because, for the first time, we offer many good-paying jobs and because they have an overall confidence that this country is moving in the right direction. We still have a lot of work to do to reverse the brain drain problem, but I think we have made some important first steps.

Finally, when it comes to the points raised by Mr Papadimoulis, who was very, very eager to defend the previous government – I understand his point but I think it is improper, sometimes, Madam President to bring issues pertaining to domestic politics to this House – I would only point out one reality, which is, Mr Papadimoulis, that seven years ago there was a referendum which was led by your government, which pushed Greece to the precipice of us exiting the eurozone. It was only because you reversed the decision of the Greek people and made the now-famous ‘kolotumba’, which is a somersault, a U-turn, that you signed the third programme and essentially condemned Greece to four unnecessary years of austerity. This is one of the main reasons you were voted out of power and why we came into power in order to make sure that we move Greece back to a proper growth track.

Finally, when it comes, again, to issues regarding the rule of law, we have an opportunity, Madam Speaker – and I will end here – to have a discussion in the Greek Parliament tomorrow regarding these issues. What is a fact today when it comes to independent justice and two of the closest collaborators of Mr Tsipras is that the Minister in charge of anti-corruption has been sent to the highest court of the country accused of tampering with justice and intervening in justice, and a second Minister in the Tsipras government has also been sent to the highest court because he interfered in a public tender regarding broadcasting rights.

So this is a track record of your government. You have two of your Ministers who will be held accountable to justice for clear interventions when it comes to the rule of law. So let the facts speak rather than using this Chamber to promote fake news. Thank you again, Madam President, for giving me the opportunity to address the European Parliament.

President. – Thank you, Prime Minister, thank you dear colleagues. That concludes the debate.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Christine Schneider (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Der regelmäßige Austausch mit den Regierungschefs der Mitgliedstaaten ist wichtig, um die Zusammenarbeit zwischen dem Europäischen Parlament und der nationalen Ebene zu verbessern. Während der Finanzkrise und lange Zeit danach noch galt Griechenland als Sorgenkind der EU. In der Hinsicht konnte Griechenland stark aufholen und gilt mittlerweile als eine der am stärksten wachsenden Wirtschaften in Europa. Zentrale Themen waren vor allem, inwieweit man die europäische Integration in Bereichen der Energieversorgung und Sicherheit weiter verbessern kann. Griechenland ist ein strategisch wichtiges Land und schützt europäische Außengrenzen. Dafür braucht es Unterstützung durch die EU. Mitsotakis betonte bezüglich des russischen Angriffskrieges auf die Ukraine, dass es bei diesem Krieg nur eine Seite gibt, an der man stehen kann – an der Seite der Ukraine, die für ihre Freiheit und Demokratie kämpft.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.10)

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

5. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.11 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

6. Głosowanie

Die Präsidentin – Die Sitzung ist wieder aufgenommen. Wir kommen nun zur Abstimmung. Zunächst stimmen wir über drei Anträge auf Beratung im Dringlichkeitsverfahren ab.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

6.1. Rosyjska inwazja na Ukrainę – środki tymczasowe dotyczące dokumentów kierowcy wydanych przez Ukrainę (C9-0201/2022) (głosowanie)**6.2. Uznanie naruszenia unijnych środków ograniczających za przestępstwa na mocy art. 83 ust. 1 TFUE (C9-0219/2022) (głosowanie)**

— Vor der Abstimmung:

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs. – Madam President, thank you, it won't be 3 minutes. Just to explain what it's about. The Council has addressed the President of the European Parliament in order to request from this European Parliament to vote on the urgent procedure of a consent procedure regarding criminal law to punish violations of restrictive measures imposed by the European Union. That is including the violation of restrictive measures in the list of EU crimes on the legal basis of Article 83 of the duty of functioning of the European Union. So that it will be possible to set common criminal rules and minimum sanctions and penalties in order to investigate, prosecute and punish those violations of the restrictive measures in all of the Member States alike.

So, we are voting first and I kindly request that you vote positively, showing again commitment to the fight against impunity, against all atrocities committed, particularly in the context of the war against Ukraine. Vote favourably on this urgent procedure so that we can on Thursday vote on the consent procedure so that the directive will be brought by the Commission to the attention and deliberation of this Parliament.

6.3. Udzielenie wyjątkowej pomocy makrofinansowej Ukrainie (C9-0221/2022) (głosowanie)**6.4. Akt o usługach cyfrowych (A9-0356/2021 - Christel Schaldemose) (głosowanie)**

- 6.5. Akt o rynkach cyfrowych (A9-0332/2021 - Andreas Schwab) (głosowanie)
- 6.6. Przyjęcie przez Chorwację euro w dniu 1 stycznia 2023 r. (A9-0187/2022 - Siegfried Mureşan) (głosowanie)
- 6.7. Umowa o partnerstwie w sprawie zrównoważonych połowów między UE a Wyspami Cooka – protokół wykonawczy (A9-0197/2022 - Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar) (głosowanie)
- 6.8. Środki tymczasowej liberalizacji handlu dla Mołdawii (A9-0201/2022 - Markéta Gregorová) (głosowanie)
- 6.9. Ubóstwo kobiet w Europie (A9-0194/2022 - Lina Gálvez Muñoz) (głosowanie)
- 6.10. Negocjacje w sprawie umowy o współpracy między UE a Interpolem (A9-0200/2022 - Jadwiga Wiśniewska) (głosowanie)
- 6.11. Strategia dla Indo-Pacyfiku w dziedzinie handlu i inwestycji (A9-0170/2022 - Jan Zahradil) (głosowanie)
- 6.12. Przyszła współpraca handlowo-inwestycyjna między UE a Indiami (A9-0193/2022 - Geert Bourgeois) (głosowanie)
- 6.13. Wspólne europejskie działania w dziedzinie opieki (A9-0189/2022 - Milan Brglez, Sirpa Pietikäinen) (głosowanie)
- 6.14. Zdrowie psychiczne w cyfrowym świecie pracy (A9-0184/2022 - Maria Walsh) (głosowanie)
- 6.15. Unia bankowa – sprawozdanie roczne za 2021 r. (A9-0186/2022 - Bogdan Rzońca) (głosowanie)

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.38 Uhr unterbrochen.)

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA*Vice-Presidente***7. Wznowienie posiedzenia**

President. – Good afternoon, colleagues. Please take your seats so that we can start our session again.

(The sitting resumed at 12.44)

8. Inicjatywy Unii Europejskiej wobec problemu rosnących kosztów życia, w tym wdrożenie Europejskiego filaru praw socjalnych (debata)

Presidente. – Passamos agora aos debates. O próximo ponto da ordem do dia é:

Declarações do Conselho e da Comissão – Iniciativas da UE para fazer face ao aumento do custo de vida, incluindo a aplicação do Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais(2022/2749(RSP)).

Recordo que os lugares são livres, com exceção das duas primeiras filas, que são atribuídas aos chefes dos grupos políticos.

Os Senhores Deputados poderão solicitar cartões para os procedimentos «catch the eye» e «cartão azul» através do vosso dispositivo de votação, depois de terem inserido o vosso cartão de voto.

Gostaria ainda de recordar que as intervenções no Hemiciclo continuarão a ser feitas a partir da tribuna central, exceto no que se refere aos pedidos espontâneos de uso da palavra, aos cartões azuis e aos pontos de ordem.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, this is my first appearance here, so I'm really looking forward to our mutual cooperation during the Czech Presidency.

Let me start by commending Parliament for placing such an important topic on the agenda of this plenary. We are living through challenging times with direct effects on European households and companies. It is therefore our collective responsibility to address those challenges at all levels and find solutions that protect our citizens and our economies.

I will use this intervention to touch upon the most critical aspects of the current situation and to present the concrete measures that the Council has taken or is considering in each of the relevant policy areas.

Inflation is a major concern for all of us, as Russia's war of aggression exacerbated the rise in the price of energy, food and commodities. This has a direct impact on our citizens and on our businesses. It has become clearer than ever that the Union's energy security is indispensable for a successful, sustainable and inclusive recovery from the crisis. It is a fact that high energy prices weigh particularly heavily on the most vulnerable parts of our populations. Therefore, alleviating energy poverty and addressing the social consequences of the rise in energy prices is one of the main priorities of the Presidency.

Last month, the Council agreed its negotiating position on the revision of the Energy Efficiency Directive, which would oblige Member States to take measures to implement energy efficiency improvements for people affected by or at the risk of energy poverty. In addition, the ongoing revision of the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive will facilitate more targeted financing to investments in the building sector, thus supporting vulnerable consumers and fighting energy poverty.

Let me recall that on 29 June the Council also agreed its negotiating position on the Social Climate Fund Regulation under the Fit for 55 package. The new fund should help tackle energy poverty by supporting vulnerable households, micro-enterprises and transport users particularly affected by the impact of the new emissions trading system for buildings and road transport. The Council remains ready to engage in negotiations with the European Parliament for a fast adoption of this important file so the support can reach the most vulnerable as soon as possible.

What is more, the Council recently also adopted a recommendation on a fair transition to climate neutrality. This recommendation encourages Member States to put in place measures to support those most affected by the green transition, in particular those in vulnerable situations, and to accompany them towards economic activities that contribute to climate and environmental objectives.

In October, we will hold a conference on tackling energy poverty, focusing on the EU approach and sharing the best practices. In the framework of the European Semester, the Council will adopt on 12 July country-specific recommendations for all the Member States.

The recommendations from the Commission for 2023 take into account the worsened economic outlook and the higher inflation compared to the Commission's 2022 winter forecast. As a result, for 2022 and 2023, it is recommended that national fiscal and social policies take into account continued temporary and targeted support to households and firms most vulnerable to energy price hikes.

The national recovery and resilience plans cover a broad range of reforms and investments that strengthen Member States' social protection systems. These measures focus on the effectiveness, quality and resilience of social protection systems and include also specific measures addressing, for instance, the inclusion of people with disabilities, increasing the adequacy and sustainability of social benefits, and improving the living conditions of elderly people in need of care.

The European Pillar of Social Rights supports and guides our work in the social policy areas. The commitment of the Council and its Member States to the Porto Declaration and to achieving the headline targets by 2030 was reinforced by setting national targets on employment, skills and the fight against poverty.

Beyond setting national targets, let me stress that important concrete achievements have been made since the Porto Summit. Last month, the co-legislators reached an historic agreement on the directive on adequate minimum wages in the EU. This should significantly contribute to reducing in-work poverty and to improving upward social convergence.

The Council has also approved in June 2021 the European Child Guarantee to address the problem of children at the risk of poverty. The implementation of this recommendation is one of our priority areas. We believe that strong political commitment, ambitious national action plans and strong governance at national level are crucial to ensure an efficient implementation. In line with this commitment, we will organise a high-level presidency conference entitled 'Child Support in the context of the Child Guarantee' later this week on 7 and 8 July.

Rising inflation and the impact of the war waged by Russia in Ukraine create real risks also for youth employment. In the framework of the implementation of the Reinforced Youth Guarantee, the Member States can better design and put in place policies for youth. Let me recall that the Council recommendation on the Reinforced Youth Guarantee recognises the partnerships between Youth Guarantee providers and other social services, including social housing and accessibility services, as cross-cutting enablers for its implementation. President, honourable Members, I thank you for the attention.

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I also want to thank the European Parliament for organising this very important debate on a topic that preoccupies European citizens all over Europe. Indeed, Europe is at a key social, economic and political juncture. We were on a recovery path, but we are now facing an unprecedented situation, largely due to Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine. This war has not only caused destruction and a humanitarian crisis, but it is also an attack on our societies and values in Europe.

This has also generated unprecedented challenges in terms of rising cost of living for households in Europe, mainly due to spiralling energy and food prices. The consequences of the current crisis have an impact on supply chains, commodity and energy prices in the EU affecting many sectors of our economy, and especially SMEs and so affecting the overall economic activity as well as the revenues and purchasing power of households.

The European Parliament in its recent resolution of May 19 on the social and economic consequences for the EU of the Russian war in Ukraine, called for action to address the economic and social crisis in a coordinated manner, mitigating the impact of energy prices on vulnerable households and supporting them to ensure a fair green transition with a view to containing poverty, while the EU frees itself of dependence on Russian energy imports and on fossil fuels. Parliament also stressed the importance of preserving social resilience against the background of a possible deterioration of the economic and social situation engendered by a protracted war in Ukraine, spiralling prices and high inflation.

We fully share your concern and we carefully listen to your calls, which are in line also with the social pillar and its action plan. In times of crisis, we must increase our efforts towards the implementation of the pillar on key issues such as the fight against poverty and inequalities. Decent living and working conditions. Labour market integration of vulnerable groups. Investment in skills and effective social protection. What is at stake now is social cohesion, which obviously has a wide political dimension. We are already experiencing a significant rise in inflation in the EU above 8% in June 2022, up from around 2% last year. This is holding back the recovery; in the latest EU economic forecasts, EU GDP growth for 2022 has been revised downward from 4% to 2.7%. The combination of high inflation and muted wage growth is significantly eroding the purchasing power of households and increasing the real cost of living, in particular for low-income households. It is of utmost importance to respect now social partners autonomy. And I want also to underline the importance of social dialogue at all levels to cope with these important economic and social challenges.

Vulnerable groups of citizens and workers have been particularly hit by the COVID crisis as well as the previous financial crisis. The most vulnerable in our society bear the brunt of the consequences of the current geopolitical crisis and the war in Ukraine. It is up to us as policymakers to act and be the Europe that protects.

Assessing the distribution of impact of inflation and rising living costs and mitigating the adverse effects of these developments on the social situation is of the utmost importance for the Commission. In this regard, I am confident that different initiatives that we have been working on will be key in the coming months and years. Let me mention a few examples. The directive on adequate minimum wages is expected to create a positive momentum for measures enhancing their adequacy. The European Child Guarantee will support children in need by breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty and inequality. And we just heard that the Czech presidency is investing a lot in developing this and strengthening the implementation of this child guarantee. The forthcoming recommendation on adequate minimum income will support those who find themselves without any means to find their way back to society, and especially the labour market. The Communication of October 21 on tackling rising energy prices provides policy guidance to Member States on how to support households. Between October 21 and mid-February 22 alone, Member States adopted measures in line with the toolbox, which eased energy bills for around 71 million households, customers and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. We recently established the Energy, Poverty and Vulnerable Consumers Coordination Group with Member States. They will discuss the implementation of emergency measures and examine their evolution. In its communication of 8 March 2022 REPowerEU joined a European Action for more affordable, secure and sustainable energy. The Commission provided guidance on the application of fiscal measures on windfall profits with a view to redistributing revenues to final consumers. These measures can play a key role in mitigating the social and economic impact of high energy prices on vulnerable households, as well as on companies and especially SMEs. Tomorrow's plenary debate on taxing windfall profits of energy companies will provide an important contribution in this context.

On May 18, in response to the consequences of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the Commission put forward the REPowerEU plan. The plan aims to achieve energy savings, diversify and secure energy supply and accelerate the green transition by the rollout of renewables, while stressing that our joint action to accelerate the clean energy transition reinforces the need for effective employment skills and social policies in line with the European Pillar of Social Rights. We call on co-legislators to adopt it swiftly.

Member States can rely on financial support at the EU level, and the European Parliament also rightly called for the continuation of financing support for as long as needed. In particular, the European Social Fund PLUS provides funding for supporting children and young people and promoting social inclusion and tackling material deprivation. The funds under the Recovery and Resilience Facility are being used by Member States to enhance social resilience and social cohesion, which accounts for around one third of national plans, as well as to address the structural causes of energy poverty.

To support REPowerEU EUR 225 billion is already available in loans under the RRF. Now it is up to Member States to update their recovery and resilience plans.

As highlighted by President von der Leyen, this transition will either be working for all and be just, or it will not work at all. And the newly proposed social climate fund aims to address the regional and social impact of the green transition, including energy, in line with the fair transition principles of the Fit for 55 package. In this regard, proposed limitations by co-legislators on fairness-focused investments should not lead to an insufficient capacity to address negative distributional impacts.

During the pandemic, we successfully mitigated the risks on employment thanks to the SURE instrument. Clearly it is an EU success story in 2020 that supported approximately 31 million people, almost one third of total employment in 19 beneficiary states.

In the new future, we have to collectively reflect on new innovative instruments modelled on previous instruments to protect citizens, especially the most vulnerable, and to tackle challenges related to the reduction of purchasing power and rising energy prices. The current social and economic outlook requires further coordinated efforts between the EU Member States and social partners to tackle the emerging challenges related to the reduction of purchasing power. To respond to the evolving crisis and the deteriorating situation, economic and social governance mechanisms under the European Semester are an invaluable asset, and the revised social scoreboard, which monitors Member States progress towards better skills and social fairness. We will follow up on the debate on the review of the EU economic governance framework, as well as on the reform of the EU own resources, including the introduction of new own resources. We need to build on the experience of the past two years where we have collectively been able to put the European Pillar of Social Rights at the heart of the EU's recovery, one that is sustainable, inclusive and fair. The challenge now is to keep the recovery on track, to address the rising cost of living in the current crisis. That is also the message and spirit of Porto, the Pillar, its action plan and the three ambitious social headline targets for 2030 must drive our joint efforts for a fair, green and digital transition. Since the Porto Social Summit, the EU has continued working towards more social and economic fairness and resilience, and we are ready to pursue actively these key objectives. We heard Parliament's call to organise a follow up to the Porto Social Summit to discuss the challenges of the extraordinary situation we are facing with increasing inflation and its social consequences. I share the view that we have to address this pressing issue of rising cost of living in the EU in a coordinated manner and at the highest level. And the Commission will obviously play fully its role. Thank you.

Isabel Benjumea Benjumea, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señor ministro, ante la creciente inflación —yo diría disparada inflación— que estamos viviendo en Europa, que castiga sobremanera a las familias, a los autónomos, a las pymes y a cualquiera que esté intentando desarrollar una actividad económica, pero también a cualquiera que esté intentando llegar a fin de mes —y a muchos cada vez les cuesta más—, Europa ha puesto encima de la mesa, a raíz de la crisis de la COVID -19, un plan de estímulo que supone una inyección de fondos europeos sin precedentes, que son los fondos NextGenerationEU. Como bien acaba de decir nuestro comisario, también ha puesto encima de la mesa ahora el Plan REPowerEU. Por lo tanto, Europa ha demostrado esa solidaridad y ahora es el momento de saber aprovechar muy bien estos fondos, para que sirvan para hacer frente a este reto de bajar la inflación y ayudar a las familias, a las pymes y a las empresas a poder seguir adelante.

Por eso, es importante que en estas modificaciones que los Estados miembros pueden hacer en sus planes nacionales se incluyan bajadas de impuestos que lo que hagan sea: aminorar el impacto que está teniendo en los precios, y en nuestra economía diaria, esta inflación; bajar impuestos que reduzcan la factura de la luz y que también reduzcan el precio de la energía; y generar incentivos fiscales para favorecer inversiones y proyectos que ayuden a crear progreso, oportunidades y puestos de trabajo. Por eso, yo apelo a que la Comisión anime a los Estados miembros a que aprovechen lo que ya existe, que son los fondos NextGenerationEU, y a que apriete a los Estados miembros para que hagan las reformas necesarias y las inversiones adecuadas para abordar el drama que vivimos hoy a causa de la inflación.

Agnes Jongerius, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I think we should say that since the war in Ukraine energy prices and food prices are going through the roof and people struggle to make ends meet while Putin is cutting off gas supplies to entire countries and capitalists make profits by speculating on markets and thereby hurting millions of households.

And like I said, people making ends meet are in trouble to make ends meet while companies benefit with huge profits. So we need to have a profit windfall tax and use the profits from this tax to mitigate the social consequences of rising energy prices and inflation.

We need to coordinate European action now to avoid a crisis in this winter, and I think we cannot wait until the social climate fund is in full action. We need action now. We have a European solution in the SURE instruments and we need to extend this programme to help households and companies to survive the winter.

I am urging the Commission, the Council, together with the social partners, to take the lead. Please present a minimum income schemes directive as soon as possible and explore the possibilities of energy price caps for basic consumptions for households so no one is left behind. We need to be bold and we need to tackle the crisis now. Hats on!

Luis Garicano, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, history teaches us that when inflation reaches these high levels, it takes discipline and patience to bring it under control. But the ECB is entering this battle against inflation with one hand tied behind its back. A decade after the euro crisis, our economic and monetary union is still deeply incomplete.

First, we have not created the safe asset for the euro area. And as a result, money flees to safety from the south to the north, placing highly indebted states under more stress.

Second, we still don't have a single deposit insurance. The ministers a couple of weeks ago abandoned the road map to build one.

Third, we still do not have an instrument for common borrowing. This places the ECB in the situation of having to support highly indebted Member States, which is not its job.

Fourth, we lack an enforceable set of fiscal rules.

Now the ECB announces an anti-fragmentation tool in order to be able to raise rates. And well, they have to know they shouldn't be naive. They will be tested. And the truth of the matter is that they do not have any long term solution. This is a non-strategy of temporary fixes which is going to run out of road very soon. Out-of-control inflation is always a very hard problem to solve by continuing to neglect the structural problems there is a risk that European leaders will make these crises fatal for the euro.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, la inflación está golpeando duramente a las familias. En este momento, la subida de gastos básicos como la comida y la energía está ahogando a las rentas más bajas. Las decisiones del Banco Central Europeo, además de tratar de frenar la inflación con un instrumento que no es el adecuado para ello, como es subiendo los tipos, puede empeorar la situación y generar una recesión autoinfligida.

Pero no todo el mundo está sufriendo este impacto por igual. No podemos negar los efectos de distribución que la inflación está generando, porque hay gente y hay empresas y actores en el mercado que están obteniendo unos beneficios extraordinarios y haciendo un gran negocio a causa de esta situación. La Agencia Internacional de la Energía nos recordaba cómo, en 2022, las compañías energéticas han ganado más de 200 000 millones de euros. O también sucede con el sector alimentario, donde las grandes agroindustrias han trasladado directamente el incremento de los costes a los consumidores.

Por lo tanto, necesitamos actuar. Y actuar significa hacerlo rápido en algunos ámbitos.

Primero, reiterar el compromiso del Consejo Europeo de avanzar hacia la fiscalidad de los beneficios «caídos del cielo».

Segundo, acelerar la transición energética. Eso significa reformar nuestro mercado eléctrico para que el menor precio de las renovables pueda llegar a la factura eléctrica.

Tercero, con un incremento generalizado de los salarios más bajos y de la protección social. Y eso también pasa, entre otras cosas, por apoyar a las familias más vulnerables, como recientemente acaba de aprobar el Gobierno español.

Cuarto, una directiva de rentas mínimas a escala de la Unión Europea. La necesitamos urgentemente.

Y quinto, frenar la especulación también en el mercado inmobiliario. Y sobre ello vamos a presentar una objeción sobre una revisión de la Directiva MiFID que no podemos compartir en este Pleno.

Estas son algunas de las medidas para tratar de ayudar a los más vulnerables frente a un impacto que están recibiendo de una manera muy, muy dramática, sin olvidar que hay actores en el mercado que están obteniendo unos beneficios magníficos a causa de la inflación.

Jaak Madison, *on behalf of the ID Group*. – Mr President, as the Commissioner rightly said it's a very important topic. I think it's the most important topic before the winter. And it's so important that in this plenary we have almost 20 MEPs listening to this debate. I think we have ten times more people there on the balcony, our visitors.

Anyway, just about inflation, about economic problems. I would like to just mention two things. First of all, we asked last year from the ECB, from the Central Bank of Europe, how will affect their very tough green policy, green deal, the European economy. And they said very clearly, 'yes, it will affect, it will increase inflation', they didn't say how much, but they said, 'yes, it will affect'.

And the same thing is mentioned several times in the speeches and in the public opinions by Ms Isabel Schnabel. Isabel Schnabel, who's a German economist, executive member of the board of the ECB and she said same things. If we are crushing this green deal forward it will affect our economy. That's a pure fact.

And if you're looking now on the energy sector and if we imagine what will happen in few years, if we are, of course, hating so much all the nuclear power and fossil fuels and we're just hoping for the wind and sun – I love also sun and wind, it's amazing things – but unfortunately, it's not enough. It's not enough for our energy sector. It means the price will go even more up. It will much more higher. And that's just an economical fact.

So that's why I would like to just hear your opinion today when we have war in Ukraine, we have this kind of problems in energy sector and we see the result of the green deal in those first years actually.

What is your opinion? What is the position of the Commission? Are we still going forward with, in my opinion, crazy idea, absolutely crazy idea? Or are there any plans that we actually will react to the problems what we have already today? So that's just my only small question. And if you can answer, I would be very grateful.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, er moet vandaag beleid gevoerd worden binnen, wat ik noem, een gevarendriehoek: klimaat, energie, koopkracht. De keuzes die gemaakt worden in elk van deze drie beleidsdomeinen, hebben duidelijk een impact op de twee andere maatregelen die genomen worden in de bestrijding van klimaatverandering. Ze hebben een effect op energiebevoorrading en zullen de koopkracht van de burgers beïnvloeden, waarschijnlijk zelfs aantasten. Maar evenzeer geldt dat het waarborgen van de energiebevoorrading door bijvoorbeeld terug te grijpen naar gas- en steenkoolcentrales een impact heeft op de klimaatdoelstellingen. Het debat van vandaag over koopkracht is dan ook onlosmakelijk verbonden met het andere grote debat van deze week, namelijk over de taxonomie.

Ik ken mijn partij. Wij zijn overtuigde voorstanders van een duurzame energietransitie, waarbij echter ook welvaart en competitiviteit centraal moeten staan. We mogen daarbij niet blind zijn voor de drastisch gewijzigde geopolitieke situatie en voor het draagvlak bij burgers en bedrijven.

De transitie zal falen als de burger zijn vertrouwen en zijn koopkracht aangetast ziet. Als we op de langere termijn de elektriciteitsprijzen enigszins in de hand willen houden met een stabiele energiebevoorrading én de klimaatdoelstellingen willen halen, dan heeft Europa geen andere keuze dan ook voor kernenergie te kiezen. Het Parlement heeft deze week de sleutels in handen om kernenergie eindelijk als duurzame energiebron te erkennen. Op de korte termijn pleit ik ervoor om de koopkracht van de burger en de competitiviteit van de bedrijven maximaal te beschermen via de fiscaliteit, via lastenverlagingen door de lidstaten.

Özlem Demirel, im Namen der Fraktion *The Left*. – Herr Präsident! Als ich eine junge Studentin war, sagte ein Professor: „Der Kapitalismus ist das Ende der Geschichte. Das Zeitalter der Krisen und Kriege ist vorbei.“

Ich weiß längst nicht mehr, wie viele Kriege und Krisen ich seitdem gezählt habe. Was ich aber gewiss weiß, ist, dass nach jeder Krise die Schere zwischen Arm und Reich weiter auseinanderklaffte. Eurokrise, Corona-Krise, der Angriffskrieg auf die Ukraine und die geopolitischen Sanktionen der EU – all dies wird ausgetragen auf dem Rücken der einfachen Bevölkerung, auf dem Rücken der Arbeiterinnen und Arbeiter.

Brot, Obst, Gemüse, Energie, Strom – alles wird teurer. Mit Milliarden wurden und werden Konzerne gerettet und Arbeiterinnen und Arbeiter sollen nun auf Realloohnerhöhungen verzichten. Mehr arbeiten sollen sie, um gigantische Rüstungsprojekte zu finanzieren. Die Superreichen werden reicher, die Armen zahlreicher. Welch ein Hohn, Welch ein Hohn, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nein, wir brauchen nicht mehr Lohnverzicht, sondern eine EU-weite Preisbremse für Mineralölkonglomerate, eine Besteuerung von perverser Reichtum, keine Aufrüstung. Ich hoffe auf einen heißen Herbst der sozialen Proteste, wo wir deutlich machen: Wir zahlen nicht für eure Krise und für eure Kriege.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'aumento del costo della vita sta avendo conseguenze economiche e sociali affrontate con provvedimenti di urgenza dai governi europei.

In Italia, ma non solo, rincari particolarmente problematici riguardano le spese domestiche relative ad abitazione, acqua, elettricità e combustibili. La crescita dei prezzi dell'energia e delle materie prime ha ampliato sempre di più la portata della pressione inflazionistica. La guerra e le tensioni geopolitiche in corso ci pongono diverse questioni sulla nostra dipendenza energetica, sulle speculazioni di mercato da contrastare e sulla fissazione di tetti massimi per gas e petrolio.

In questa fase diventa allora ancora più importante esigere l'uso corretto ed efficace dei fondi europei, tra cui NextGenerationEU e European Social Fund Plus. Il sostegno alla ripresa, agli investimenti per le imprese, alla coesione economica e territoriale non può prescindere dalla tutela delle fasce sociali vulnerabili e del potere di acquisto delle retribuzioni. La povertà lavorativa si previene anche garantendo salari minimi adeguati per soddisfare i bisogni dei lavoratori e delle loro famiglie.

Dennis Radtke (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der jetzigen Krise begegnen wir nicht am besten, indem wir schneidige und altkluge Ratschläge an die EZB verteilen. Wir wollten eine politisch unabhängige EZB, und jetzt sollten wir sie auch ihre Arbeit tun lassen, und wir sollten uns auf das konzentrieren, was wir können.

Ich will an dieser Stelle mal verweisen auf den Klima-Sozialfond, den wir hier in diesem Hause vor Kurzem auf den Weg gebracht haben. Ich stelle mir schon die Frage, warum gerade der deutsche Bundeskanzler – der in seinem eigenen Land gerade nichts tut, um diese Krise zu bekämpfen, der ein Entlastungspaket auf den Weg gebracht hat, das den Namen nicht verdient, das Rentner und Studenten nicht enthält – warum gerade dieser Bundeskanzler dafür wirbt, dass der gegenüber dem Kommissionsvorschlag eh schon verkleinerte Klima-Sozialfond jetzt noch einmal verkleinert werden soll? Wir sollten sehen, dass wir diesen Fonds schnellstmöglich an den Start bringen.

Wir müssen sehen, dass wir als Europäische Union einen Beitrag leisten, um Lebensmittelproduktion zu erhöhen, um den Druck der Preise aus dem Markt zu nehmen. Und wir müssen drittens sehen, um Beschäftigung zu sichern, dass wir die Industrie von zusätzlichen Belastungen wie beispielsweise der Chemikalien-Richtlinie befreien und das, was verschoben werden kann, jetzt an dieser Stelle auch verschieben. Das sollten wir gemeinsam auf einem großen Sozialgipfel, auch mit Sozialpartnern, diskutieren. Dafür werbe ich hier eindringlich.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Minister Bek, lieber Kommissar Nicolas Schmit! Wir haben die Säule sozialer Rechte auf den Weg gebracht, als wir gerade die schmerzlichen Erfahrungen der Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise und der sozialen Krise in vielen Mitgliedstaaten hatten. Wir wussten aber nicht, dass wir bald danach noch viel größere Krisen haben werden, die alle erfassen. Das haben wir erst in der Pandemie gesehen, und wir haben es geschafft, als Europäische Union gute Instrumente wie SURE zu entwickeln. Aber ich fürchte, dass dieser Herbst und Winter zu einem der größten Tests der Solidarität in Europa wird.

Die Frage ist, ob wir nicht nur schöne Worte finden oder ob wir wie der Kollege Radtke versuchen, das in nationale Politik umzubringen, sondern ob wir Konzepte haben, ob wir Strategien auf europäischer Ebene haben. Und da geht es nicht nur um Energiearmut und —sicherheit, da geht es eben auch um die Frage, dass wir den Menschen die Angst nehmen müssen, nämlich die Angst, dass sie ihre Heizkosten nicht mehr bezahlen können, die Angst, dass das Geld, das sie in der Tasche haben, jeden Tag weniger wird, weil die Inflation einfach explodiert.

Deshalb finde ich es gut, dass die Kommission sagt, sie werde alles tun für einen Sozialgipfel. Und meine Frage auch an den Rat: Versteht man, was uns bevorsteht? Versteht man, dass, wenn wir das jetzt nicht hinkriegen, die Welt und die EU im Frühjahr eine andere sein wird und dass wir wirklich deshalb Maßnahmen ergreifen müssen? Es ist schon gesagt worden: die Energiepreise kappen. Es ist gesagt worden: die Übergewinne besteuern und dass wir die Menschen mit kleinem Einkommen, mit mittlerem Einkommen wirklich entlasten und dass wir in Europa nicht einen Flickenteppich von Maßnahmen haben – das eine Land kappt, das andere macht andere Maßnahmen –, sondern dass wir wirklich auch unsere Ressourcen bündeln. Die unterschiedlichen Instrumente sind genannt worden, aber ich habe auch hier im Raum den Eindruck, dass noch nicht verstanden worden ist, in welcher Situation wir sind. Deshalb: Welche Antworten gibt die Kommission? Was macht der Rat anderes als business as usual?

Dragoș Pîslaru (Renew). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, am tot vorbit în ultima vreme despre generația *lockdown*. Acum trebuie să recunoaștem că pandemia și agresiunea Rusiei în Ucraina au scos însă la suprafață vulnerabilitățile socioeconomice.

Statele membre sunt din ce în ce mai îndatorate, deficitele sunt în creștere, iar veniturile cetățenilor se topesc de la o lună la alta din cauza inflației. Nu este o soluție să aruncăm cu bani din elicopter. Îmbunătățirea traiului de zi cu zi vine din reforme, din investiții și din construirea unei reziliențe sociale puternice, inclusiv cu sprijinul planurilor naționale de redresare și reziliență.

Îmbunătățirea traiului de zi cu zi va veni din puterea pe care le dăm noi tinerilor. Acum, și nu mai târziu, trebuie să investim în generațiile de tineri. Acum, și nu mai târziu, trebuie să investim în educația lor. Acum, și nu mai târziu, trebuie să le creăm oportunități pentru mediul antreprenorial. Tinerii trebuie să creadă ei înșiși că pot reinnoi Europa. Noi suntem responsabili să le deschidem ușa către Europa. Avem nevoie de măsuri curajoase, rapide și fără precedent pentru a evita o generație retrogradată la un nivel de trai mult mai prost decât al părinților sau bunicilor lor.

Pentru aceasta avem pilonul european în drepturi sociale și aceasta ne poate conduce la o viață mai bună pentru toți cetățenii.

Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Soziale Gerechtigkeit ist der Kitt, der die EU, unser Europa, zusammenhält. Wenn dieser Kitt zerläuft, dann haben wir in Europa, in der EU, ein Demokratieproblem. Wenn wir über soziale Gerechtigkeit sprechen, das ist ein sehr, sehr großes Wort, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Minister, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, das ist ein großes Wort. Dann reden wir über Menschen, die in Armut fallen.

Vor einem Jahr engagierten sich viele EU-Mitgliedstaaten in Porto zum sozialen Europa. Der Aktionsplan für die Europäische Säule gibt hier konkrete Maßnahmen und Zielvorgaben bis 2030 vor, beispielsweise, dass weniger Menschen von Armut und sozialer Ausgrenzung bedroht werden sollen – 15 Millionen Menschen weniger. 15 Millionen!

In der Art und Weise, wie die Mitgliedstaaten miteinander verhandeln, sehe ich aber nicht, wie wir diese Ziele erreichen. Egal, ob in den Verhandlungen zum *Social Climate Fund*, Mindestlohn oder zur immer wieder scheiternden Koordinierung sozialer Sicherungssysteme, *file 883*: Wenn es um konkrete Maßnahmen geht, sträuben sich die Mitgliedstaaten. Und immer wieder scheitern wir an diesem sozialen Europa, obwohl wir genau das brauchen, um zusammenzuhalten. Die nächste Initiative zur Grundsicherung – *minimum income* – darf nicht wieder verwässert werden. Wir brauchen ein starkes Europa – für unsere Kinder, für unsere Enkel, für uns alle und für die Demokratie.

Mara Bizzotto (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, bollette di luce e gas alle stelle, prezzo della benzina insostenibile, aumento del costo della vita, calo delle materie prime, potere d'acquisto dei salari drasticamente crollato: sono questi i problemi veri che i nostri cittadini devono affrontare ogni giorno e che vanno risolti il prima possibile.

Tutti noi abbiamo il dovere di aiutare concretamente milioni di famiglie italiane ed europee, stritolate dall'inflazione e da una crisi economica, energetica e sociale senza precedenti. Servono soluzioni veloci e soldi veri, prima che la situazione degeneri in conflitti sociali esplosivi in autunno. Invece, in questo contesto drammatico, assistiamo allibiti alle proposte folli della sinistra italiana ed europea.

In Italia, in questo momento di crisi devastante, la sinistra ha come priorità dell'agenda politica liberalizzare la cannabis e regalare la cittadinanza agli immigrati. Basta perdere tempo con queste assurdità. Basta con le chiacchiere. Basta inseguire i fantasmi di una sinistra che vive sulla luna, distaccata dalla realtà. Abbiamo il dovere di risolvere i veri problemi dei nostri cittadini e lo dobbiamo fare subito, ora, prima che sia troppo tardi.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter! Voor de mensen thuis wordt het leven onbetaalbaar. De inflatie staat op het hoogste niveau sinds decennia. De elektriciteitsrekening, de benzineprijs, diesel, gas en een volle winkelwagen in de supermarkt: het wordt allemaal steeds duurder.

Dat heeft twee oorzaken. De eerste is het falende energiebeleid. Door halsstarrig vast te houden aan utopische klimaatdoelen en ondoordachte sancties gaan energieprijzen nu door het dak. De tweede oorzaak is het financiële beleid – de verantwoordelijkheid van onze beleidsmakers en centrale bankiers. Door het massaal opkopen van schuld en het stimuleren van exorbitante uitgaven, zoals NextGenerationEU, en het uitblijven van hervormingen in bepaalde lidstaten oogsten wij vandaag de inflatie die zij hebben gezaaid.

Welnu, wat zouden wij voor de mensen thuis moeten doen? Bespaar de miljarden op die onhaalbare klimaatdoelen en houd energie betaalbaar en toegankelijk. De EU en overheden moeten gaan inkrimpen. Snijd eens in het eigen vlees, voer hervormingen door en verlaag de lasten voor de burgers. Dat is wat de mensen van de politiek verwachten. Dat is wat wij moeten doen.

Younous Omarjee (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, pendant que nous parlons, une minorité de spéculateurs continuent de manière éhontée à tirer profit des crises et de la guerre, quand les citoyens européens, eux, souffrent. Ils souffrent de la flambée des prix dans tous les secteurs, notamment de l'alimentaire et de l'énergie, et, il faut bien le dire, après les années de crise de la COVID-19, nos peuples européens sont épuisés. Ils sont épuisés de voir leurs conditions de vie continuer à se dégrader après avoir consenti beaucoup d'efforts. Ce qu'ils attendent de nous aujourd'hui, ce sont des décisions immédiates et la capacité, en temps exceptionnel, de prendre des mesures exceptionnelles.

Taxer les profiteurs de crise maintenant pour que cessent les profits record des multinationales, contrôler les prix de l'énergie, baisser la TVA sur les produits de première nécessité, indexer les salaires sur l'inflation, augmenter le Fonds européen d'aide aux plus démunis pour que chaque personne puisse manger trois fois par jour: voilà, Monsieur le Président, des décisions immédiates qui seraient efficaces et qui pourraient maintenant permettre à des millions d'Européens de vivre et non pas de survivre.

Jörg Meuthen (NI). – Herr Präsident, werte Kollegen! Wenn wir heute über Initiativen zur Bewältigung der Inflation sprechen, dann sollte jedem bewusst sein, dass wir hier über die vollkommen absehbaren Folgen eines fundamentalen Versagens der Europäischen Zentralbank reden. Mit ihrer unverantwortlichen Nullzinspolitik, befeuert zusätzlich durch gigantische Anleihekaufprogramme, hat die EZB dieses Inflationsmonster geradezu systematisch erschaffen.

Zum Vergleich: Während die Inflationsrate aufgrund des globalen Preisdrucks in der Schweiz aktuell bei rund 3 % liegt, haben wir im Euroraum eine Rate von schon über 8 %. Schuld daran sind EZB-Präsidentin Lagarde und ihr Zentralbankrat, die ihren Auftrag der Gewährleistung von Preisstabilität fundamental missachtet haben. Die Folgen dessen erleiden nun vor allem die sozial Schwachen, denn sie sind immer die ersten Opfer einer Inflation.

Mit teuren EU-Ausgabenprogrammen zur Abfederung der Konsequenzen wird das nicht gelöst werden können. Das ist nur hilfloses Kurieren an Symptomen. Was wir nun brauchen, ist eine längere Phase harter und restriktiver Geldpolitik der Europäischen Zentralbank. Die Medizin wird nun deutlich bitterer, als wenn man damit früher begonnen hätte, wie alle Experten es im Grunde genommen empfohlen haben. Sie ist aber unabdingbar notwendig. Und ich sage Ihnen: Mit Frau Lagarde an der Spitze wird das nichts werden.

Ева Майдел (PPE). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, скъпи колеги, инфлацията в еврозоната и Европейския съюз в момента достига рекордни нива. Едно семейство вече ще трябва да избира какво да купи и какво да не купи, защото ще разполага с почти 10% по-малко.

Европейският съюз започна като мирен проект, но икономическото благоденствие, което той подsigурява, е това, което до голяма степен ни крепи и днес. Хората харесват Европа, защото тук имат спокоен, добър и сигурен живот. Днес ние заемаме много твърди и ясни позиции срещу агресията на Русия. Приемаме санкции и ембарго. И това са истински правилните стъпки. Но за да не се окажат те неприемливи и твърде тежки за гражданите, ние трябва да предприемем конкретни действия, които да компенсират евентуални негативни ефекти.

Мерките точно за това трябва да бъдат практични и таргетирани. Трябва да подкрепим хората в риск, но трябва да подкрепим и бизнеса в неговото възстановяване, защото само големият, силен и бърз икономически растеж може да компенсира рекордната инфлация.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Comissário, caros Colegas, também vou falar em português. Estava a escutar em português, mas também vou falar em português para que os nossos concidadãos, também lá no meu país, nos possam ouvir.

Temos pela frente um risco enorme de uma crise económica e social na Europa. Muitas famílias e empresas europeias vão precisar de solidariedade para garantir o abastecimento de energia a preços razoáveis, para comprar combustíveis para aquecer as suas casas.

É mais do que tempo de agir. Esperamos, Senhor Comissário, propostas atempadas da Comissão, no verão, para prepararmos adequadamente o inverno na União Europeia.

Tomemos o exemplo da Bulgária: uma família de três pessoas gasta, em média, um quarto do seu rendimento em energia. As previsões são de um aumento de 30% do custo da energia para aquecer as suas casas no próximo inverno. Será, contudo, assim na generalidade dos Estados-Membros: os preços da comida, dos transportes, da habitação, dos combustíveis. Os riscos de paragem das empresas devido às restrições de abastecimento de gás são também bem reais.

Em cima da mesa tem, portanto, de estar uma resposta coordenada entre as Instituições Europeias e os parceiros sociais. Pedimos, por isso, a convocação de uma cimeira social já nos próximos meses.

Precisamos de controlar temporariamente os preços da energia, como já fizemos na Península Ibérica, porque os preços já não refletem condições normais de mercado e fazem sofrer os cidadãos e a economia. Precisamos de apoiar as famílias europeias em risco de pobreza devido a esses preços da energia. Precisamos de apoiar os milhões de refugiados ucranianos que estão na Europa. Não estão cá porque querem, fogem de uma guerra, e merecem ser adequadamente apoiados. Precisamos de manter ativo o mecanismo SURE, devido aos riscos de desemprego temporário ao longo de toda esta crise. E precisamos, para financiar todo esse esforço, de aplicar de forma coordenada, ao nível europeu, um imposto sobre os lucros absurdamente altos de muitas empresas, incluindo as energéticas, no âmbito desta crise. Com isto poderemos financiar todas estas iniciativas europeias.

Não há como fingir nem como adiar. Precisamos, agora, de construir as respostas. Este é mais um grande teste à União Europeia que está pela nossa frente. Estejamos à altura, porque os cidadãos esperam o nosso apoio imediatamente antes do inverno.

Anna Júlia Donáth (Renew). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Európa-szerte elképesztően emelkednek a megélhetési költségek, és ilyen rendkívüli helyzetben van létjogosultsága annak, hogyha egy tagállam kormánya úgy dönt, hogy hatósági áras, szabályozza például a benzin árát. Magyarországon még a választási kampány részeként vezette be a magyar kormány a hatósági árat. A választásoknak azonban már vége van, a kormány pedig az ellátásbiztonság veszélyeztetése miatt már szabadulna a hatósági áráktól. Mégsem meri kivezetni, mert attól fél, hogy a magas benzinárak miatt a magyarok haragja rajta csattan természetesen. Mit tesz ebben a helyzetben a minden hájjal megkent populista? Trükkhöz folyamodik, megtiltja a nem magyar állampolgároknak, hogy hatósági áron vásároljanak benzint a magyar benzinkutakon. Mindezt úgy teszi, pontosan tudja, lépése EU-s jogba ütközik, hiszen nem tehetne különbséget EU-s állampolgárok között.

De hát pontosan ezen van a lényeg. Alig várja ugyanis a kormány, hogy az Európai Bizottság fellépjen a hatósági árral szemben, hiszen így ujjal mutogathatna majd Brüsszelre, mint minden rossz okozójára, hogy ők akarják elvenni a hatósági árat. Arra kérem tehát a Bizottságot, hogy ne dőljön be ennek a trükknek, ne adjon ürügyet az EU-ellenes, újabb EU-ellenes kampányra. Ez most a magyar társadalom szociális és az Európai Unió politikai érdeke is.

Mounir Satouri (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, alors que l'Union européenne est la deuxième puissance économique mondiale, près de 97 millions de personnes sont confrontées à la pauvreté et à l'exclusion sociale, et 22 % de la population n'arrive pas à joindre les deux bouts ni à mener une vie décente.

Nous redoutons l'automne, mais réveillons-nous: nous sommes déjà dans l'inacceptable. Il est urgent d'arrêter les «mesures» nationales. Les gens ne veulent pas la charité, mais la dignité et le respect de leurs droits. Nous devons faire du projet européen notre meilleur bouclier social. C'est urgent. Un système de revenu minimum dans tous les États membres doit voir le jour pour garantir à chacun de vivre dignement. Il doit être au-dessus du seuil de pauvreté.

Nous devons aussi poursuivre la transition écologique de manière juste pour garantir des emplois sûrs et décents, mais aussi des projets de rénovation énergétique qui limiteront les dépenses contraintes des ménages. Nous avons réussi le salaire minimum. Nous devons réussir aussi le droit au logement, à l'alimentation et à la santé.

Cristian Terheş (ECR). – Mr President, I say to the Commissioner, and our dear colleagues: the definition of insanity is to do the same thing over and over again expecting different results. We talk now about the increase in cost of living in the European Union, which is just a result of the insane, unsound policies promoted by the European Union since Ursula von der Leyen took office.

Ursula's plan to forcibly change the behaviour of Europeans through higher prices and higher taxes, as she said, caused an unseen inflation in the EU and more poverty than ever seen before. The solution to make the cost of living in the EU more affordable is to reduce taxes so businesses will have more money to invest and create jobs, as well as people will have more money to spend.

Ursula von der Leyen must understand that she cannot tax people out of poverty. She cannot – in a market where demand for energy is increasing – get cheaper energy by closing down sources of energy. Nevertheless, the European Parliament must stop the insane, and support the creation of energy from nuclear and gas that, along with renewable energy, can provide sustainable and cheaper energy, which will make the cost of living affordable for all Europeans.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A háború okozta inflációnak és a fenyegető gazdasági válságnak csak a béke vethet véget. A legfontosabb tehát, hogy újra béke legyen a kontinensen. Ne feledjük, épp csak talpra álltunk a járvány után. A versenyképességünket meg kellene erősíteni, ha nem akarunk teljesen lemaradni az USA és Kína mögött. Ezt a polgárok és a vállalkozások terheinek mérséklésével, tehát az adók csökkentésével tudnánk elérni. A Covid felgyorsította a digitalizációt, Putyin agressziója pedig a zöld átállást. Ennek az árát azonban nem varrhatjuk a családok és a vállalkozások nyakába, különben az egész Unió elszegényedik. Magyarországon, hiába fáj az ellenzéknek, a rezsicsökkentéssel és az alapvető cikkek árának maximalizálásával megmutattuk, hogy ez lehetséges.

Jó lenne, hogyha a Bizottság is végre felismerné, rendkívüli időkben rendkívüli intézkedésekre és rugalmasságra van szükség. Brüsszel segítsen, hogy a tagállami kormányok meg tudják védeni a családokat, a gazdasági fellendülést hátráltató intézkedéseket törölje, a fejlesztési pénzeket adja végre oda mindenkinek. Alkalmazkodjon a háborús realitáshoz! Máskülönben az Unió hamarosan nem lesz más, mint egy skanzen, ahol az idelátogató kínai turisták megtekinthetik a letűnő európai kultúrát.

Engin Eroglu (Renew). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Vertreter des Rates, Herr Bek, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar Schmit! Wir reden heute über die Kostensteigerungen innerhalb der Europäischen Union, der Währungsunion. Und natürlich hat das auch was mit dem verheerenden Angriffskrieg des russischen Machthabers Putin auf die Ukraine zu tun. Aber Teil der Wahrheit – und deswegen müssen wir heute darüber reden – ist auch das Totalversagen der EZB. Denn die Inflation ist von vier auf acht Prozent gestiegen aufgrund des Krieges, aber ohne diesen Krieg wären wir immer noch bei vier Prozent, Herr Bek. Und das bedeutet doppelt so viel Inflation auch ohne Krieg in der Europäischen Union, ein klares Versagen der EZB. Darüber müssen wir hier reden. Wir brauchen ein System, das die Inflation nicht fördert, und wir müssen über Reformen in der Europäischen Union reden.

Natürlich müssen wir darüber reden, was wir jetzt mit den Krisengewinnern machen. Aber warum diskutieren wir nicht mal, was wir hier im Parlament machen können? Warum gleich immer mehr Umverteilung, mehr Schulden, was zu mehr Belastung führt? Warum mal nicht wirklich hier im Parlament darüber diskutieren, warum wir jedes Jahr mehr als 200 Millionen Euro dafür ausgeben, hier nach Straßburg zu kommen? Das sind Finanzen, das sind Euros, die unnötig ausgegeben werden, unabhängig von den vielen Millionen Tonnen CO₂, die wir dafür verbrennen. Deswegen: Wir müssen über Reformen reden, die wir hier machen können, und nicht nur über Reformen über die Köpfe der Menschen hinweg.

Michal Šimečka (Renew). – Mr President, thank you Mr Vice-President, Mr Commissioner, dear colleagues, the cost of living crisis is indeed affecting everyone and especially low income households. But I would like to focus on one group in particular, and that is young people. Because for too many young people in too many Member States, even obtaining their own housing has now become an almost impossible problem, an impossible challenge.

In 2020, the share of young people living with their parents was over 67% in the EU, and that was before the war. That was before the pandemic and before this crisis. As rents and property and property prices grow, housing as such basically becomes inaccessible to millions of young Europeans, regardless of their social status.

And now, of course, we must think about how to tackle inflation and energy prices, but I would really like to see a long-term solution for affordable housing to ensure that nobody is left behind and that young people have the opportunity that older generations, including my generation, have taken for granted.

Intervenções «catch the eye»

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, konferencia o budúcnosti Európy sa skončila pred dvoma mesiacmi a zatiaľ čo sa v Bruseli či Štrasburgu už prijímajú uznesenia o zahájení konventu na revíziu základných zmlúv EÚ, občanov členských štátov trápi niečo úplne iné. Sú to predovšetkým dôsledky pandémie ako i vojny, zdražovanie, rastúce ceny energií a potravín. Tu musíme prinášať rýchle a efektívne riešenia. Zdôrazňujem pritom, že názory na budúcnosť Európy občanov 21 členských štátov neboli vôbec náležite reflektované v záveroch, a to vzhľadom na nejasné organizačné podmienky. Doposiaľ nie sú dostupné ani oficiálne preklady do jazykov všetkých členských štátov vrátane slovenčiny. Aký signál týmto vysielame občanom? Nedávno som si dala na Slovensku vypracovať prieskum, ktorý jasne hovorí, že občania chcú od nás primárne riešenia na zdražovanie, rozvoj ekonomiky a pracovných miest. Až tri štvrtiny obyvateľov Slovenska sa totiž bojí, že nezvládnu zvyšovanie cien. Problémom EÚ je, že často koná tam, kde kompetencie nemá a nekoná dostatočne tam, kde môže priniesť tak potrebné riešenia.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, a esmagadora maioria da população em Portugal, como na Europa, confronta-se com a brutal subida dos preços. A vida está mais cara: os já magros salários e pensões não suportam estes aumentos. As pequenas e médias empresas não aguentam os aumentos dos custos de produção. À margem deste debate, as razões que determinam esta escalada de inflação, a especulação e o escandaloso aproveitamento dos grupos económicos da atual situação, os efeitos perversos das sanções.

Enquanto defendem mais dinheiro para a militarização e para a guerra, negam dinheiro para o aumento de salários, de pensões, para o investimento nos serviços públicos e no desenvolvimento dos setores produtivos do país. Faltam medidas que não sejam meros paliativos. Contrariar o aumento do custo de vida exige o aumento geral e real de salários, desde logo o salário mínimo nacional, combater a precariedade, aumentar direitos. É preciso regular e fixar preços, apoiar e dinamizar a produção nacional, substituir importações e garantir preços justos à produção, nomeadamente no setor agroalimentar.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα λαϊκά νοικοκυριά βιώνουν συνεχείς ανατιμήσεις στην ενέργεια, στα καύσιμα, σε είδη πρώτης ανάγκης και διατροφής. Πρόκειται για αποτέλεσμα της στρατηγικής απελευθέρωσης της ενέργειας, της πράσινης μετάβασης, των πράσινων φόρων που γιγαντώνονται από τον ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία, τις κυρώσεις στη Ρωσία και τα αντίμετρα. Οι προειδοποιήσεις για τον επικείμενο δύσκολο χειμώνα συνοδεύονται με μέτρα-κοροϊδία για τον λαό που ξαναμιζονται από την ακρίβεια και τον τεράστιο πληθωρισμό.

Την ίδια στιγμή, οι αστικές κυβερνήσεις και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πριμοδοτούν τους μεγάλους ενεργειακούς και άλλους ομίλους από τη βαριά φορολόγηση του λαού, το Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης και Ανθεκτικότητας, θωρακίζοντάς τους για το ενδεχόμενο της νέας κρίσης. Προετοιμάζουν εξοπλιστικά προγράμματα-μαμούθ που πληρώνουν οι λαοί στα πλαίσια της ευρωατλαντικής αντιπαράθεσης με τη Ρωσία και την Κίνα. Ο εργαζόμενος λαός πρέπει να κλιμακώσει την πάλη ενάντια στον ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία, να απαιτήσει κατάργηση των άδικων φόρων στα καύσιμα, την ενέργεια και στα είδη λαϊκής κατανάλωσης, να διεκδικήσει συλλογικές συμβάσεις εργασίας, με αυξήσεις στη βάση των σύγχρονων αναγκών, τη σχεδιασμένη αξιοποίηση όλων των εγχώριων πηγών ενέργειας, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του λιγνίτη με κατάργηση των απαράδεκτων ευρωενωσιακών όρων και τελών.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Vážení pane předsedající, pane komisaři, děkuji za přístup Komise a děkuji místopředsedovi České republiky za předsednictví, kterého se nyní ujímá, protože to bude velmi obtížná doba, kdy zejména právé dopady v oblasti sociální politiky budou muset řešit především členské státy, ale pomoc Evropské unie je tady očekávaná, a vy jste ji zmínili. Zmínili jste důležité programy, které mohou členské státy využívat. Jsou to programy, které již delší dobu existují, jako jsou třeba záruky za mladé, ale zejména členské státy by měly využít právě plány obnovy, z kterých mohou čerpat sociální pomoc jak pro rodiny, pro zaměstnanost, tak i pro malé a střední podniky.

Velmi bych se přimlouvala za cílené zaměření této pomoci a podpořila bych návrh, který tady zmínila kolegyně Miriam Lexmann, to znamená dělat všechna opatření s ohledem na subsidiaritu, protože členské státy mohou velmi dobře tuto situaci řešit, a na úrovni Evropské unie bychom měli řešit to, co na úrovni členských států nemůžeme.

Na závěr mi dovolu, abych popřála panu místopředsedovi, aby zde zažíval dobré debaty, dobré diskuse, které pomohou při řešení sociálních dopadů.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the Russian rouble is at a seven year high. Inflation reached a record high in the eurozone in June. The people of Europe are struggling to survive due to the crushing cost of living, compounded by sanctions on Russia that are not of any use to the people of Europe.

We are letting the warmongers ensure the destruction of Ukraine and the collapse of living standards across Europe, and driving millions into poverty in the Global South. We are spending billions of euros making sure the war in Ukraine continues. We're spending billions of euros on the militarisation of the EU. Since the invasion, NATO countries have committed billions to military equipment in Ukraine. War is a profitable business.

The shares of BAE Systems, the largest weapons manufacturer in Europe, have risen by 32% since the start of the war. The best way to deal with the cost of living crisis is to stop prolonging the war. The people of Europe favour peace, even well above punishing Russia. We can do something positive about bringing an end to the war.

To date the EU has made no serious effort for dialogue and diplomacy. We have prioritised the military dimension from the start.

(Fim das intervenções «catch the eye»)

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I first want to thank the honourable Members for this enriching debate. I think we are all sharing the fact that especially households, but also companies, SMEs, are suffering from these price increases. And we are all convinced that we have to act boldly to mitigate this situation.

When we are talking about the causes, I'm a bit surprised. Because first it seems that we have forgotten that before the war there was a pandemic. And this pandemic has already pushed prices high because a lot of value chains have been interrupted. When you talk to some industries, they cannot get the material they need. So there is a price hike which is due to the pandemic.

The second one is that we are moving into something which is quite close to a war economy. And we should call it like that, that the situation is not a normal situation which can be easily resolved. And we know where the responsibility lies. The responsibility first lies there where the war has started, where the decision to aggress an independent country has started and was taken. And I think that we just cannot give in to such an aggression, which would then be an invitation to pursue this kind of aggression.

Now we all know that in an exceptional period markets do not normally function. And we are driven in many areas not by normally functioning markets, but by incredible speculative movements, which has pushed food and energy up. And when you look at the inflation, it's mainly pushed by the price hikes of energy and food beside the causes I've mentioned on the value chains.

And those who now say that it's because of the Green Deal that we have inflation. They just do not tell the truth because we have not yet seen finally some real impact of the Green Deal. We see now that even coal factories are relaunched. So we have not yet seen any real impact on this by the Green Deal. But what we know, by the way, is that due to the war, climate change is continuing. Climate change does not wait, it's just there. And we have seen it now recently again in Italy with this catastrophe.

So I think that we have to be now serious on really trying to mitigate the impact of inflation. And therefore, social is so important because social means that we have to work on the cohesion of our societies because there is also speculation, speculation on dividing our societies even more, on creating new kinds of divisions inside our societies, but also among European countries.

And therefore, I think the best way now to deal with this is not each Member State individually – certainly a lot of measures have to be taken individually by Member States – but what is needed now is a good European-wide coordination in order to make sure that we are not at the end dividing Europe in those who are able to help and those who have more difficulties to help. And this is a broad issue.

The unity of the union is needed more than ever now. And therefore, unity means working on social Europe, working on the principles of the pillar, but adapting also our policies to the exceptional situation of something which is close to a war economy we are going through.

And we have to convey to our citizens the real messages that we are ready to help. We are ready to support their purchasing power, the way how they have to try to make ends meet, as it has been said by colleagues, but also to have companies who will be affected by the fact that they have energy problems, the prices, but also perhaps the supply of fundamental energy will be blocked specially by the Russians.

And so it's not the sanctions who have created inflation, it's the war mainly. It's the fact that markets are overshooting due to speculation and when the OECD International Energy Agency considers that about 200 billion special windfall profits have been produced by the fact that markets are not rationally behaving any more – and some certainly take their advantage out of this – then I think we have to draw the right consequences from that and not put into question now the Green Deal, which is an issue which we cannot escape from.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, thank you for this vigorous debate on an urgent topic. We learnt many lessons with the last crisis but perhaps the strongest one is that we have to show our unity and our determination. I remain confident that the targeted measures at national level and the instruments adopted and coordinated at the EU level will prove to be effective in protecting the most vulnerable groups and the people at risk of poverty.

I very much agree with what was said, that we need a European coordinated effort and that Member States need to be encouraged on how to best use and implement instruments and policies that are already in place. And yes, as Mr Radtke said, this crisis will be tackled with new innovative ideas, not with business as usual, and here I agree with Ms Bischoff.

Let's have in mind that this price increase crisis has some of its roots in the energy sector and that its price hikes are partially linked to the overall uncertainty on the market, which is constantly nurtured by the Russian war of aggression. Our common goal should be to bring predictability and certainty to our energy providers' back. That is why our regulatory framework is developing so fast, and you all mentioned them: the REPowerEU plan, Fit for 55 package and also the taxonomy climate delegated act, which this House is going to vote on tomorrow are a few of the many examples.

We will continue this discussion also in the context of the debate on taxing the windfall profits of energy companies, which I look forward to, but already now I would like to reassure you that the Council will do its utmost in line with its competences to tackle this unprecedented challenge. The debate, along with action, will continue at the European level. We will have a social summit ahead of the October European Council, which will for sure deal with this issue.

I would like to close my brief remarks by thanking you for giving me the opportunity to participate in this fruitful discussion.

Presidente. – Muito obrigado. O debate está encerrado. Passamos ao próximo ponto da ordem do dia.

Declarações escritas (artigo 171.º)

Sara Cerdas (S&D), por escrito. – A Presidência Portuguesa do Conselho da UE, através da Cimeira Social do Porto, recolocou as questões do bem-estar social no topo da agenda política. Após um ano o desígnio mantém-se – agora exponenciado pela guerra – de até 2030 empregar 78% da população em idade ativa (20-64), de uma participação de 60% de todos os adultos em ações de formação pelo menos uma vez ao ano e de reduzir em 15 milhões o número de pessoas em risco de pobreza ou exclusão social.

Lutar pelo aumento da taxa de emprego e a redução do número de pessoas em risco de pobreza e exclusão social, promover a igualdade e a inclusão, reforçar a dimensão social da Europa para também enfrentar os desafios ligados às alterações climáticas e à transição digital, deve continuar a manter-se no topo das prioridades, sob risco do aumento das desigualdades sociais face à atual escalada de preços. O número de pessoas em risco de pobreza prevalece nas regiões ultraperiféricas, como é o caso da Madeira, que apresenta percentagens muito acima da UE e do índice nacional. Importa apoiar estas regiões na aplicação do Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais e no cumprimento dos objetivos da Cimeira do Porto em matéria de emprego, competências e redução da pobreza.

Estrella Durá Ferrandis (S&D), por escrito. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Ibán García Del Blanco (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Nicolás González Casares (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Alicia Homs Ginel (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Ádám Kósa (NI), *írásban*. – A józan ésszel szembemenő szankciós politika drasztikus áremelkedéshez vezet és az európai családok elszegényedését okozza. Nekünk Magyarország biztonságos energiaellátása és a magyar családok jövője az első. A megélhetési költségek EU-ban látható meredek emelkedését Magyarországon a rezsicsökkentéssel védjük ki, amely a közszolgáltatások végfogyasztói árának jogszabályok által megszabott mértékű csökkentését jelenti. Az üzemanyag árának emelkedését a lakosság részére elérhető benzínárstop állítja meg. A szomszédunkban zajló háború ellenére is meg kell védenünk a munkahelyeket és fizetések, illetve a nyugdíjak értékét. De csak akkor lesz újra gazdasági fellendülés, ha béke lesz. Azonnali tűzszünetre és béketárgyalásokra lenne szükség Ukrajnában, mert a háborús inflációnak és a fenyegető háborús gazdasági válságnak csak a béke vethet véget! Mi a béke pártján állunk!

César Luena (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *por escrito*. – El proyecto europeo nació de la solidaridad y la necesidad de avanzar a través de la puesta en marcha de políticas sociales y económicas sólidas. Hasta la fecha, la UE ha sido un faro en el mundo como un bloque basado en derechos más avanzado, con décadas de progreso social que atestiguan su éxito y expansión. Sin embargo, si la UE no ofrece una vida mejor para la mayoría, corremos el riesgo de que la gente de la espalda al proyecto.

Pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión medidas ambiciosas que muestren su determinación para garantizar un nivel de vida digno, un crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo y una convergencia social ascendente. En tiempos de crisis, solo un enfoque renovado en el proyecto social, ambiental y económico integrado de Europa garantizará su éxito futuro. Estamos convencidos de que poner el bienestar de las personas en el centro de todas las políticas es tanto un objetivo realista como un imperativo ético de nuestro tiempo.

Los socialistas apostamos por una recuperación diferente, que priorice el progreso y la justicia social, el diálogo social y civil y el respeto de los derechos sociales fundamentales como base de las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Europa išgyvena ekonominę krizę, kuri neigiamai paveiks visus, o ypač paprastus žmones. Todėl mes, Parlamentas, turime padaryti viską, kas įmanoma, kad sušvelnintume krizės poveikį mūsų piliečiams. Europos ekonomika dar nespėjo atsigausti po pandemijos sukeltos krizės, tačiau ir vėl patiria dar vieną didelį smūgį – didėja infliacija, kyla energijos ir kuro kainos, parduotuvių lentynose brangsta produktai ir dėl to didėja pragyvenimo kaina. Didėjanti infliacija ypač neigiamai veikia namų ūkių biudžetus – tą stipriai jaučia Europos gyventojai. Remiantis ES agentūrų ataskaitomis, rudenį maisto kainos Europos Sąjungoje išaugs apie 20 proc. Didelis kainų augimas paveiks visas valstybes nares, tačiau šis poveikis bus daug labiau pastebimas taip vadinamosiose naujose šalyse, tarp jų Lietuvoje. Maistui tenka apie 30 procentų visų namų ūkio išlaidų, ir šis skaičius nuolat didėja. Todėl, siekdama apsaugoti žmones, kuriems labiausiai gresia skurdas, Sąjunga turėtų sukurti specialų „antiinfliacinį skydą“, kuris leistų sumažinti kainų augimą, euro zonoje didėjančių daug greičiau nei piliečių pajamoms. Tai smukdo pragyvenimo lygį, o namų ūkiai yra priversti mažinti išlaidas. Žmonėms, kuriems reikalinga pagalba, reikia suteikti galimybę gauti socialinį būstą arba paramą būstui įsigyti. Nepalankioje padėtyje esantys asmenys turi teisę į tinkamą finansinę pagalbą ir paramą, o paprastus žmones turime apsaugoti nuo krizės padarinių.

István Ujhelyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Magyar szociáldemokratáknak régóta képviselem azt az álláspontot, hogy az európai közösségnek az évek óta meghatározó jobboldali-liberálkonzervatív irányú után végre balra kellene fordulnia és az embert a középpontba helyezni. A Covid-járvány és az azt övező, majd a háborús helyzet miatt még inkább felerősödő gazdasági válság mélyülő szociális válsággal is sújtja a tagállamokat, ellenállóképességüktől függő mértékben. A válság bizonyította, hogy szolidaritás és együttműködés nélkül nincsenek érdemi és hosszán ható megoldások. Szociális válságot pedig csak szociális megoldásokkal lehet kezelni. Számos tagállami példa van már arra Spanyolországtól Romániáig, hogy miként lehet uniós forrásból finanszírozott szociális intézkedésekkel érdemben segíteni a válság által ellehetetlenített családokon. Sajnos Magyarország kormánya egyelőre nem ismerte fel, vagy Európa-ellenes harcában ennyire érzéketlenné vált, hogy rendelkezésre állnak azok az uniós eszközök, amelyek átmeneti mentőövet biztosíthatnak a polgároknak: például az MSZP által javasolt Esély-kupon élelmiszer-támogatás finanszírozásával. A magyar kormánynak mielőbb felül kell vizsgálnia és újraírnia a helyreállítási alap kapcsán benyújtott nemzeti tervét annak érdekében, hogy megerősítse benne a szociális alapú, válságkezelő intézkedéseket. Az Európai Unió közösségének pedig fontos feladata, hogy mielőbb rászorítsa a tagállami kormányokat az elfogadott, de teljességében be nem fogadott szociális pillérek minél szélesebb körű végrehajtására. Ideje végre az embereket a középpontba helyezni Európában és nem kizárólag a gazdasági érdekeket védeni.

9. Plan działania UE na rzecz gospodarki społecznej (debata)

Presidente. – O próximo ponto da ordem do dia é:

O relatório do Deputado Jordi Cañas – Plano de Ação da UE para a economia social (2021/2179(INI)) (A9-0192/2022)

Recordo que os lugares são livres, com exceção das duas primeiras filas, que são atribuídas aos chefes dos grupos políticos.

Os Senhores Deputados poderão solicitar cartões para os procedimentos «catch the eye» e «cartão azul» através do vosso dispositivo de votação, depois de terem inserido o vosso cartão de voto.

Gostaria ainda de recordar que as intervenções no Hemiciclo continuarão a ser feitas a partir da tribuna central, exceto no que se refere aos pedidos espontâneos de uso da palavra, aos cartões azuis e aos pontos de ordem.

Jordi Cañas, ponente. – Señor presidente, quisiera empezar esta intervención sobre el informe sobre el plan de acción de la Unión para la economía social con agradecimientos. En primer lugar, el agradecimiento al comisario Schmit, porque sin su trabajo y sin su impulso no hubiera sido posible el plan de acción presentado por la Comisión para la economía social. En segundo lugar, quiero agradecer a todos los ponentes alternativos su trabajo en este informe, un informe que es de todos, que nos pertenece a todos, en el que hemos trabajado codo con codo para desarrollarlo de una forma constructiva y positiva, y quiero desde aquí agradecerles su trabajo. Quiero también dar las gracias al Intergrupo de Economía Social, que durante años y años ha trabajado e impulsado la economía social en este Parlamento, buscando situarla en el centro del debate político. Pero, sobre todo, quiero dar las gracias a las entidades, asociaciones, fundaciones, cooperativas y a todas aquellas personas que trabajan en la economía social, que durante años, de una forma incansable, han trabajado por llegar a este momento, por llegar al momento en el que el Parlamento Europeo contribuya y dé su palabra y proponga medidas para contribuir, junto con el plan de acción a la economía social, presentado por la Comisión, para que la economía social se sitúe en el centro del debate político y ocupe el espacio que le corresponde en la Europa social que queremos.

El informe, como el plan de acción, es el resultado de años de lucha de estas entidades que integran la economía social para tener un marco armonizado a nivel europeo que les permita crecer, que permita crecer a la economía social. Y este informe busca complementar y concretar con medidas concretas el plan de acción con el objetivo de impulsar el debate, para que finalmente la resolución que planteen los Estados miembros se ajuste tanto a la voluntad de la Comisión como a la voluntad de la mayoría democrática que este Parlamento expresa.

Este informe, por ello, busca orientar las recomendaciones del Consejo para crear un entorno propicio para la economía social, con el objetivo también de aprovechar el potencial de financiación y los instrumentos que tiene la UE para sentarlos y situarnos en la economía social y, sobre todo, para una correcta implementación del plan de acción. Porque la economía social necesita un marco europeo que le permita reconocimiento y visibilidad, que le dé un entorno legal, que le dé un entorno financiero y regulatorio suficiente. Porque la economía social es muy importante para Europa, es muy importante porque juega un papel fundamental en la creación de empleo de calidad, especialmente para las personas que más lo necesitan: las personas con discapacidad, las personas en riesgo de exclusión social. Es una palanca de inclusión clave, que lo ha demostrado hasta en los momentos de mayor dificultad, demostrando una resiliencia única, y a la que Europa no puede renunciar.

La economía social tiene que ser un elemento clave que esté y que guíe en la triple sostenibilidad, en la social, en la medioambiental y en la económica. Es un elemento transformador o una palanca de cambio para que Europa sea más justa, más cohesionada, más inclusiva, una Europa más social.

La economía social tiene mucho que aportar. Y este informe del Parlamento Europeo aspira a desarrollar todo su potencial y lo quiere hacer, primero, instando a los Estados miembros a que proporcionen una definición común de la economía social, una taxonomía común que les dé garantías legales y que le permita desarrollarse en el conjunto de los países de la Unión. Actualmente no es así. Es muy asimétrica la presencia de la economía social en los diferentes Estados y es necesario que avancemos a una armonización que les permita crecer en el conjunto de la Unión Europea.

Para ello, hemos propuesto cinco puntos clave: que los Estados miembros y la Comisión integren la dimensión de la economía social en las políticas y programas de una forma transversal e integral; que la Comisión cree un grupo de trabajo para la aplicación del plan de acción; que la Comisión cree una palanca, una plataforma de la Unión única y en línea para el intercambio de buenas prácticas; que los Estados miembros designen coordinadores para la economía social y creen puntos de contacto locales, en este ámbito, a fin de dar a conocer las formas de apoyo y financiación disponibles; y, por último, que la Comisión supervise que los Estados miembros sigan de cerca los compromisos relativos a la economía social en sus planes nacionales de recuperación y resiliencia.

En resumen, trece millones y medio de trabajadores de la economía social de los 27 Estados miembros nos van a mirar mañana, van a mirar qué votamos. Estamos en un momento histórico en el que este Parlamento tiene que mostrarse unido y propulsar a la economía social al lugar que se merece y al que Europa necesita.

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first, I am very pleased to see Parliament's support and engagement towards the development of the social economy. We all recognise the important role of the social economy in our economies and societies, as it puts fairness and sustainability as its core values. Working for an economy that works indeed for people. Today, our societies face major social, environmental, democratic and economic challenges. The COVID-19 crisis, the green and digital transitions and the war in Ukraine are largely affecting our resilience and social cohesion, as the previous debate has illustrated.

In this particular context, the social economy has a key role to play to make our society fairer and more inclusive. The social economy represents a strong social and economic reality in several Member States providing quality jobs, contributing to the overall economic activity, particularly at local and regional level, and to the provision of care and social services. In fact, more than a third of the estimated 13.8 million paid jobs in the social economy is in the sector of social services.

Social economy organisations also contribute to social and labour market inclusion of disadvantaged groups like people with disabilities or migrants. They help to improve gender equality and integrate young people. They also drive sustainable economic and industrial development, promoting the active participation of citizens in our societies, and revitalise Europe's rural and depopulated areas.

However, the social economy potential is not fully tapped as its business model is not evenly spread across the European Union. While in a number of EU Member States, it is still largely underdeveloped and the action plan put forward by the Commission aims to allow all relevant public authorities and stakeholders to act jointly and fully use the potential of the social economy using also and benefiting from the European dimension, be it financial but also the European internal market.

The action plan presents more than 60 measures to unlock this potential with three key objectives. First, the development of an enabling framework for the social economy. Policy and legal frameworks need to be adapted to this specific business model, including in specific areas such as state aid, public procurement and taxation. And in this regard, the proposal for a council recommendation will be key. It will set out guidelines on the policies and legal frameworks. Member States need to put in place to support the development of the social economy, providing targeted guidance while taking into account the different traditions, scope and denomination of the social economy in the different Member States. Secondly, the opening of opportunities through enhanced support to capacity building and skills, as well as improved access to funding. Thirdly, enhancing the recognition of the social economy and its potential by promoting a better understanding of its specificities to all relevant stakeholders.

I want to thank the rapporteur and the shadows for your important report. Parliament is fully supporting the ambition of the action plan and the Commission is very grateful for that. In particular, you share the Commission's view that policymakers and stakeholders need to work on improving all aspects of the social economy ecosystem jointly. Your report also includes several concrete suggestions on the way we should implement the action plan. These are very valuable to us as we are busy preparing several key initiatives. Please be assured that we will duly take those suggestions into account. Your ideas on the scope of the Future Council recommendation on developing social economy framework conditions; your call for the role of the social economy to be fully recognised in the context of other policies and future initiatives, such as the care strategy we discussed this morning; your suggestions on our future study to collect qualitative and quantitative information on the social economy across all Member States; your consideration for the transition pathway for the proximity and social economy industrial ecosystem which is under preparation; and your call for new initiatives to support the development of worker buy outs.

We also recall the European Parliament's recent legislative own initiative resolution on the statute for European cross-border associations and non-profit organisations. The Commission committed in its reply to the Parliament of May 22 to come up with a package of legislative and non-legislative measures to address the Parliament's objectives. We will continue engaging with you on this important matter.

Dear President, your ideas and support are very valuable to us in our work on the implementation of the action plan. But they are also valuable to the millions of people working every day in social enterprises, social entities and making our society function a bit better. Social economy can play a decisive role to support the shift to a sustainable and resilient growth model, as proposed by the Conference on the Future of Europe.

Niyazi Kizilyürek, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Regional Development*. – Mr President, as rapporteur for the REGI opinion on the EU action plan for the social economy, I would like to stress once again the key role of cohesion policy funds in financing social economy projects, both for urban and for rural development, and especially for regions that suffer from severe and permanent natural or demographic handicaps, such as islands, outermost, cross-border and mountain regions.

At the same time, the EU action plan for the social economy can greatly contribute to solving urban challenges such as discrimination, poverty, inequality and social exclusion. Most importantly, though, the EU plan for the social economy should be accompanied by impact assessment tools.

Commissioner, the Commission should put mechanisms for monitoring and supporting social economic policies in place. The Member States must set targets or objectives organising at the same time consultation processes with relevant social economy actors, local and regional authorities.

We should all call for participatory approaches in support programmes and funding opportunities for the EU action plan for the social economy.

Eugen Tomac, *în numele grupului PPE*. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, vreau să îl felicit pe colegul raportor și toată echipa care a lucrat pentru acest raport important. Eu cred că în aceste vremuri dificile, când solidaritatea cu cei aflați în dificultate a fost în centrul atenției noastre, cred că sectorul economiei sociale și al entităților care au avut obiectiv social și care pun oamenii pe primul loc și nu doar profitul, capătă un rol din ce în ce mai important în societățile noastre.

Salut inițiativa Comisiei Europene de a publica la finalul anului trecut noul plan de acțiune pentru economia socială. Acest pas pe care l-a făcut Comisia deschide calea spre o economie cu un potențial extraordinar, dar care, din păcate, în multe dintre statele membre a rămas încă neexploatat.

În timpul pandemiei am putut observa cum entitățile din economia socială s-au aflat în prima linie în combaterea crizei, producând măști, facilitând educația digitală și oferind suport comunităților locale. Mai mult decât atât, în contextul crizei refugiaților cauzate de agresiunea Federației Ruse împotriva Ucrainei, am văzut cum oameni simpli, afaceri locale și mici comunități au dat dovadă de un spirit civic extraordinar, demn de valorile europene.

De aceea, consider că cetățenii care doresc să se implice mai mult în comunitățile lor trebuie să fie susținuți de către statele membre, iar orice barieră care stă în fața atingerii obiectivelor sociale trebuie eliminată.

Uniunea Europeană poate și trebuie să promoveze solidaritatea prin economia socială.

Heléne Fritzon, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Herr kommissionär! 2,8 miljoner aktörer inom den sociala ekonomin skapar jobb till miljoner människor i EU. Det handlar exempelvis om den lilla lanthandeln som förser byn med matvaror eller den kooperativa förskolan som tar hand om barnen. Med satsningar på den sociala ekonomin finns det stora möjligheter att skapa fler jobb, en starkare välfärd och en positiv ekonomisk utveckling. Jag ser det i mitt land, Sverige.

Den sociala ekonomin kan också spela en viktig roll i en rättvis återhämtning från pandemin, liksom i den gröna och digitala omställningen. Därför är kommissionens handlingsplan för den sociala ekonomin oerhört viktig.

Nu gäller det att förstå det värde som skapas av den sociala ekonomin, öka dess synlighet och utarbeta en främjande miljö för den sociala ekonomin så att den på riktigt kan blomstra. Handlingsplanen med alla dess förslag kommer att bidra positivt. Samtidigt som vi lyfter fram möjligheterna med detta, är det självklart att det ska gå hand i hand med goda arbetsvillkor, kollektivavtal och fackliga rättigheter. Inte minst kommer kvinnor som grupp att gynnas. De utgör redan i dag en stor del av entreprenörer och ledare inom den sociala ekonomin. Att underlätta för den sociala ekonomin kommer också möjliggöra kvinnors ekonomiska frihet.

Det är därför dags att ge den sociala ekonomin och dem som verkar inom sektorn den status och de möjligheter som de förtjänar. Med det sagt vill jag verkligen tacka föredraganden, Jordi Cañas, för ett utomordentligt bra och konstruktivt arbete med betänkandet. Så som betänkandet ser ut just nu innehåller det så mycket bra saker och viktiga rekommendationer att vi i S&D-gruppen kommer att rösta för det.

Атидже Алиева-Вели, от името на групата Renew. – Г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, уважаеми колеги, докладът относно плана за действие на ЕС за социалната икономика представлява пътна карта и inkluderar socialния растеж, стимулирането, socialното приобщavane, иновациите и предприемачеството в полza на всички.

Подкрепяйки socialната икономика, подкрепяме намаляvanet на неравенствата, засilvane на чувството за общност, намаляvanе на обезлюдяvanet, както и укрепvane и развитие на sелските райони. Modelът на socialna икономика притежава голям потенциал за постигане на kvalitetsna zаетost при uязvimите групи. По този начин се полага основата за по-uстойчивa икономика, при която никой не е изоставен.

Dejstvitya на ниво Европейски съюз и на национално ниво за насърчvane на развитието на socialната икономика са от особено значение в настоящия период на наслагvashi се кризи. Необходимо е държавите да подкрепят участниците в socialната икономика. Те следва да разработят хоризонтални политики и програми за socialni иновации, за usъвършенstvane на развитието, за повишvane на достъпността на услугите за най-uязvimите, в това число и на хората с увреждания и възрастните хора.

Katrin Langensiepen, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, the social economy provides innovative solutions in education, health care, energy transition, housing and the delivery of social services. It can also be a pioneer in local green deals by creating alliances in territories involving citizens and enterprises in the climate transition.

We call for better access to funding for social economy entities, in particular those run by women, as well as skills development to facilitate youth and under-represented groups to engage in the social economy. Improvements to the enabling environment are urgently needed to allow social economy entities to operate effectively across Europe, particularly through a common EU-level definition.

We call for a calendar of actions for the implementation, for social conditionality for accessing public contracts and to enable partnerships and improve access for social economy entities. We call on the Council to come up with a Union-level definition of the social economy, and we call for the establishment of a statute for a European association in line with prior EP resolutions, education on opportunities and social economy for youth and, as we said, under-represented groups.

This dossier could have been – it's a personal comment – more ambitious, more future orientated than proposed. We as Greens very much regret that it is not. But I am looking forward to improving the social economy sector with you, dear colleagues, and the Commission, in the European Union.

Dominique Bilde, au nom du groupe ID. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, austérité, casse sociale, coupes dans les services publics: il y a quelques années, l'UE n'y est pas allée de main morte pour écoper l'euro-Titanic qui fuyait de partout.

Alors que la petite musique du retour à la rigueur budgétaire se fait entendre, l'Union européenne noie le poisson avec des textes comme celui-ci. Quand vous appelez de vos vœux – je cite – la Commission à promouvoir l'économie sociale au niveau international, il faut vraiment se retenir pour ne pas rire. La réalité, c'est que l'encombrant paquebot «Commission» navigue à l'aveugle, rencontrant galère sur galère, submergeant nos marchés de produits fabriqués à bas coûts, importés grâce aux porte-conteneurs qui traversent mers et océans. Qu'elle est loin, l'économie sociale!

Nous n'avons plus le temps de nous payer de mots en ajoutant des virgules à des rapports qui n'ont finalement qu'un seul objectif: faire tenir la barre à une Commission qui rame, tandis que le pouvoir d'achat des Français prend l'eau. Face à la dérive, contre vents et marées, les patriotes sont les seuls à garder le cap de la nation qui protège.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, la economía social supone un nuevo esquema con respecto al tradicional que puede cubrir una realidad intermedia entre el sector público y el privado, generando nuevas oportunidades que respondan a un bien social. La tipología y el desarrollo de entidades reconocidas dentro de este modelo en el espacio europeo han sido muy heterogéneos. Por lo tanto, debe ser respetada la singularidad y la regulación de cada nación.

No estamos de acuerdo con que la riqueza que pueda aportar la economía social, la creatividad por desarrollar o el potencial se vean afectados por una imposición, por una exigencia de alinear o de condicionar estos proyectos a los objetivos de otras agendas, como puede ser la medioambiental, o a los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible, que limitan el emprendimiento en una sola dirección.

La economía social debe contribuir a generar actividad y servicios —necesidades que no están siendo satisfechas—, pero a la vez debe convivir con una economía de mercado, nunca fagocitarla. Debe hacerlo respetando la libre competencia y ofreciendo los mismos estándares de calidad, sin exigir privilegios exclusivos que resten presencia o competitividad a otros proyectos empresariales en el mismo sector.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, κύριε Schmit, χαίρομαι πάρα πολύ όταν σας βλέπω και πρέπει να σας πω ότι μας αρέσει πάρα πολύ να συνεργαζόμαστε μαζί σας. Νομίζω ότι είμαστε σε πολύ καλή κατεύθυνση και θα μοιραστούμε μερικές σκέψεις, μήπως βοηθήσουμε.

Η κοινωνική οικονομία λειτουργεί διαχρονικά ή θα έπρεπε να λειτουργεί διαχρονικά ως στήριγμα της κοινωνίας και σε καιρούς κρίσης. Το ζήσαμε εμείς στη μεγάλη δεκαετή κρίση στην Ελλάδα με τη χρεοκοπία και τα μνημόνια. Το ζήσαμε και στην Ένωση —όλοι το ζήσατε— με την πανδημία της COVID-19. Το ζούμε και τώρα στην Ευρώπη που καλούμαστε να αντιμετωπίσουμε μια κρίση από τον πόλεμο του Ρούτιν, με τον πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία. Κοιτάξτε, η κοινωνική οικονομία μπορεί να λειτουργήσει ως συμπληρωματικό αλλά και παράλληλο μοντέλο οικονομικής ανάπτυξης: ένα μοντέλο από τα κάτω προς τα πάνω, συμβάλλοντας στην κοινωνική συνοχή, στην αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας, στην πραγματική ένταξη των ευάλωτων —αυτό που λέμε, των αόρατων ανθρώπων.

Και εδώ θέλω να σας μεταφέρω μια εμπειρία: 33 χρόνια ήμουν στις θεραπευτικές κοινότητες απεξάρτησης στην Ελλάδα ως εθελοντής. Δουλέψαμε πάνω σε αυτά τα μοντέλα κοινωνικής οικονομίας με θεραπευόμενους και πήγε καλά. Βοηθήθηκαν οι άνθρωποι και στηρίχθηκαν στα πόδια τους. Και οι μονάδες ήταν βιώσιμες, απλώς εδώ χρειάζεται να ενισχυθούν, αυτό που λέμε, και από τα κράτη και, πόσο μάλλον, και από την Ένωση μας. Βάζω και άλλα ζητήματα, όπως τον σεβασμό στα εργασιακά δικαιώματα, πάντα με γνώμονα την αλληλεγγύη και τη δημοκρατία. Όχι στη μετατροπή της κοινωνικής οικονομίας σε ανταγωνιστικό περιβάλλον, όπως οραματίζεται η Δεξιά. Εμείς θεωρούμε το εντελώς αντίθετο, δηλαδή, να μην είναι ένα κοινωνικό ξέπλυμα αυτό. Τα επιβεβλημένα οικονομικά κίνητρα για τη στήριξή της να μην γίνουν ευκαιρία για να κερδοσκοπήσουν πάλι οι μεγάλες ιδιωτικές εταιρείες.

Και ένα τελευταίο: νομίζω ότι και σε αυτήν τη μάχη το Κοινοβούλιο μπορεί να παίξει τον ρόλο του, καθώς και η Επιτροπή, ώστε ο άνθρωπος να μείνει στο επίκεντρο.

Cindy Franssen (PPE). – Voorzitter, het actieplan “sociale economie” is bijzonder belangrijk voor de 14 miljoen werknemers die hierin actief zijn. De laatste jaren zagen we een snelle groei van de sector, met ook een toenemend belang van sociaal ondernemen in onze samenleving. Opdat de sector in de toekomst ook duurzaam en sociaal zou kunnen blijven groeien, was er behoefte aan het actieplan. Ik licht er graag drie belangrijke elementen uit:

Ten eerste, een herziening van de bestaande staatssteunregels. De huidige regels zetten te vaak een rem op de werking van sociale ondernemingen. Om maatwerkbedrijven te kunnen laten groeien, is deze versoepeling van de regelgeving dan ook broodnodig.

Ten tweede moeten we verder inzetten op sociaal verantwoorde openbare aanbestedingen. Deze openbare aanbestedingen staan voor 14 % van het Europese bbp en kunnen dus een belangrijk hulpmiddel zijn om de sociale doelstelling uit de Europese sociale pijler te behalen.

Ten derde kunnen de echte sociale ondernemingen zich door een eenduidige Europese definitie makkelijker differentiëren, zowel bij overheidsopdrachten als bij de toegang tot Europese fondsen.

Dit actieplan moet een sociale boost geven aan onze arbeidsmarkt, zodat mensen die vaak in de reguliere arbeidsmarkt niet aan bod komen, op een zinvolle en volwaardige manier kunnen participeren in onze samenleving

Guido Reil (ID). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Kommission möchte die Sozialwirtschaft stärken. Das ist grundsätzlich richtig. Aber geht es darum, die Sozialwirtschaft sozialer zu machen, menschlicher zu machen, zum Beispiel die Arbeitsbedingungen der Pflegekräfte zu verbessern? Nein.

Die Kommission möchte die Pflege klimaneutral gestalten. Was für eine Überraschung! Ganz besonders begeistert davon ist die deutsche Arbeiterwohlfahrt. Die tauscht jetzt nämlich gerade ihre veraltete Fahrzeugflotte gegen E-Autos aus, und das wieder mal auf den Schultern der Steuerzahler. Denn die müssen wieder mal dafür aufkommen.

Und wie ist es um die Sozialwirtschaft in Deutschland grundsätzlich bestellt? Sozialwirtschaft ist zum größten Teil eine Vorfeldorganisation der Parteien und der Kirchen, und sie genießen Sonderrechte: steuerliche Sonderrechte, arbeitsrechtliche Sonderrechte, und sie brauchen auch nicht so besonders transparent zu sein, Rechenschaftsberichte müssen nicht veröffentlicht werden, was dazu führt, dass wirklich monatlich massive Skandale aufploppen – Skandale über die Chefetagen, wo man sich dicke Dienstwagen leistet, Gehälter über 150 000.

Liebe Mitglieder des Parlaments, die Sozialwirtschaft ist in großen Teilen nicht sozial, sie ist asozial. Sie zockt die Gemeinschaft ab und dagegen müssen wir kämpfen. Wir brauchen endlich Transparenz und Gerechtigkeit in der Sozialwirtschaft.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Koleżanki i koledzy! Gospodarka społeczna obejmuje szereg zróżnicowanych podmiotów, które łączy jedno – działalność na rzecz lokalnych społeczności i dobra wspólnego. Ponadto gospodarka społeczna to nasz sprzymierzeniec w realizacji europejskiego filaru praw socjalnych. Sektor przyczynia się do tworzenia wysokiej jakości miejsc pracy, promocji równych szans, ma wkład w kształtowanie bezpiecznego i dobrze dostosowanego środowiska pracy, a także w dialog społeczny. Dlatego tak ważne jest przyjęcie planu działania na rzecz gospodarki społecznej.

Aby wspierać sektor, przede wszystkim należy zapewnić łatwiejszy dostęp do finansowania, w tym unijnego, tak aby podmioty gospodarki społecznej nie tylko mogły prowadzić swoją codzienną działalność, ale także wprowadzać innowacje społeczne i sprawniej mierzyć się z sytuacjami kryzysowymi. Ważna jest także zapowiedź uruchomienia jednolitego portalu poświęconego gospodarce społecznej, który umożliwi jej podmiotom dostęp do informacji o wsparciu, inicjatywach i polityce. Powinniśmy też zwrócić szczególną uwagę na promocję gospodarki społecznej i położyć większy nacisk na przepływ dobrych praktyk w zakresie tworzenia odpowiedniego środowiska dla funkcjonowania tego sektora, a także stymulowania jego rozwoju poprzez budowanie jego zdolności, zapewniając dostęp do usług doradczych, coachingu, szkoleń czy doradztwa prawnego.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caras e caros Colegas, apoiar a economia social é fortalecer a Europa Social. Estas entidades são fundamentais para a promoção da qualidade de vida dos nossos cidadãos, da coesão territorial, económica e social. São uma prova de solidariedade: favorecem e incluem. São entidades onde verificamos a valorização do voluntariado. Entidades que respondem e estão presentes nos sítios mais despovoados, nos meios rurais e dão resposta nos momentos de dificuldade.

Por isso, Senhor Comissário, temos de as apoiar, temos de as valorizar, e eu sei que tem feito um esforço nesse sentido. Mas é preciso trabalhar com os Estados-Membros para que os enormes recursos financeiros que tem à sua disposição sejam bem utilizados. Os planos de recuperação e resiliência, os fundos da coesão e do desenvolvimento rural devem estar disponíveis para essas entidades. Elas devem ser elegíveis e, por isso, fica aqui este pedido e este desafio: essas entidades devem ser apoiadas e devem ser valorizadas.

Intervenções «catch the eye»

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi discutiamo la relazione Cañas e ringrazio moltissimo il relatore.

Abbiamo discusso qualche settimana fa la relazione Lagodinsky, un'altra probabilmente è in arrivo dal Parlamento dalla commissione ECON, questo dimostra l'estrema attività e attenzione del Parlamento sul tema dell'economia sociale, lo dico anche a nome dell'intergruppo Economia sociale.

Ma la grande novità accanto a questo impegno è il piano d'azione della Commissione; io devo dare atto al Commissario Schmit, e lo faccio in ogni sede, e alla Commissione, ma a lui in particolare, di avere per la prima volta posto all'attenzione della Commissione, con gli strumenti da mettere in campo, questo settore, indicando anche agli Stati membri cosa bisognerebbe fare. E qui aspettiamo la dichiarazione del Consiglio. Devo dire che la Presidenza francese ha lavorato molto a riguardo, l'attuale Presidenza brilla per assenza e questo non è un buon segno, Presidente, andrà fatto notare, su un tema di questo genere.

Allora io credo che questo è il momento, davvero, per mettere al centro delle politiche europee e nazionali l'apporto dell'economia sociale. C'è una grande crisi, è stato detto, più crisi, c'è l'esperienza di questo settore, che non è solo servizi sociali, è oggi digitale, è oggi impegno nel settore *green*, è insomma un modello di *business* alternativo. Si può fare attività d'impresa con un *business model* diverso, non orientato al profitto, e ne abbiamo estremamente bisogno.

Termino richiamando gli strumenti, Commissario, Lei è molto sensibile a questo, dovranno esserlo tutti i commissari, dalla DG GROW alla DG CONNECT, a tutti quelli che si occupano dei diversi settori, come state facendo, come noi vi spingiamo a fare ancora di più. Siamo un Suo alleato, perché davvero bisogna mettere in campo strumenti anche finanziari; anche i commissari che si occupano di finanze devono cogliere questa specificità e la novità saranno anche strumenti finanziari adeguati a questo settore.

Comunque, grazie ai colleghi del Parlamento che lavorano in questa direzione e grazie al Commissario Schmit.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señor presidente, Jordi, gracias por tu compromiso en este informe, porque impulsar la economía social es impulsar la resiliencia y la transformación de la Unión: una transformación ambiental y digital, pero centrada en las personas.

La economía social las coloca en el centro del emprendimiento, cuida sus condiciones de trabajo, impulsa la transparencia y la solidaridad, fija el desarrollo al territorio y convierte así, en una consecuencia natural la responsabilidad social corporativa. Devuelve, además, al sistema financiero el papel de instrumento al servicio de la economía productiva que nunca debió abandonar. No es un cuento de hadas. Muchos estudios confirman esta realidad muy presente en el País Vasco, una de las razones que explica la solidez de nuestro modelo de desarrollo económico con desarrollo social.

En Euskadi, la cooperativa es la opción preferida de los jóvenes para trabajar. Nueve de cada diez personas conoce alguna. Dos de cada tres tienen a una persona conocida trabajando en alguna. Y no es nada raro si recordamos que es la mayor corporación corporativa industrial, con más de 80 000 empleados y ventas en 150 países, en el País Vasco. Además, compañías vascas, líderes mundiales en su sector, están fuertemente participadas por sus trabajadores. Por eso, este plan europeo es una potente herramienta para que nuestra resiliencia tenga su base en las personas. Y, en este sentido, comisario Schmit, me gustaría preguntarle si considera que el modelo del País Vasco puede ser una buena práctica para mejorar los valores del sistema productivo.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, o Plano de Ação da UE e o relatório que aqui debatemos partem de uma premissa com a qual não podemos concordar: apelar ao setor social de economia social. Uma opção política e ideológica, deliberadamente tomada, que pretende mercantilizar a prestação dos cuidados sociais.

É inegável o papel das instituições de solidariedade social e das cooperativas. Mas umas e outras não se devem substituir, mas sim complementar, às respostas públicas dos Estados.

A garantia dos direitos sociais e a proteção social são, na nossa opinião, uma responsabilidade do Estado. O setor social deve dar uma resposta de qualidade, universal, próxima e tendencialmente gratuita. Aos trabalhadores do setor social devem ser garantidos os mais altos padrões de direitos laborais e sociais, remunerações dignas e justas e formação contínua.

Responder aos flagelos e necessidades sociais não pode ser uma mera ação de assistencialismo, de caridade ou de filantropia, mas antes um verdadeiro e genuíno comprometimento por parte do Estado com o combate às desigualdades e à injusta distribuição da riqueza.

(Fim das intervenções «catch the eye»)

Nicolas Schmit, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, first I want to thank Mr Cañas again for this report. But I think the Parliament is a great ally, a great supporter, and especially also the Intergroup. And I want really to thank the Intergroup for the work which is done there on promoting social economy.

The potential of the social economy to create and retain quality jobs, contribute to social inclusion, drive economic development, drive the twin transition and revitalise our democracy should now be enhanced and should find its place in our policies, in our national policies, but also at the European level.

I think what we need now are more social enterprises, stronger social entrepreneurship, creation of new entities precisely to promote also social innovation. Yes, there are regions that are ahead in promoting and developing social economy. Showing, by the way, how this can function in the interest of prosperity, in the interest of good jobs, in the interest also of solid social services. So if you ask me, yes, there are regions, the Basque region, the Basque country certainly is one of them.

I am very grateful to the support of the European Parliament in enhancing the recognition of this alternative way of doing business. This is essential for it to develop more evenly in all territories of the European Union.

And also to say a word on the accessibility of European finance, I think this is a real important issue. We have to make all financial resources, all European financial resources, more easily accessible to social economy entities, enterprises or whatever status. So therefore, we are creating a digital single gateway to make it easier precisely to find the right resources and to facilitate the administrative procedure.

Anyway, I must say your report Mr Cañas is a good contribution to the preparation of our recommendation, and certainly we will come back to that once we propose this recommendation.

Jordi Cañas, ponente. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, gracias por sus palabras, gracias por su trabajo. Pero preguntaban algunos diputados: ¿qué es la economía social? Miren, cuando escucho «economía social» pienso en compromiso, en inclusión, en respeto, en dignidad y en oportunidad. Eso es la economía social. Es una palanca de transformación, es una forma en la cual aquellos que más lo necesitan pueden incorporarse al mercado laboral, pueden recibir las ayudas, el apoyo que necesitan. Y lo hace la economía social. Y la economía social es clave en la Europa que queremos, en la economía que queremos y en la sociedad que queremos: una sociedad más justa, más inclusiva.

Aquí muchas veces somos presas de la retórica —*lógica, política et rhetorica*—. Las propuestas muchas veces son retóricas. La economía social es una realidad que existe, que solo nos ha pedido y nos pide ayuda, que le demos el marco para que pueda desarrollarse, que le demos los instrumentos legales para que pueda desarrollarse, que le demos los instrumentos financieros para que pueda desarrollarse. En definitiva, que le demos instrumentos para hacer su trabajo, para seguir permitiendo dar a millones de personas algo que en política es muy difícil de conseguir, que es esperanza, futuro y oportunidad.

Quiero nuevamente agradecer desde aquí el impulso del comisario Schmit y de esta Comisión por poner negro sobre blanco una propuesta ambiciosa. ¿Se puede ir más allá? Claro, siempre, pero hay que buscar equilibrios. Y este Parlamento lo que pretende y que ha pretendido con este informe es concretar, complementar, pero yendo de la mano, porque necesitamos ir de la mano para construir eso que queremos para la economía social. Lamento no ver aquí al Consejo. Lo lamento profundamente. Lo lamento porque este informe busca orientar las recomendaciones del Consejo. Espero que su ausencia no signifique su falta de compromiso. Estoy convencido de que no. ¿Por qué? Porque en el fondo todo esto que hacemos no es ni más ni menos que intentar contribuir a situar a la economía social y a esos millones de personas donde les corresponde: en el centro de nuestras políticas públicas.

Presidente. – O debate está encerrado.

A votação deste relatório realizar-se-á amanhã.

A sessão está suspensa por alguns minutos. Será reiniciada às 15.00 com o período de perguntas à Comissão que consta da ordem do dia.

Declarações escritas (artigo 171.º)

Stefania Zambelli (ID), *per iscritto*. – Gentili colleghi, l'economia sociale consiste nel settore economico formato da associazioni, fondazioni e imprese sociali; coinvolge 2,8 milioni di organizzazioni in tutta Europa e dà lavoro ad oltre 13 milioni di persone. Queste organizzazioni svolgono un ruolo fondamentale per le nostre società dal momento che operano in numerosi settori: assistenza sociale, aiuto alle persone con disabilità, assistenza sanitaria, edilizia, commercio e turismo.

È utile sottolineare come tali entità abbiano una caratteristica prettamente territoriale: operano in un contesto regionale o locale, dando un contributo decisivo alla crescita economica di un territorio e danno attuazione al principio di sussidiarietà. Nel Piano d'azione per l'economia sociale presentato dalla Commissione, desta preoccupazione il riferimento ad alcune linee guida da rispettare per l'ottenimento di risorse e finanziamenti: vi è il serio rischio che solamente alcune entità sociali allineate a certi dettami ideologici e politici possano accedere agli aiuti finanziari previsti.

Prendiamo dunque atto della proposta della Commissione sul Piano d'Azione; tuttavia, questo Piano dovrà tenere conto delle particolarità territoriali in cui operano le associazioni o le fondazioni e dovrà essere quanto più inclusivo, al fine di comprendere ogni entità che opera nelle nostre società.

(A sessão é suspensa às 14h54)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

10. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.02 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

11. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar.

Gibt es Einwände?

Das ist nicht der Fall. Das Protokoll ist damit genehmigt.

12. Tura pytań (do Komisji) Zwiększyć ambicje UE w dziedzinie różnorodności biologicznej przed COP 15

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Fragestunde mit Anfragen an die Kommission gemäß Artikel 137 der Geschäftsordnung.

Ich begrüße Herrn Kommissar Sinkevičius zu dieser Fragestunde.

Das Thema dieser Fragestunde lautet: Ehrgeizigere Ziele der EU im Bereich der biologischen Vielfalt im Vorfeld der COP 15.

Die Fragestunde wird etwa 90 Minuten dauern. Die Fragen werden nicht einzelnen Mitgliedern im Voraus zugewiesen. Die Redezeiten sind: eine Minute, um eine Frage zu stellen, zwei Minuten für die Antwort, 30 Sekunden für eine Zusatzfrage und zwei Minuten für die Antwort.

Ich weise Sie darauf hin, dass eine mögliche Zusatzfrage nur dann zulässig ist, wenn sie in einem engen Zusammenhang mit der Hauptfrage steht und keine neue Frage enthält.

Wenn Sie eine Frage stellen möchten, ersuche ich Sie, Ihren Antrag jetzt zu registrieren, indem Sie die Funktion Ihres Abstimmungsgeräts für spontane Wortmeldungen nutzen, nachdem Sie Ihre Stimmkarte eingeschoben haben.

Entsprechende Anleitungen sind im Plenarsaal verfügbar.

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

Während der Fragestunde erfolgen Wortmeldungen von Ihrem Sitzplatz aus. Ich ersuche alle Redner, die ihnen zugewiesene Redezeit einzuhalten.

Die Kolleginnen und Kollegen benötigen möglicherweise einige Augenblicke, um ihren Antrag, eine Frage zu stellen, über ihr Abstimmungsgerät zu registrieren. Daher ersuche ich Sie erneut, Ihren Antrag jetzt zu stellen.

Alexander Bernhuber (PPE). – Herr Kommissar! Herzlichen Dank, dass wir hier so schnell zu Wort kommen dürfen. Die Biodiversität ist eine allumfassende Krise. Ich finde es gut, dass wir uns hier beraten, und ich finde es sehr gut, dass wir sehr ehrgeizige Ziele auf europäischer Ebene umsetzen.

Meine Frage ist aber: Wie können wir dazu beitragen, die Biodiversitätskrise auch in anderen Teilen der Welt sichtbar zu machen? Welche konkreten Schritte setzen Sie als Kommissar in diesem Bereich, um hier wirklich Aufmerksamkeit zu schaffen und Biodiversität auch wirklich nicht nur in Europa zu fördern, sondern auch in anderen Teilen dieser Welt?

Denn ich gehe schon stark davon aus, dass wir, wenn wir alle unsere Ziele des *Green Deals* umsetzen, trotzdem noch Versorgungssicherheit mit Lebensmitteln gewähren wollen. Wie gehen Sie davon aus, dass nicht Teile der Produktion in anderen Teilen der Welt unter schlechteren Bedingungen stattfinden und die Umwelt in anderen Teilen der Welt mehr zerstören? Das ist eine ganz konkrete Frage.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you very much for your question and of course, thank you very much to all Members of this Parliament for putting this question, this important question, on the agenda as we are heading towards COP15. Finally, the date and the place is clear.

So of course, for us to have an ambitious outcome, we need to be united and also lead by example. So the first part of my answer to you is that we have strong legislation here in the EU with the biodiversity strategy, now also with the nature restoration legislation and other pieces of legislation, which allows us to lead the way.

Secondly, I think what's extremely important is to seek an agreement which would be a landing zone for all regions around the globe, finding a perfect match between an ambition but also realistically what can be implemented and also, of course, funded.

Last but not least, I'm very thankful that you have mentioned the food security issue there, because exactly due to biodiversity loss, exactly due to ecosystem degradation, this is the biggest threat to our food security and I think this has to be addressed immediately. One of the steps forward is, of course, nature restoration legislation, which on one hand does not maybe directly produce the crops and yields, but on the other hand plays a vital role to ensure food security in the long term for our people. The same goes for other regions.

So I think this food insecurity which is now very much at the centre of attention, caused by Russian war crimes and even a bigger war crime is committed when the Port of Odessa is blocked, must be also one of the topics that should be mentioned in COP15 and especially the biodiversity's and ecosystem's importance for food production.

Alexander Bernhuber (PPE). – Mr President, first of all, I want to mention the sound of the Commission is very low, so maybe the technicians can increase the sound a bit.

My further question would be, do you think that with regard to the COP15 resolution, can there be really part of food security, and also with the context of the war in Ukraine and with the changes of delivery of wheat to North Africa – what is your expectation on this topic?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – At the moment, it does not have a mention, and of course, knowing the dynamic of the COP and the UN, that might be challenging. But I think what's extremely important is that we keep it in mind and we know what is the issue.

As I said, you know, the issue as regards the Odessa port blocking is, first of all, a war crime. Secondly, it is a logistical issue. But then, when we see the situation also here in the EU, our farmers already lose every year more than EUR 1 billion in crop yields just because of biodiversity loss. The same applies to other parts of the world.

I think that's inevitably going to be underpinning and therefore I think it's going to be inevitably applied. And I think, you know, when we look at developing countries, we see that there is an urgent need to help them, but to help them not only with development funding, but also ensuring that they have the environment which can produce.

César Luena (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, los resultados que hemos tenido en Ginebra, en Nairobi, no son muy halagüeños. Y las expectativas, que realmente fueron frustradas, de las metas de Aichi, pues tampoco deben ser el ejemplo. Entonces, mi pregunta es: ¿usted cree que tenemos que tener un acuerdo, pero que sea vinculante como lo es, en relación con el clima, el Acuerdo de París? Un acuerdo vinculante significa que tiene que tener metas e indicadores específicos, un plazo de cumplimiento, un mecanismo de implementación, un mecanismo de revisión.

Por otro lado, en relación con los objetivos —le hablo de los objetivos tanto de recuperación como de protección, de los dos—, ¿no cree usted que es el momento de aumentarlos al 30 %? Es decir, las expectativas son muy altas y necesitamos que la Comisión Europea, que representa ahí a la Unión Europea, sea muy ambiciosa en objetivos y en que el acuerdo sea vinculante, como el Acuerdo de París lo es para el clima.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you very much for your question and for the very clearly expressed ambition, but I think we have to be realistic on the ambitious targets that we set.

There's nothing wrong with being realistic, because, looking back, we have failed to implement the targets before. And every time we return, we return with new targets. And of course, I'm happy to do so. But I think there is a clock ticking and asking for urgent implementation. So I think the 30x30 target which is proposed, which is there, is enough. Because if you look back at the Aichi targets, they are still relevant and they are not implemented.

Secondly, what we have to have, in order to successfully implement it, is a monitoring framework review clause, which would allow us a successful implementation.

Last but not least, when we speak about the Paris moment for biodiversity and the environment, what we want to do with the COP, and when you mentioned at the beginning that the rounds in Geneva and Nairobi didn't bring the result that we expected, you're absolutely right. I think there are many reasons for that. But one of the key reasons was, of course, that COP15 was constantly postponed and, of course, it didn't get the political momentum that it should have. So hopefully now, when we have clarity, that will pick up pace.

I think if you compare the Nairobi round and the Geneva round, there was already progress. Yes, that progress is still in brackets. And we will have to do a lot of work to take it from brackets and make it an agreement, because we have to be also, you know, very clear here that there is no broad agreement between countries, and that will require a huge effort negotiating even 30x30 targets, and then, at the end of the day, it's implementation. But I am optimistic. I think the EU has the credibility to talk and to lead. We managed not only to already have a significant increase on biodiversity funding, but also we have very ambitious domestic legislation, which has been proven to be working.

César Luena (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, me alegra escucharle con esa pasión y esa fuerza. Este Parlamento le va a acompañar en Montreal con esas ambiciones y con esas metas, pero también con otras expectativas. Y le hablo de algo que es muy importante: hace falta inversión para proteger y para recuperar la biodiversidad —según algunos expertos, hasta 700 000 millones de dólares—, pero tan importante es poner como quitar. Y aquellas subvenciones, aquellos subsidios que perjudican a la naturaleza —lo hemos pedido en este Parlamento reiteradas veces— hay que eliminarlos. Hay que invertir donde hay que invertir y retirar aquello que perjudica a la naturaleza.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Absolutely. I think when we speak about any agreement, funding we know is going to be a complicated part, especially when we talk about biodiversity.

Remember the Paris Agreement? For Paris to become a reality there was a Copenhagen before, where actually the number on funding was finally met and then it sort of started a true dialogue towards an ambition. We don't have that time for COP15. We all have to become a bit more, let's say, pragmatic and realistic about what can be put on the table. Because when I also hear calls for a EUR 100 billion per year from the current EUR 6 billion, we understand that it's unrealistic – although, you know, creating additional funding, additional funds and so on, we are ready to explore those opportunities. We are ready to have a look how they're going to work.

We as the EU, and President von der Leyen, have very clearly showed our leadership already in doubling our funding for biodiversity from EUR 3.5 billion to EUR 7 billion. I hope – and I'm working together with colleagues especially in the high ambition coalition – that others will follow. But I think here, in order to really have as much as possible funding available, we also need to look at other sources, at private funds, where we can get additional support to increase that number as much as possible.

That will require lots of creativity. That will require additional solutions. As I said, we are ready to explore those options, but nevertheless we have to be realistic as to what it is possible to allocate. Now I fully agree with you as regards the harmful subsidies. I think some progress has been reached and the question is becoming a centre of attention. Here within the EU we also need to fully implement the 'do no significant harm' principle – and especially now when we are in the middle of a transition where Member States are going to be using funds as regards the post-COVID restoration, as regards the war in Ukraine and so on. So it is extremely important that those funds would be used without doing harm to our environment, to our climate targets.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani povjereniče, klima se mijenja. Ne treba biti nikakav genijalac za to ustvrditi, ali ono što mislim da trebamo znati je činjenica da taj utjecaj klime ima utjecaj i na različite temeljne resurse.

Temeljni resursi jesu zrak, da, jest zemlja, ali za nas koji živimo na Mediteranu, to je apsolutno i voda odnosno more. Iz tog razloga ja imam *feeling* da smo mi malo manje koncentrirani na more, a malo više na onečišćenje u zraku i zemlji i želim da se to ispravi.

Iz tog razloga, a s obzirom da vidimo da se mijenja bioraznolikost u moru, posebice u Jadranskom moru, dolaze nove vrste riba i tako dalje i tako dalje... Pitam vas, da li je Komisija toga svjesna i što će Komisija učiniti da se taj problem riješi? I to hitno.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – First of all, there is no chance that we can succeed in the fight against climate change or halting biodiversity loss without the oceans playing a vital role, oceans, of course, including the sea basins that we all know best. And here, I think, speaking against the background of the Ocean Conference in Lisbon, we can clearly say that this year we need to use, as much as is possible, to actually put the ocean nexus into the final documents of COP15.

It must be also a clear visibility at COP in Sharm el-Sheikh, too, because without healthy oceans, without their mitigation functions, without absorption of CO₂, we won't be able to fight climate change. And you are absolutely right. Climate change is already putting huge pressure on our oceans and we see this with very quickly changing ecosystems, biodiversity, within our oceans.

Another thing which I think is going to be an important step on the way to Montreal is negotiations on so-called BBNJ – beyond national jurisdictions – on the protection of the high seas. That can give a great booster towards the meeting in Montreal in finding an agreement on protection of the high seas and having clear rules there. So I hope that we will be able in August to have a final meeting in New York to close these negotiations. That would be a big step further as regards our oceans' protection.

The final thing is, of course, we also have to look and protect marine resources better in our seas. I think what's very important is to step up the implementation of marine protected areas. So far we've seen significant steps done by some Member States and we just had a huge announcement of the largest marine protected area, but still, it's not enough. We need to do more. We need to be aiming at and reaching our 30% goal that we have in our biodiversity strategy. And of course, the Member States will have to step up their efforts.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, drago mi je da sve to čujem, drago mi je da vidim da postoji strategija, da postoji dobra volja.

Ono što bih vas ja htio zamoliti jesu vrlo konkretni operativni planovi. Siguran sam da ćete u tome imati pomoć, partnerstvo, sinergiju gradova, općina, županija, država, različitih centara za istraživanje mora. I onda na temelju struke, na temelju svih njih i zajedničkog promišljanja da idemo zajedno napraviti vrlo konkretne projekte: od ovih o kojima vi govorite, dizanja mora pa do zaštite različitih onečišćenja.

Radujem se takvim projektima i vjerujte da su oni nužni, potrebni i hitni.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – I always say that in order to fight issues like climate change or biodiversity loss or pollution, they respect no borders. Of course we have to cooperate transboundary, but also at the regional level because, at the end of the day, implementation comes to the regional level.

Especially when we speak about our sea basins, about our seas, we know how our regions are heavily dependent on activities. COVID, unfortunately, very clearly exposed that our coastal regions are mainly dependent on two activities: fisheries and tourism. We know that with ecosystem decline at the rate that we have, the places where eutrophication is taking place and dead zones are forming there will be neither fisheries or tourism.

So of course we have to deploy all the possible efforts. We are already working very closely as regards the fisheries management with the regional fisheries management organisations, which helps us to get the specifics and, of course, successfully address them. I am sure that also with the deployment of funds as regards the cohesion funds or fisheries fund, we can also engage even closer with the regions, with the coastal communities, because at the end of the day we are speaking here about their social and economic well-being, which is unfortunately with the declining of our ocean ecosystems might be severely impacted as well.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, εξαιτίας της κλιματικής αλλαγής, ανθρώπινης αμέλειας και κάποιων σημαντικών ατυχημάτων, οι πυρκαγιές έχουν ήδη ξεσπάσει στη Μεσόγειο και ειδικά στη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, η οποία τις τελευταίες μέρες αντιμετωπίζει σοβαρό πρόβλημα.

Το πρώτο μου ερώτημα αφορά στο εάν προτίθεστε ενόψει και της COP15 να ζητήσετε από την Επιτροπή να προχωρήσει στη θεσμοθέτηση εξειδικευμένων μέτρων που αφορούν στην αποκατάσταση της βιοποικιλότητας στις περιοχές που καίγονται, και μέσω της ανταλλαγής τεχνογνωσίας μέσα από ειδική πλατφόρμα, και πέρα από τον σχεδιασμό από τα κράτη μέλη ειδικών προγραμμάτων για την αποκατάσταση τέτοιου είδους βιοποικιλότητας.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you very much for your question. So you're absolutely right. We already see that this summer, the beginning of the summer is very hot. We had heat waves in the regions and of course, early forest fires in some parts of Europe, particularly in Greece. I would say that we were prepared as much as possible and rescue deployed its capacities around Europe, especially around those regions where the forest fires are most likely. I think, you know, Greece and I visited myself places which were severely impacted by the forest fires have huge experience in managing the forests and then restoring it's, of course, unique ecosystems. I think what's extremely important, I'm sure, and we always find the capacities to rebuild. But of course we have to realise that for ecosystems the investment and our efforts to rebuild is relevant. But most importantly that it takes years to replenish. So, therefore, we have to deploy all possible efforts to prevent forest fires from happening as much as it's possible, deploying all the possibilities of monitoring and so on, ensuring that the least possible amount of land is affected.

And therefore, I think that's where we should put all the possible effort. And it's not only in regards to the COP15, I think we as Europeans and citizens of Europe, we value every piece of our land, and especially forests which bring so much into our lives, which are our lungs and our support system. So, of course, we have to be prepared and ensure that we do not lose them in the first place.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Sinkevičius, έχετε επισκεφθεί τις πληγείσες περιοχές από τις πυρκαγιές στην πατρίδα μου, την Ελλάδα, και γνωρίζετε ότι ένα από τα είδη που έχει πληγεί από τις πυρκαγιές αυτές είναι οι επικονιαστές, και συγκεκριμένα οι μέλισσες. Εφόσον το έχετε αυτό υπόψη σας, θα ήθελα να γνωρίζω εάν η Επιτροπή προτίθεται, ειδικά για τις περιοχές που υφίστανται φυσικές καταστροφές εξαιτίας της κλιματικής αλλαγής, να προχωρήσει σε μέτρα στήριξης των προσπαθειών των καλλιεργητών εκεί, και λόγω της επείγουσας ανάγκης οι άνθρωποι να μείνουν στον τόπο τους.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Absolutely, pollinators are a crucial part of our ecosystem, and we are seeing a steep decline in pollinators, especially wild pollinators, in our nature.

Therefore, in nature restoration legislation, as a specific target, we actually have a target on pollinators, ensuring that they do not decline and instead reach a positive status.

Secondly, when we speak about pollination and so on, I think it must be addressed not only from an environmental point of view, but also from our CAP and agriculture. I think we know that it is not only forest fires, which destroys forests, destroys pollinators, but there are other pressing chemical uses and so on that also do harm to the population of pollinators, which also have to be addressed. So I truly hope that, with the implementation of nature restoration legislation, Member States will have two years to prepare their plans, and within those plans, we will see a prominent role for protecting and ensuring the protection of pollinators.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Herr Kommissar! Sie haben es ja in einigen Antworten anklingen lassen: Die Hausaufgaben für die COP 15 machen wir ja nicht erst in der Woche der Vorbereitung, sondern die machen wir jeden Tag hier im Parlament, Sie in der Kommission. Und ein Meilenstein, mit dem wir anreisen werden auf die COP, ist das EU-Entwaldungsgesetz.

Ich hätte dazu eine Nachfrage, weil wir ja doch mit Erstaunen gesehen haben, dass einige der Produkte, die nachweislich zur Entwaldung beitragen, wie auch Ihre eigene *Impact-Assessment-Studie* deutlich macht – Mais und Kautschuk in dem Fall –, momentan nicht von dieser Verordnung abgedeckt werden. Wie begründen Sie das und welche Rolle spielt da zum Beispiel die Automobilindustrie?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you very much for your question. So our proposal was based on an impact assessment, and it addressed the six commodities that have the biggest impact currently on deforestation.

We account that in our impact assessment these six commodities are responsible for 80% to 85% of deforestation globally. So of course we wanted to ensure addressing the biggest part, let's say, of deforestation, but we also have included a very clear review clause which will allow market monitoring. If we see that certain product groups or deprived products or commodities are responsible for deforestation and that number is increasing, we would, of course, be able to include it into our legislation.

The work is now, of course, within co-legislators. We have a Council opinion and Parliament will be soon voting on their opinion and then we will have three trilogues where I think also these questions can be addressed. I think at the end of the day, what's most important is not the long list of commodities – even though I think that including two additional commodities can be an important step forward – but it's implementation on the ground. We have to ensure that we learn the past lessons, lessons which showed that very often coming out with a very ambitious proposal and really good aims, we ended up with no implementation and unfortunately seeing the catastrophic numbers, with every year a larger and larger area being destroyed due to deforestation.

So I think what's most important is the implementation on the ground, working mechanisms across the value chain, ensuring that our proposal is actually the largest nature protection act, which is what we want.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Ja, da kann ich sehr gut anschließen, denn gerade bei Kautschuk wissen wir, dass es für Indonesien eine sehr große Herausforderung ist bei der Waldzerstörung. Dementsprechend wäre es gut, dort auch kollektional auf die COP blickend genauer hinzuschauen.

Aber Sie sprechen mit Ihrer Antwort auch ein wichtiges Problem an, nämlich die Frage des Monitorings, der Implementierung von unseren ambitionierten Zielen, die wir ja nicht nur im Entwaldungsgesetz haben, sondern auch im *Nature Restoration Law*.

Genau da schließt die Frage an: Wie kriegen wir es denn hin, dass die Ziele, die wir uns setzen, besser implementiert werden, dass das Monitoring besser wird? Was plant die Kommission, um da aus Versäumnissen der Vergangenheit auch zu lernen?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you very much for your question. So absolutely. That's what I probably meant by saying that implementation is crucial. So, of course, traceability and monitoring, verification of data that is received based on geolocation data at the source by operators is crucial to have. Then we can ensure that our legislation reaches its aims and we have approved data that can prove the origin of the commodity rather than, you know, we know that very often through the value chains, the product can travel through a few countries. And then we do not receive accurate data and might be misled and that would leave a major loophole. So we have to ensure that, of course, the monitoring framework is strong ensuring that the implementation is fully deployed.

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, il y a deux semaines, la Commission européenne a proposé des mesures législatives ambitieuses de restauration des écosystèmes et de réduction des pesticides. C'est un signal fort envoyé avant la COP 15. La surpêche est aujourd'hui le premier facteur du déclin de la biodiversité marine. Le plan d'action sur la protection des ressources halieutiques et de la biodiversité marine doit donc jouer un rôle crucial pour protéger et restaurer les écosystèmes marins. Sa publication a pourtant de nouveau été reportée.

Cela aura-t-il des conséquences sur son ambition? Comment la Commission européenne va-t-elle s'assurer que les aires marines protégées soient vraiment protégées en y interdisant enfin les activités extractives industrielles comme les forages en mer, l'extraction minière et les techniques de pêche qui ont le plus d'impact sur les fonds marins? Comment la Commission européenne entend-elle mettre fin à la surpêche en dehors des aires marines protégées? Et quelle sera l'articulation entre la loi sur la restauration de la nature et la politique commune de la pêche, notamment en ce qui concerne les mesures de restauration qui ont jusque-là échoué à être mises en œuvre dans le cadre de la politique commune de la pêche?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you very much for your question. So, as regards the marine resources protection, we are working on the plan, which will be finalised this year, as regards the marine resources protection action plan.

Then, as regards fisheries activities, of course, our CFP has to play a crucial role, but not only CFP, also our fisheries fund, which is actually aimed at investing into more sustainable fisheries practices, helping our fishermen to transition.

Secondly, I think that what's extremely important when we talk about deep-sea mining is that we cannot rush. We cannot rush things here, and we have to ensure that we have a proper impact assessment of what such activities would have as regards the sea's ecosystems and environment in general. Only by having these results could we advance. But I am already really happy about the calls of the European leaders at the Lisbon Ocean Conference for actually halting such activities, which I think, especially as regards when we speak about the MPAs, is a crucial element. So I think there is a lot of work to be done as regards stepping up, the protection of the MPAs. We should not forget the principle of, of course, how the MPA is done, and there is always research and evidence behind the MPA into what is protected and what is aimed to be protected. But clearly, I think it has to address, first of all, the seabed, which is crucial for a thriving ecosystem.

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, certaines mesures sont demandées par les pêcheurs eux-mêmes. Par exemple, les pêcheurs du nord de la France demandent avec insistance un moratoire sur l'utilisation de la senne danoise, notamment dans la Manche. Seriez-vous prêt à soutenir cette demande?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – I think it's not mentioning and highlighting any Member State, because I think what's extremely important is ensuring a level playing field to our fishermen and that the rules should be applicable across the board. Only then can we advance with the implementation and ensure that our fishermen and women, first of all, by doing their activities, will respect the rules. So a level playing field is, of course, crucial here.

Karolin Braunsberger-Reinhold (PPE). – Herr Kommissar! Gebiete, die unter Naturschutz stehen, gerade im europäischen Raum, sind oft festgelegt auf genau den Moment, in dem sie unter Naturschutz gestellt wurden. Das betrifft zum Beispiel Natura 2000. Aufgrund geänderter Klimabedingungen haben sich allerdings in den letzten Jahren und auch Jahrzehnten diese Lebensräume teilweise geändert. Gefördert, gerade im finanziellen Bereich, werden allerdings nur Maßnahmen – Erhaltungsmaßnahmen und Entwicklungsmaßnahmen –, die sich auf den ursprünglichen, damals festgelegten Naturzustand beziehen.

So werden zum Beispiel Bäume und Sträucher mit Fördermitteln gepflanzt, die nicht mehr ins Gebiet passen, weil sich dieses Gebiet eben geändert hat. Es werden teilweise Tiere zwangsangesiedelt, die schon längst woanders Lebensraum gefunden haben und in dieses Gebiet gar nicht mehr passen. Alle Beteiligten wissen im Endeffekt – das haben sie mir auch mitgeteilt –, dass die Maßnahmen, die sie mit europäischen Fördermitteln durchführen, nicht zweckführend und auch nicht zielführend sind.

Warum findet da keine Anpassung statt? Warum pumpen wir also finanzielle Fördermittel in Gebiete, die wir durch andere Maßnahmen wirklich unterstützen und entwickeln könnten? Und warum können wir die Richtlinien in dem Fall nicht anpassen?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for your question. First of all, it's our responsibility what is planted and what management plans are prepared, especially for Natura 2000 areas.

Usually for Natura 2000 areas that's extraordinary cases, but we see this trend more dangerous outside Natura 2000 areas.

I think one of the major aims of our 3 Billion Trees initiative is not only to plant the 3 billion additional trees in Europe, but it's actually education – education that there must be a right tree at the right place planted, which would be resilient to future shocks, because we have a very diverse ecosystem across Europe, north and south, different geographical locations, and we've seen the mistakes done in the past where species that were planted unfortunately today have proved one of the major impacts on forest fires as well in some regions. So of course we have to avoid such mistakes.

We have to also educate people who really passionately takes the duty of planting more trees. But, as you said, we need to build the forest of the future. So through the 3 Billion Trees initiative that can be addressed.

As regards the Natura 2000 areas, these have to have solid management plan, and within those plans, of course, such questions also must be addressed.

Karolin Braunsberger-Reinhold (PPE). – Nur die Nachfrage: Wir wissen ja, welche Bäume wir in unseren Gebieten pflanzen können. Wir dürfen sie aber nicht pflanzen, weil sie nicht finanziell durch die EU unterstützt werden, eben aufgrund dessen, dass quasi der alte Erhaltungszustand wiederhergestellt werden muss. Und das ist die Problematik, die geändert werden müsste. Also: Wir wollen. Wir wissen, was. Wir dürfen aber nicht, weil es finanziell nicht gefördert wird.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, so speaking about the funding, of course we have a LIFE fund which could be helpful, which is our environment fund. Even so, it's a very little fund.

Secondly, I think what's very important when we speak about natural areas, about the management and so on, that also should be a part of the Member States' recovery and resilience funding, which can be addressed through those funds. Some Member States actually took that into account and of course, I hope that is going to be implemented.

Aurélia Beigneux (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, la préservation de la biodiversité est primordiale, tant pour lutter contre le réchauffement climatique que pour la sauvegarde des espèces animales. Vous affirmez vouloir préserver notre biodiversité. Soit. Toutefois, votre hypocrisie naturelle revient au galop lorsqu'il s'agit de signer des traités de libre-échange avec le monde entier. Le dernier exemple en date est celui conclu le 30 juin avec la Nouvelle-Zélande.

Saviez-vous qu'un aller-retour en avion entre Auckland et Paris pollue plus qu'un ménage européen en un an? Pensez-vous vraiment que les super-cargos qui parcourent nos océans ne détruisent pas notre biodiversité marine?

Vous mentez aux Européens, car tous les efforts que nos concitoyens fournissent pour lutter contre le réchauffement climatique sont réduits à néant par les effets pervers de votre politique économique désastreuse. Ce modèle détruit notre biodiversité et fait disparaître les espèces animales et végétales. Alors oui, pour relever le défi de la COP 15, il va vous falloir abandonner cette mondialisation outrageuse et intensifier la recherche scientifique.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for your remarks. I can only say that, absolutely, our trade agreements overall, our policies when it comes to environmental protection or the fight against climate change, has to be horizontal and of course, has to intake our Green Deal policies. Otherwise, it's going to be extremely difficult to implement the Green Deal if we will see the Green Deal or the environmental policies such as nature restoration legislation or others as some nature beauty legislation, that's not the case. So, absolutely that also has to be addressed in the economic activities. And trade agreements can be an excellent tool which can successfully export our Green Deal to other regions. That would, of course, ensure also a level playing field. So I think there is still a lot to be done in the future as regards to looking at the trade agreements and introducing the Green Deal component into our trade deal agreements.

Aurélia Beigneux (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous trouvez donc que la religion du libre-échange est bien au-dessus de l'environnement dans l'échelle des valeurs des fonctionnaires européens. Pouvez-vous nous promettre qu'aucun autre traité de libre-échange ne sera signé? Sinon, je vous encourage vivement à écouter la majorité des citoyens qui en ont plus que marre de la politique schizophrène menée par ce Parlement.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – I can only say that we always listen to the majority of citizens and I'm extremely happy to see huge involvement into our policies from citizens. Every policy or proposal that had a large amount of citizens' signatures behind it usually went through this House also extremely successfully. So we always call for citizens' involvement and very carefully listen to their voice.

The European Green Deal was actually a result, and one of the first proposals – actually the first – of this Commission very carefully listening to what our citizens want. So I am sure we will continue to do so, matching the differences that we have between our regions, between the Member States and between the Members of this Parliament.

Silvia Modig (The Left). – Mr President, biodiversity, of course, has an absolute value in itself, but it's also a crucial part in our fight against climate change. The stronger the biodiversity is, the better is our planet's resilience ahead of the inevitable warming we are heading to. That is why we need a strong international agreement. I refuse to accept that the momentum has gone due to these postponements. I think if it is gone, then we have to regain it, and I think that the EU is a key player here.

So, Mr Sinkevičius, how do we do that? I think that, first of all, we have to put our own house in order – and we are not quite there yet – and then we have to have real ambition. You were talking about the finance earlier, and I really didn't get exactly your position. What is the Commission's position on the Global South demand, which I think is very reasoned and very sound? What is the Commission's position exactly on the Global South demand to get international finance, because they need the finance as otherwise they will not meet the targets.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you for your very concrete question. Don't get me wrong, the momentum is actually just arrived, I would say, and that will pick up with the clear date and place of COP15 happening due to postponement of the event. I think that's why the momentum wasn't there. Now it's there for sure. What can we do? I think, first of all, of course, President von der Leyen made a huge step when she announced the doubling of our resources for biodiversity outside the EU. Doubling it from three and a half billion to 7 billion. We, of course, need to get everyone else on board as well, especially here I am speaking about the G20 countries. They also have to increase and chip in to have as large as possible amount. Secondly, there are different ideas floating. I fully agree with you that demands from Global South are based on their needs. But we also have to see what is the reality to get this money actually on the table. Not to create fake expectations and not to over promise what actually have been done before and then that failed to reach the goal.

So my first aim is to raise as many funds as possible. Use the resources that are not only international development funds, but also private funds, philanthropies etc., which also can play a crucial role. And then try to use that amount as efficiently as possible. Finding the possible agreement with the Global South. Their demands also have to be realistic. Creating additional funds, raising 800 billion per year, that's going to be extremely difficult in this very short time. We can look at the timeline. We should see what is going to be realistic. But also we cannot only focus on funds because with funds obligations and implementation must also come. And it has to be very clear. And so far, I don't really see it happening as well. Well, all the goals are still in brackets.

Silvia Modig (The Left). – Thank you, Commissioner Sinkevičius. And what about the measurable targets? Because we need an agreement with measurable targets. How will we bind the finance to the measurable targets? Because as we have failed completely in our 2020 targets, so have all the countries I know, including my own, has failed their biodiversity targets for 2020. So, we don't have a very strong reference there to give us guidance. So, how to bind the finance to measurable targets so that you get finance when you proceed, because that would probably be the only way to get this part of the country, Europe, to do its part as well.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – So the measurable targets are probably the crucial part. First of all, of course, the overarching target ‘30 by 30’ is the fundamental one. Secondly is, of course, we want to have a measurable target on nature restoration, also the same as we just proposed within the EU of 20%, most likely 10% for the oceans, 10% for terrestrial areas. And then, of course, looking at direct and indirect drivers of ecosystem loss, addressing them within the targets and then not only having those measurable targets, but also very clear milestones, how we reach those targets, having a very clear review mechanism, returning back every two years to the target and see are we able to reach that first, second or third step towards the ‘30 for 30’ target, how the implementation is done and what measures are deployed in one or the other ecosystem.

As I said, a lot can be done not only within the COP 15. We have already some very strong proposals on the table as regards the marine resources, as regards our oceans, so if we are able to agree on rules beyond national jurisdiction and protect the high seas, which was mapped by scientists as the rules that requires and could be protected. Secondly, of course, we have our proposal as regards the ocean around Antarctica that would protect 1% of the world’s ocean.

So there are already even clear proposals on the table which we could be advancing with. And I think that would be the best way to go forward: measurable and concrete. And for that, of course, we could do our utmost to raise the fund.

There is another idea, you know, returning to funding coming from Colombia as regards the working project where we would have additional fund and then certain projects implemented from that fund, that is also measurable and implemented on the ground, which could be considered.

Catherine Chabaud (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, comme cela a été largement évoqué la semaine dernière à Lisbonne au sommet des Nations unies sur l’océan, l’océan se trouve dans une situation d’urgence absolue du fait du réchauffement climatique, des pollutions et de nos activités. Comme le rappelle la mission Starfish que vous avez lancée, nous devons impérativement non seulement protéger, mais aussi régénérer nos mers, nos rivières et l’océan si nous voulons continuer à équilibrer le climat, à réduire l’immersion côtière et à nourrir les populations.

L’océan est dans une urgence absolue et malgré tout, j’ai été dans l’incapacité de proposer une résolution au Parlement européen cette semaine. Je la repropose au mois de septembre.

Pour autant, je voudrais saisir l’opportunité de cet échange parce que les Nations unies, comme vous l’avez rappelé, vont prendre des décisions absolument majeures sur plusieurs négociations d’ici la fin de l’année, et même avant la COP15. L’Union européenne joue un rôle fondamental dans ces négociations et je tiens à saluer, Monsieur le Commissaire, l’engagement de la Commission et de vos équipes, que je soutiens. Je voudrais vous dire mon soutien, mais aussi vous poser une première question dans le cadre de la négociation sur la préservation de la biodiversité en haute mer. Est-ce qu’à Lisbonne, vous avez pu avancer sur la...

(Le Président retire la parole à l’oratrice)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – First of all, thank you for your leadership as regards the oceans and their protection. Of course, it was great to meet such a large group of European parliamentarians in Lisbon, which clearly showed that international ocean governance is a key question for the European Union.

Now, as regards the progress made in Lisbon, I have had numerous meetings with my counterparts discussing the possibilities and the outcome of the BBNJ agreement and the meeting in New York. But, as always in negotiations, everything will be done at the very last moment and to say we have made progress or not, is very hard. I hope that we are very close. But even our closest allies have to make a step towards a middle ground in order for us to advance. I think that would be an historic step, which we have to deploy all the possibilities, all the efforts, all the pressures in order to get it done.

So my team is currently focusing mainly on the August meeting. We are reaching out to stakeholders. We welcomed additional countries in our high ambition coalition. Hopefully all these efforts are going to help. But, as I said, you know, it’s extremely hard to predict the outcome of the negotiations.

I was going to the WTO negotiations with a good mood, and thought that we had a deal in sight. Then it took two additional days and nights to get at least a partial deal. So I won't estimate what I think we should deploy all the possible efforts and then of course ensure that it's really, really happening. I think that can have a fundamental role than going to Montreal and COP.

Catherine Chabaud (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, deux autres questions concernant l'agenda climat.

La première: l'Union européenne va-t-elle rejoindre la coalition pour le carbone bleu et inscrire les écosystèmes du carbone bleu dans l'agenda climatique, dans les contributions déterminées des États membres?

Et deuxième question: à Lisbonne, la France s'est prononcée pour l'exploration, mais contre l'exploitation des grands fonds marins. Allez-vous appuyer cette position attendue pour engager d'autres États membres dans cette voie?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – So as regards the Blue Carbon Coalition, you know, EU usually supports the ambitious coalitions, coalitions which lead to example. I'm a bit afraid that after the COP in Glasgow there is more and more coalitions created. But as long as that leads to result and we not devalue the meanings of coalition and we really manage to get the countries, like-minded countries together to make a push, that's fine.

Now, as regards the announcement by the French President, I was of course extremely happy to hear it. And, of course, that depends on Member States if they will be able to join. But my call remains the same. We also put a very clear language into our nature restoration legislation that such activities can be only done when we have a clear scientific evidence, which means that at the moment they cannot be happening and deployed and, of course, I'm happy by President Macron's clear leadership here and a clear call for other Member States as well to join.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Tak fordi du er her, Kommissær Sinkevičius. Nu handler COP'en jo i høj grad om at blive enige om høje ambitioner, men den handler jo også om at række ud til hinanden med værktøjer og med initiativer. Og jeg kunne godt tænke mig at høre – for det har vi ikke snakket så meget om i den her debat: Hvad kommer EU-Kommissionen til at sende af signaler til forskere, til iværksættere og til investorer, om hvad det er for et fællesskab, hvad det er for et agilt samarbejde, som vi meget gerne vil have i EU, også med forskere og virksomheder, som inviterer nye løsninger – f.eks. biologiske løsninger som biologiske pesticider i stedet for kemiske pesticider, mere digitalisering – også af vores fødevarerproduktion, sådan at vi bliver bedre til at passe både på klimaet og på miljøet med indflydelse på biodiversiteten. Hvad bliver beskeden til de investorer og virksomheder, som vi simpelthen ikke har råd til at miste fra EU, så vi kan gøre den forskel for verden, som vi gerne vil.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – I mean, of course, I think our Green Deal policy through these two and a half years from the very beginning when it was adopted, then of course, we had we heard tries to shut down the Green Deal during COVID. We hear similar calls as regards Russia's war in Ukraine. But we kept on implementing the Green Deal. And the Green Deal proved to be the right direction. And I think this is a very clear signal to the market. I do not really think that the market needs additional calls to really see the way forward and where to deploy their capabilities, what decisions will be needed for us, for example, to transit, to fully decarbonise our economy. But then when you look at the opportunities and the funding opportunities, they are all there. First of all, our Horizon Europe programme, which very well funds the transition and so on, Member States deploying their research action to the green policies. So I think there are very clear opportunities for the market, for the private sector and I don't really think that it's going to be left behind. Left behind can be only those who didn't believe, didn't invest and then find themselves in a few years in a disadvantage position. But at the end of the day, I think all that demand is very much going to be created by the market. And when we speak about agricultural policy, transport, energy policies, we clearly see where the trend is going and where the biggest investments are being put. So there is no chance of implementing the Green Deal without solutions that are coming and going to come from the private sector. And most importantly, I truly count that our companies, those who, let's say, are early on this transition path, they will be able to reap the advantages and we will be the ones leading in this technological change, which will require an enormous amount of technology as regards the transition. But just to finalise – I'm very sorry I've gone over the time – but you know, I remember very well when we proposed our decarbonisation goals. There were just a few countries on board and now we have quite a club which formed. And that's also a very clear signal to companies that the market for clean technologies is there.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Jeg har det tillægsspørgsmål og den opfordring til kommissæren, at jeg synes, du skal forholde dig til, at man ude i markederne beder om, at der bliver lavet en et nyt kapitel i taksonomien for »enabling technologies«. Det mangler der! Det har vi ikke endnu. Jeg synes også, at du skal lytte til, at der fra rigtig mange stakeholdere bliver bedt om, at der bliver lavet nogle fast track-godkendelsesprocedurer i Kommissionen i forhold til de nye innovative løsninger, som ser anderledes ud end det, som jeres medarbejdere er vant til at se. Det fungerer ikke endnu, og det vil jeg gerne have et svar på, om du kan svare markedet på til COP-15?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you very much. I think that call was well addressed in REPowerEU as regards the clear need for deployment of renewable technologies and fast-track procedures. The proposal by the Commission is on the table and now I think it will be, of course, in the hands of the co-legislators. I hope for a swift adoption which will allow us, of course, a swift transition and faster permitting procedures for private investments.

Grace O’Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Good to see you here today, Commissioner. Look, it’s clear that environmentally harmful subsidies given by the EU are causing significant harm to biodiversity. So can you tell us, is the EU in the high ambition camp regarding commitments to phase out or reform environmentally harmful subsidies?

And related to this, is the Commission on track to produce a methodology to identify environmentally harmful subsidies by 2023, as we committed to in the eighth environmental action programme (8th EAP).

And then in terms of consumption: food production, consumption and overconsumption are having an impact on biodiversity. So what is the EU pushing for in relation to consumption footprint targets and when will the Commission introduce the EU 2030 reduction targets for consumption footprint, another commitment that was in the 8th EAP?

And lastly, in terms of political will: Commissioner, you’re going to the COP15 later in the year but I genuinely feel that we need to call for a legally binding agreement at that Conference because we’ve seen that we failed in the past in terms of biodiversity and monitoring isn’t enough. It has to be legally binding otherwise, as you know and I know, it won’t happen.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Thank you for your question. And again, thank you for your work on the ETAP, which I think we have achieved a great result.

So first of all on the first part on harmful subsidy, so the work is already ongoing and as it’s framed in the ETAP, we will propose it in 2023. We started, of course, with the stakeholder consultations and so we will move on, work with the Member States and then finalise the proposal in 2023.

As regards the footprint and reduction of waste, so of course one thing is our waste legislation. Secondly, our ecodesign sustainable product policy, which is really transformative legislation. And last but not least, of course, our proposal on food waste. These all will have a major impact on reduction of the footprint.

I think what’s very clear, of course, we have to implement the circular economy action plan. The circular economy action plan will help us to significantly reduce the footprint of our consumption, allowing, first of all, to take responsibility for the consumption patterns that we have here in the EU. But secondly, we also have to look at other legislation which can also significantly contribute. And of course, I count on Parliament’s support on the proposals that already are put on the table.

As regards the binding targets in COP 15, so first of all we have to agree on what those targets are. And then depending, I guess, on the outcome of negotiations, depending on the possibilities of funding, we can see what is there to be achieved. At the moment it doesn’t look like the binding targets would be accepted and approved, but we of course must work to ensure and find a way, let’s say, to ensure that what is going to be agreed is implemented. So that’s why the review clauses, the implementation review mechanism and monitoring mechanism can be those tools, and there are many reasons for that. It is not only – I am very sorry I am over the time – there are many reasons for that because for some countries to accept the binding targets is extremely difficult due to national rules, etc., so we also have to bear that in mind. Therefore, I think we have to put very clear and very strong implementation mechanisms.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – I know you are a man of ambition and I really do believe you should push for those binding targets. We have them in the climate law and, as I said, if we do not have them binding, they won't happen.

Lastly, on the environmentally harmful subsidies: maybe you could think of a hierarchy, once you identify the environmentally harmful subsidies, a hierarchy of the ones that would give us the greatest effect over the shortest period of time.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – You know, talking about the COP15 agreement, of course I hope and I count on support from Parliament as well and we will be getting that agreement and negotiating together.

Now as regards the harmful substances, I think one core element which we maybe didn't mention in our debate today is, of course, the 'do no significant harm' principle in our spending – as regards our funds, as regards our multiannual financial framework, as regards our other funds. If that is kept in line, I think that will already have a significant contribution, especially also looking at the recovery and resilience plans from the Member States, which have a very clear notion of 'do no significant harm', which was kept in the plans but of course, it's very important that it would be kept also in the implementation phase.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – I have a very brief question. If we look at the EPAs and the scientific community, they are very clear that 40% of the land and water area should be in a favourable state to support our ecosystems. If we look at that, what are your plans to proceed with this rewilding target in biodiversity of about 20%? Because there seems to be one half missing.

This leads to a second question. How are you going to push the higher ambition level internationally? I am not going to take the second question because I can very briefly add then, when we have the targets, what about using Copernicus and artificial intelligence better on supervision and make it more binding?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – So, first of all, I fully agree with you and now I think our nature restoration legislation is exactly addressing that we find in bad or poor quality around 81% of our ecosystems. So, of course, deploying for 20% nature restoration, just not to mix it with rewilding because it's not the same. Nature restoration efforts would of course, allow us to bring that back to around 40%. But of course, we want to go even beyond that; the 2030 and 20% target, this is what it is realistic to achieve. Even so, it's quite ambitious but further on we want, of course, to deploy nature restoration efforts on all ecosystems that are in bad or unfavourable status.

Now, when we speak, what we're able to do. So, first of all, of course, we need to lead by example. We need to prove that our legislation works. We need to use the High Ambition Coalition. During the Lisbon COP, we welcomed the 101st country to the High Ambition Coalition for Nature, which I think is a very positive step, which shows that there is a strong club of ambitious countries which clearly understand the need. We, of course, need to push, together with them, for an ambition which would be implementable, realistic, but yet would allow us to reach a common agreement.

Last but not least on artificial intelligence: I think this is very much an untapped potential, an area which I think can be very well addressed now, during the Czech Presidency, where the Czech Presidency of the Council put the digital and green transitions together, and I think in a very good way we can really rethink on where the digital solutions are going to be crucial to implement our Green Deal ambition. And very quickly, we will be able to see that without the digital solution, we cannot really advance much.

So far in speaking about the COP15 and its resolution, there is no mention of the use of artificial intelligence. But again, I think when it comes to implementation across the board, across the countries, it will be very vastly used.

Anja Hazekamp (The Left). – De Europese landbouw, met name de intensieve veehouderij, speelt een belangrijke rol bij het biodiversiteitsverlies. Decennialang is er gestuurd op groei en intensivering van de veehouderij door subsidies, door overheden, door banken.

Nederland is nu een van de landen die eindelijk inziet dat de hoeveelheid stikstof die in natuurgebieden terecht komt, drastisch moet verminderen. En dat betekent onherroepelijk ook dat het aantal dieren in de vee-industrie drastisch moet verminderen. Eindelijk, zou ik zeggen.

Minder dieren betekent ook minder mest en minder ammoniak. Maar dat leidt ook tot heftige protesten van boeren, die wegen blokkeren, ministers intimideren en zelfs natuurgebieden vernietigen. Wat zou uw boodschap zijn aan ministers die nu geconfronteerd worden met een verlies aan biodiversiteit, maar ook met boze boeren? Hoe leg je uit dat jarenlang een beleid van onverschilligheid niet langer houdbaar is? En hoe leg je uit dat uitstel geen optie is en dat onze planeet enkel een kans maakt als de doelen eindelijk gehaald worden?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Of course, when we see the current situation, it's very difficult, and I really appreciate the Dutch Government's efforts to deploy a plan with the funding to solve this issue.

But this issue aggravated, not yesterday and not even a year before, the implementation of the Nitrates Directive has been hanging there since around the 1960s. So the answer here is of course very simple, even so, that it is hardly applicable for today. But in order to be compliant with the EU rules, you had to take measures since the very beginning, and of course over time that wouldn't be so drastically painful. But unfortunately, when the measures were taken in the opposite direction, we find ourselves in a very difficult situation which will require now a significant investment from taxpayers' money to ensure that of course there is a full compliance with EU legislation.

Just this morning I was discussing with Spanish colleagues the situation in Mar Menor, in which a very dynamic, very touristy area became basically uninhabitable. This is what happens at the end of the day when you have a nutrient runoff.

So I think we have agreed a very clear plan with the Dutch Government of how to implement the legislation. Many Member States went through that and did the implementation, and I think we will find a way forward with the Dutch Government as well. It's very important that the funds that are allocated would be of course precisely used for those who will be affected most in that transition.

Anja Hazekamp (The Left). – Well I would prefer to give up my time for a second question. Maybe another MEP can ask a question.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Thank you very much for giving me your space. And I'll be very brief in trying to make the circle to come back to where we started, because the question was EU ambitions on biodiversity ahead of COP 15. And I think if we'll look at the restoration law which you presented last week, it is already quite good. But the crucial point is, what means of governance do we have? What means of actually enforcing what is there as an ambition? And it's a bit the same on the global level, whereas it is much easier within the European Union because there we have the structures where the Commission can actually tell Member States, well, if you do not abide by the law, then we might start writing letters and later infringement procedures, which is not possible on the global level.

So how do you think might the restoration law influence the negotiations at the COP 15? And especially, how can it be perceived in the Global South that the EU, or generally spoken the Global North, does not come forward as colonialist, telling the Global South how to act on biodiversity?

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – First of all, we all sitting at the same table, we all share the same urgency. Yes, there are different ideas of how to implement, what steps should be taken. But I think we are all sitting at the same table because we are talking about the biodiversity and ecosystem loss, which is a loss of our lifeline basically, of our health support system. So I think, you know, what's extremely important is, as I mentioned multiple times during my answers, is the framework of implementation of how to put the right mechanism into place to ensure that we can do checks and balances later on, that we can return and we can monitor what has been done and what has been achieved and what impact it had. That's not easy.

One of the ways could be through the funding mechanism, as I've mentioned, through the agreed possible fund per project, where that could be possibly achieved. Secondly, of course, monitoring can be done always returning back at the meetings, at the COP meetings, where we could evaluate the progress and then, of course, the reporting also has to be very clear. So it's not an easy way through that. But I think what's very important, first of all, is to reach the commitment of all, all sitting at that table and agreeing on the urgency. Then secondly, we have to meet that urgency with funding mechanisms which would allow us to then ensure the implementation of the proposed targets.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist die Fragestunde beendet.

Ich bitte auch um Verständnis. Wir haben für die Fragestunde 90 Minuten angesetzt. Die sind jetzt um. Wir wissen nicht, wie viele Zusatzfragen jeweils kommen. Wir versuchen, das auszubalancieren.

Ich will auch einmal sagen, dass wir dafür vereinbart haben, dass d'Hondt für die Fraktionen Anwendung findet und dass, wenn alle Fraktionen ihre Möglichkeiten ausgeschöpft hätten, die letzten zwei oder drei Redner beziehungsweise Fragesteller nicht zum Zuge gekommen wären.

Das heißt: Wir haben da schon ein Maß an Flexibilität, und jetzt sind auch schon wieder Leute weggegangen, die ich dann zuerst berücksichtigen sollte. Da habe ich vorhin meine Entscheidung getroffen und will sie auch nicht mehr ändern.

Damit ist die Fragestunde abgeschlossen.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

13. Oficjalne powitanie

Der Präsident. – Meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Bevor wir jetzt mit der Tagesordnung fortfahren, möchte ich sehr deutlich zum Ausdruck bringen, dass wir uns sehr geehrt fühlen, den Sprecher des jordanischen Repräsentantenhauses, seine Exzellenz Herrn Abdel-Karim Deghmi, und eine gemeinsame Delegation des jordanischen Senats und des jordanischen Repräsentantenhauses auf der Diplomatengalerie begrüßen zu dürfen. Herzlich willkommen im Europäischen Parlament!

(Beifall)

Die Delegation ist hier, um am 10. Interparlamentarischen Treffen EU-Jordanien mit der Delegation für die Beziehungen zu den Maschrik-Ländern teilzunehmen, das morgen Nachmittag um 15.30 Uhr stattfindet.

Nochmals herzlich willkommen und die besten Grüße des Europäischen Parlaments an die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Ihres Heimatlandes Jordanien!

14. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 111 ust. 3 Regulaminu: Zmiana aktu delegowanego w sprawie unijnej systematyki dotyczącej zmiany klimatu i aktu delegowanego w sprawie ujawniania informacji w tej dziedzinie (debata)

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zum nächsten Punkt der Tagesordnung, dem Einwand gemäß Artikel 111 Absatz 3 der Geschäftsordnung: Änderung des delegierten Rechtsakts zur Klimataxonomie und des delegierten Rechtsakts zur Offenlegung der Taxonomie (2022/2594(DEA)).

Ich darf zu dieser Aussprache auch die zuständige Kommissarin, Frau McGuinness, willkommen heißen.

Ich möchte Sie noch einmal daran erinnern, dass die gesamte Vorgangsweise bei dieser Aussprache so ist, wie wir das bei den letzten Tagesordnungspunkten gehandhabt haben. Ich brauche dies nicht zu wiederholen.

Bas Eickhout, author. – Mr President, it is good to kick off this discussion. Maybe just to start off with, where is the taxonomy for? The taxonomy is very clearly to harmonise claims by investor, what is a green and a sustainable investment. We're not talking about banning any investment. We are talking about what is a green investment, nothing more, nothing less than that.

Unfortunately, in the proposal, and we are having that discussion for a longer while already, you are green or you are not green. I know some are saying that there are different categories, but in the end – and that is now also very clear from any ongoing and follow up on any legislation, think for example of the green bonds – the moment you comply with the taxonomy and there is taxonomy alignment, then there is a green label and you are having a green bond. So there is no ‘amber’ category at all or whatsoever.

Secondly, on the process – and here the Parliament has been very clear – the Parliament has been sidelined in this process. When we had the first delegated acts, there was a very clear public consultation for weeks, and then it took months before that delegated act was being published. On this second complementary delegated act, there was no public consultation. The Member States were being asked to reply too, the Parliament was only unofficially invited, but there was no formal consultation and the Parliament can only say something now.

On the contents, on nuclear first of all, it's very controversial. Will any investor really step in because of a green label? Absolutely not, because an investor will need security from the government. This green label will not work and will not help. This is a pure political game by France. The criteria are written by France, for France. Even the Netherlands has said that the criteria they cannot comply with. This clearly shows that this is a political game by France only.

Then, on gas, first of all, we are making a separate category here for gas and having a higher emission threshold over other energy. Everyone who is claiming we need to be technology-neutral, why are we then having a separate category for gas and for the others you still have a threshold of over 100, whereas for gas it can be 270. This is not technology-neutral. And on top of that, we now have the war in Ukraine. How can we label gas green, and LNG terminals will not comply, but gas from Russia can? That is the opposite direction and we have to stop this idea. This is the moment to stop this delegated act.

Sirpa Pietikäinen, *author*. – Mr President, I'm very saddened to see the Commission take the role of being just a stepping stone for Council and Member States in this case. And this is not promising for the taxonomy and its future. What was negotiated in the first round and first level of regulation was that this was supposed to be the gold standard of what is green and to create a reliable, verifiable framework. That's why it is clearly written in the first level of regulation that it needs to be science-based.

And what the platform proposed was not this what the Commission is proposing. It says it needs to have ‘clear indicators’. Well, that can be doubted in this case. It says clearly it needs to be substantially better than the industry average, and that is the industry that we are talking about, substantially better than the nuclear in general. Substantially better than the gas in general. And it means that now when we look at the delegated acts, how can anyone say that if you have old-fashioned Russian nuclear reactors – where you have a plan for the waste treatment by 2040 — that is the best gold standard of the nuclear energy in the European global market. And the Parliament and the negotiating team was open to discuss this point, for example.

We might disagree or agree about what is the role of nuclear in the future, but if you include nuclear, it should have been that kind of a technology that has the plans already for the waste treatment. The new model of small nuclear; maybe in future fusion, if we are talking about as long as a 2040 timeline, and those ones in technology that are recycling and reusing the fuel. So there are plenty of options that from the bottom of my heart I really would have hoped the Commission would have used.

And with gas, in some cases it goes close to ‘do no significant harm’ limits when we are talking about a temporary use of gas.

So disappointed. Not in the line of the first level of the regulation. There's a severe brake on this and this has been the reaction by the financial market investors already. None of them are labelling gas or nuclear as green investment. So the EU, according to this proposal, would do that. And there is a strong signal that this might discredit the whole process.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, to quote one of the many commentators on our debate today, ‘this is a moment of truth’. The first and most important truth that I want to convey to you, as former colleagues, is that the Climate Delegated Act, now in legislation since 1 January of this year, prioritises investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency. And, given the urgency of moving away from Russian fossil fuels, we need to ramp up those investments with a renewed sense of urgency. This is our future.

You know, there was considerable debate about the first delegated act. Just as there is strong debate about the complementary delegated act we're discussing today. The Climate Delegated Act was also opposed by some who are speaking and will speak in this debate. As a former Member of this Parliament, I fully respect your strongly held views, but I also appreciate the pragmatism and realism in this House that allowed the Climate Delegated Act move from proposal to legislation.

The second truth: gas is a fossil fuel. It is not green. And I have never described it thus. I can say that in several languages if you wish. But I have never described gas as anything other than a fossil fuel. But some Member States moving from dirty fossil fuel may need gas in transition, and that is where we have placed gas in this taxonomy.

Nuclear power: the speaker before me just said it is divisive. There are many different views around nuclear. It has supporters and detractors. But nuclear, low carbon is part of our energy mix in transition too. That is why it is in the transition category of the taxonomy.

The third truth: the taxonomy is a voluntary instrument to guide private investors towards investments that allow us to reach our climate goals. It is a tool for the financial sector and for investors. It is not energy policy. Member States are, and remain, fully in charge of their energy mix.

I want to stress that there is no obligation on any Member State to invest in either nuclear or gas. There is no obligation on any private investor to invest in nuclear or gas. But, and this is a fundamental truth, with this complementary delegated act, we provide clarity around the criteria under which private investments in gas or nuclear, or both, comply with the taxonomy in the transition category.

While the CDA was drafted before Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine, it does actually help us to look for alternative sources of gas, including LNG from our international partners. It sends a signal that we support investment in gas infrastructure, power plants during our transition. It does not deepen our dependence on Russian gas.

Our REPowerEU plan aims to tackle our energy insecurity as we move away rapidly from Russian fossil fuel. We need these alternative sources to eliminate over-reliance on Russian gas, and we have to guard against stranded assets by ensuring that any new gas infrastructure would have to be able to convert to low carbon or renewable gases.

So our priority is to ensure investment in renewables intensifies. But without diverting EU green finances to fossil fuels, like gas or indeed nuclear, at the expense of renewables, which are a priority in our legislation, as I have already said.

For me, it's better that we have clear rules, clear conditionality on private investments in gas and nuclear, to ensure that we move towards our shared net-zero ambitions. Without this complementary delegated act, there would be no rules and conditions guiding such private investments. In addition, the financial sector will be required to provide full disclosure of their financial products with additional transparency required for products that might contain or would contain gas and nuclear. There will be no greenwashing. Instead, it would be crystal clear for investors as to what investments are contained within financial products.

Colleagues, we are in a time of great uncertainty. Today we see what we think was the unthinkable. Some Member States are reopening coal-fired power plants because of energy insecurity concerns. I hope that my remarks clarify why the Commission believes that this complementary delegated act is important for our energy transition. It is both realistic and pragmatic given the very uncertain times we live in.

Markus Ferber, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Bei der heutigen Diskussion geht es um die richtige Einstufung von Gas und Kernenergie. Und ich glaube, wir täten gut daran – was unser Berichterstatter schon gesagt hat –, uns auf das eigentliche Ziel der Taxonomie zurückzubedenken.

Wir wollten auf Basis wissenschaftlicher Fakten einen Transparenzstandard schaffen, der Marktteilnehmern Investitionsentscheidungen in nachhaltige Investments erleichtern soll. Wenn wir den delegierten Rechtsakt, der auf dem Tisch liegt, an diesem Standard messen, kann man eigentlich nur zu dem Schluss kommen, dass dieser delegierte Rechtsakt diesem Anspruch nicht genügt. Dafür gibt es zwei Gründe, die eng miteinander zusammenhängen.

Erstens: Ich glaube, man kann nicht bestreiten, dass dieser delegierte Rechtsakt nicht nach wissenschaftlichen, sondern nach politischen Kriterien zusammengestellt wurde. Die Kommission hat ganz genau überlegt, wie man die beiden Elemente Gas und Kernenergie, die miteinander nichts zu tun haben, so miteinander kombiniert, dass sie sich gegenseitig neutralisieren. Das hat nichts mit Wissenschaft zu tun, das ist Politik.

Zweitens: Die Kommission hat einen Standard vorgelegt, der vielleicht für eine kritische Masse an Mitgliedstaaten akzeptabel ist, aber nicht für eine kritische Masse an Marktteilnehmern. Um es ganz deutlich zu sagen: Anleger, die grüne Investments tätigen wollen, wollen keine Gaskraftwerke und keine Atomkraftwerke finanzieren. Deswegen kann eine solche Taxonomie auch nicht funktionieren. Wir haben also einen Standard vorliegen, der nicht nach wissenschaftlichen Kriterien erdacht wurde und der den Marktteilnehmern nichts nützt, und deswegen werde ich ihn ablehnen.

Simona Bonafè, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi avevamo seguito con grande interesse fin dall'inizio il regolamento sulla tassonomia proposto dalla Commissione.

Un provvedimento importante che aveva l'obiettivo di stabilire criteri chiari e condivisi in base ai quali le attività economiche potevano essere incluse tra gli investimenti sostenibili, evitando quindi fenomeni di *greenwashing* e dando un segnale inequivocabile a chi vuole contribuire con i propri risparmi privati al contrasto al cambiamento climatico.

Oggi discutiamo di un atto delegato con cui la Commissione intende includere attività economiche legate alla produzione di energia da gas e da nucleare tra quelle che risulterebbero conformi alla tassonomia e quindi sostenibili. Il gruppo dei Socialisti e Democratici è contrario a questa proposta.

Questo atto delegato, oltre a non rispettare l'ambito di applicazione del regolamento, come già spiegato negli interventi che mi hanno preceduto, dà un messaggio sbagliato agli investitori e ai cittadini europei perché etichetta come verde ciò che verde non è, screditando l'intero regolamento, perché non può essere considerata sostenibile una fonte di energia che è un combustibile fossile, come il gas, o una fonte, come il nucleare, i cui scarti di produzione, le scorie, impiegano migliaia di anni per essere smaltiti, in barba al principio di non arrecare un danno significativo.

Siamo ben consapevoli del ruolo di nucleare e gas nei prossimi anni per garantire la sicurezza degli approvvigionamenti, ma qui non sono in discussione le scelte sul mix energetico degli Stati membri, ed escludere gas e nucleare dalla tassonomia sugli investimenti che si vogliono qualificare come verdi non vieta a questi settori di ottenere comunque finanziamenti pubblici e privati.

Piuttosto, si tratta di essere seri e chiari. Vorrei chiedere se qualcuno in quest'Aula davvero consiglierebbe gas e nucleare a un cittadino europeo che volesse investire i suoi risparmi in attività economiche sostenibili per l'ambiente, a discapito, per esempio, di energie rinnovabili o di efficienza energetica.

Questo atto delegato non possiamo cambiarlo, ma solo respingerlo o accettarlo così com'è. E noi lo vogliamo respingere. Questo è il momento di mostrare che non prendiamo in giro i cittadini e che prendiamo sul serio il contrasto ai cambiamenti climatici e il futuro delle prossime generazioni.

Gilles Boyer, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, les sujets énergétiques sont évidemment très controversés dans cet hémicycle. Mais je crois qu'un point nous rassemble, sinon unanimement, du moins très largement: c'est l'obligation de respecter les accords de Paris et les objectifs du pacte vert que nous nous sommes fixés.

Pour cela, nous devons organiser une transition. À terme, j'espère, comme nous tous, que nous pourrions fournir 100 % des besoins en énergie des Européens avec les énergies renouvelables. Ce sera l'idéal, mais ce n'est pas possible tout de suite. Nous devons donc, par obligation, si ce n'est par choix, permettre de nouveaux investissements dans le gaz et le nucléaire dans certaines conditions strictes, en particulier de transparence pour les investisseurs, et pour un temps limité, ce qui est la définition d'une transition, pour que les États membres qui, comme cela a été dit, sont maîtres de leur mix énergétique puissent organiser leur transition à partir de points de départ que nous savons très différents.

Madame la Commissaire, vous l'avez dit: ces émissions, personne ne dit qu'elles sont vertes, mais elles sont temporairement indispensables à la transition. Et c'est l'occasion ici de tordre le cou à des idées fausses qui commencent à prospérer: la taxonomie, par exemple, n'oblige personne à investir dans un secteur ou dans un pays, vous l'avez rappelé. Et en particulier, il est faux de dire qu'elle favorisera les investissements en Russie. Croyez-moi, il y aura beaucoup de raisons de ne pas investir en Russie, à commencer par l'embargo. Le ministre ukrainien de l'énergie vient d'ailleurs d'apporter son soutien à cet acte délégué en disant à quel point il sera important pour la reconstruction future de son pays, le plus tôt possible.

Nous devons, je crois, utiliser tous les outils pour nous passer en priorité du pétrole et du charbon, puis progressivement du gaz, puis progressivement, peut-être un jour, du nucléaire. Alors je vous appelle, mes chers collègues, à rejeter cette objection, à adopter l'acte délégué qui est le seul moyen de respecter le pacte vert et les accords de Paris à court terme.

Michèle Rivasi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, d'abord, le premier axiome: vous l'avez dit, le gaz et le nucléaire ne sont pas verts. Là, tout le monde est d'accord. Sauf que nous, nous vous invitons fortement à voter pour cette objection rejetant l'inclusion du gaz et du nucléaire dans la taxonomie verte.

D'abord, rien que pour notre crédibilité. On a fait bosser des scientifiques, on a élaboré des principes objectifs pour mettre ou pas certains types d'énergie. Eh bien, on n'en tient pas compte. On n'en tient pas compte parce que c'est une décision politique. Il y avait des arguments scientifiques sur le nucléaire: on a vécu Fukushima, on a vécu Tchernobyl, on sait qu'on n'a pas de solution pour les déchets radioactifs. Comment peut-on transmettre une énergie pour laquelle on n'a pas de solution pour les déchets nucléaires? Et puis, c'est quand même un fardeau vis-à-vis des générations futures, donc ça ne peut pas être une énergie de transition. Ce sera beaucoup trop tard: il faut quinze ans pour construire un réacteur.

Pour ce qui est du gaz, c'est la même chose: c'est une énergie fossile, vous l'avez dit. Et si on veut atteindre les accords de Paris, il faut qu'on élimine toute production de gaz fossile d'ici 2022. Donc, c'est fini.

Là, cela va à l'encontre de tout ce qui est dit, donc je vous demande voter pour que la taxonomie n'intègre ni le gaz ni le nucléaire.

Bogdan Rzońca, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Proszę Państwa, taksonomia jest potrzebna, bo wskazuje, które inwestycje są czyste, a które – jak powiedziała Pani Komisarz – są brudne. I ta taksonomia jest potrzebna, tylko że cały ten proces wskazywania, które inwestycje są brudne, które są czyste, wymaga dużo czasu.

Odrzucenie aktu delegowanego spowoduje, że biedniejsi będą biedniejszymi. Dzisiaj, z tej mównicy, premier Grecji powiedział, że mogą czasem przy naszych nieodpowiedzialnych decyzjach załamać się budżety domowe.

My, posłowie, pracujemy dla ludzi, którzy nas wybierają, i powinniśmy uwzględnić wszystkie prędkości, które dotyczą jakichkolwiek zmian, także zmian, które dotyczą tego, czy w domu będzie ciepło, czy będzie ciepła woda, czy ludzie będą po prostu mieli pieniądze na to, żeby żyć w lepszych warunkach niż te, które spowodowane są obecną sytuacją kryzysową.

I chcę bardzo wyraźnie powiedzieć, że odrzucenie aktu delegowanego spowoduje brak finansowania inwestycji gazowych i w energetyce jądrowej w dłuższym okresie czasu, że trwanie przy odrzuceniu aktu delegowanego to po prostu wskazywanie na to, żeby dalej ludzie ocieplali swoje domy węglem, a węgiel jest gorszy niż energia jądrowa, niż energia gazowa. Jest gorszy. Dobrze o tym wiecie! Chiny budują w tej chwili 14 elektrowni jądrowych, Indie 8, Rosja 4.

Dokąd wy nas prowadzicie?!

Silvia Modig, *The Left -ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, resepti ilmastonmuutoksen torjumiseen on lopulta aika yksinkertainen: päästöt on saatava alas, nielut ja biodiversiteetti ylös ja rahavirrat tukemaan tätä ekologista jälleenkäytämistä.

Taksonomia on tärkeä työkalu ohjattaessa rahavirtoja niihin investointeihin, jotka tarvitaan välttämättömän siirtymän toteuttamiseksi. Rahoituslaitokset ja sijoittajat välittävät yhdenmukaista viestiä: tarvitsemme keinon määrittellä, mitkä sijoitukset ovat aidosti vihreitä ja mitkä edistävät ilmastonmuutoksen ratkaisuja. Juuri tähän tarpeeseen luotiin taksonomia: tieteellisiin kriteereihin perustuva luokittelujärjestelmä, joka mahdollistaa aidosti vihreiden investointien tunnistamisen.

Nyt komissio antaa täydentävän säädöksen, joka on täydessä ristiriidassa jo hyväksytyyn taksonomian kanssa – siis komission itsensä hyväksymän sääntelyn kanssa. Tilanne on niin absurdi, että se naurattaisi, ellei asia olisi niin vakava. On kiistaton fakta, että maakaasu on fossiilinen energianlähde ja että se on voimakkaasti ilmastoa lämmittävä, mutta komissio haluaa silti määrittellä sen vihreäksi eli kestäväksi. Erityisen hankalan esityksestä tekee se, että komissio on niputtanut samaan säädökseen sekä maakaasun että ydinvoiman. Ne ovat kaksi aivan eri asiaa ja investointilogiikaltaan aivan erilaiset. Ydinvoima on vähäpäästöistä, vaikka ei täysin vapaa ympäristöongelmista, mutta tietyin reunaehdoin se voi olla osa kestävästä polkua kohti ilmastokestävää Eurooppaa. Näiden kahden niputtaminen samaan on paitsi älyllisesti epärehellistä myös täysin epäloogista.

Tämän seurauksena on se, että koko taksonomia saastuu, kun se ei enää pysty tarjoamaan tietoa siitä, mikä investointi todella on vihreää. Ja näin se muuttuu viherpesuautomaatiksi, vaikka yksi sen tarkoituksista oli nimenomaan ehkäistä viherpesua. Jos tämä säädös jää voimaan, on komission luovuttava puheistaan, joiden mukaan EU olisi globaali ilmastotyön johtaja. Miten ihmeessä me voisimme vaatia muilta fossiilisten alasiojia, kun itse päätämme, että fossiilinen onkin vihreää? Hyvät ystävät, ainoa tapa pelastaa taksonomia on hylätä tämä päätös delegoituun säädöseen.

András Gyürk (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Tisztelt Ház! Európa energiaválságban van, emelkedő árak, bizonytalan ellátás. Ez a javaslat pedig csak tovább súlyosbítaná a helyzetet, ezért nemet kell mondanunk rá. Nemet kell mondanunk, mert az atomenergia és a földgáz fenntartható energiaforrások és nélkülözhetetlenek a klímavédelemhez. Ez a javaslat a beruházások akadályozásával ellehetetlenítene a klímacélok teljesítését. Nemet kell mondanunk, mert Európának törekednie kell az energiatartósságra, ami új atomerőművek és LNG-terminálok nélkül egyszerűen nem fog menni. Ez a javaslat ezzel szemben fókuszál az európai energiaellátás kiszolgáltatottságát. Végül nemet kell mondanunk, mert csak az atomenergia használatával lehetséges a megfizethető rezsik fenntartása. Ez a javaslat pedig tovább növelné az energiaárakat.

Tisztelt Ház! Meg kell védenünk az európai polgárokat az energiaválságtól, ezért kell nemet mondanunk erre a javaslatra!

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es gibt viele Gründe, gegen diesen delegierten Rechtsakt zu stimmen. Wegen der knappen Zeit will ich mich auf zwei beschränken.

Erstens: Der delegierte Rechtsakt kann die neue Lage nach dem russischen Angriffskrieg in der Ukraine nicht berücksichtigen, weil er davor geschrieben wurde. Man kann es drehen und wenden, wie man will – Dinge, die durch die Taxonomie nicht gefördert werden, werden teurer. Deshalb wollen ja alle taxonomiekonform sein, und die, die nicht auf der Liste sind, beschwerten sich. LNG-Terminals und LNG-Schiffe sind aber nicht drauf, und das ist ein Grund, diesen delegierten Rechtsakt abzulehnen.

Der zweite Grund sind für mich die Regeln, die Sie für die Kernenergie aufgeschrieben haben. Ich kann akzeptieren, dass Kernenergie eine Übergangstechnologie ist und dass wir sie gerade in der jetzigen Phase vielleicht noch etwas länger nutzen müssen. Aber, Mairead McGuinness, 2045 Baurecht für neue Kernkraftwerke herkömmlicher Bauart: Diese Kernkraftwerke werden vor 2070 keinen Strom produzieren, geschweige denn, dass sie bis dahin amortisiert sind. Wenn wir es bis 2070 nicht schaffen, erneuerbare Energien zu der einzigen Energiequelle zu machen, dann sind wir unser Geld nicht wert, und deswegen werde ich gegen den delegierten Rechtsakt stimmen.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Mr President, a full debate on a delegated act does not happen every day, but this issue goes to the heart of who we are. Are we still serious about defending our planet? Serious about advocating energy independence in a geopolitical world? Serious about building a sustainable Europe for all citizens? By labelling gas and nuclear as green we answer these questions with a clear and resounding 'no'.

Voting for gas turns Europe from a climate front runner into a climate laggard, as even Russia and China don't call it green, and for good reason: there's no place for fossil gas if you want to stop global warming. But Europe's reasons to turn away from gas are stronger still, because our addiction means dependence, dependence on dictatorial dealers like Putin or a Saudi Prince. And is this the message that we, defenders of our planet and advocates for independence, want to give?

And one can sort of understand those who favour nuclear. Yes, it will be a future source of energy, but no, your country will not benefit from labelling it green. It doesn't work for all Europeans, only for a few. Because Macron's backroom deal is a deal written for France. So is it a surprise that it's just about only France that can fulfil the requirement, the requirement of a permanent storage for nuclear waste by 2050? The bottom line is this act takes green funding away from the countries that need it most and puts it in the pockets of Macron.

So, dear colleagues, do not support this deal that favours just a few, and be true to this institution that looks for European solutions to our problems for all European citizens.

Luis Garicano (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner McGuinness, dear colleagues, I'm afraid, Commissioner McGuinness, that many of my colleagues in this Chamber believe in what in my primary school, in your primary school would have been called the Immaculate Energy Transition. They think that burying it all in renewables will be enough and we will just stop climate change. And so did Germany believe until a few months ago and now it is reopening coal plants. The reality is that as long as we do not have a viable large-scale storage technology, renewables will not be enough. And in the transition, we will need to use nuclear and gas for a very limited period of time. Nuclear is a useful transition technology because it doesn't emit any CO₂ and the taxonomy allows investments up to 2045. Also, gas is necessary in the transition, as this war has made – sadly – painfully clear. Gas emits half as much CO₂ as coal. That's not ideal, but it's the most reasonable temporary alternative. Moreover, it's only given this label transitionally for seven years. Therefore, this recommendation is a balanced compromise and a key step towards a sensible transition. That is why I'm not going to vote for this objection and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Dass ich hier stehe und die Finanzbranche verteidige, das hätte ich auch nicht gedacht. Aber so ist es. Gestern sagte mir jemand vom Bundesverband Öffentlicher Banken, dass niemand die grüne Taxonomie ernst nehmen wird, sollten Atomkraft und Gas aufgenommen werden. Anders gesagt: Wir haben einen exzellenten Kompass, der Europas Energiewende vorantreibt, und schlagen jetzt mit der Faust drauf, weil marode französische Atommeiler dringend Geld für die Renovierung brauchen. Ganz ehrlich: Das ist absurd.

Gleichzeitig bekommen diejenigen, die morgen für Atomkraft und für Gas stimmen, ein Dankeschreiben von Wladimir Putin. Er reibt sich schon die Hände, weil er sein Gas künftig als nachhaltig verkaufen kann und noch mehr Milliarden einstreichen wird.

Ich appelliere an Manfred Weber und an die EVP: Seien Sie vernünftig! Zerstören Sie nicht Europas Gütesiegel für die Finanzbranche, unser Siegel für Europas Energieunabhängigkeit von Putin!

Laura Huhtasaari (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, valtion perimmäinen tavoite on tarjota ihmisille turvallisuutta, johon kuuluu myös energiansaanti. EU:n parlamentilla ja yleisesti vihervasemmistolla on kummallinen tarve toimia kansalaisensa etua vastaan. Saksassa omakotitalon lämmityslasku voi nousta jopa neljä tuhatta euroa vuodessa.

Tosiasia on, että ydinvoima on tässä maailmantilanteessa varmin ja edullisin keino tuottaa energiaa. Saksa saa nyt maksaa vihreiden poliitikkojen hölmöydestä, kun ydinvoimaa ei ole ja kaasua ei ehkä tule. Saksan on pakko ottaa käyttöön hiilivoimaa ja sehän on ympäristöystävällistä.

Suomelle ydinvoiman hyväksyminen osaksi kestäviä energiamuotoja on erityisen tärkeää. Ei Suomi voi jatkossa kuulua klubiin, joka tekee idioottimaisia päätöksiä. Vastustan jyrkästi tämän vastalauseen hyväksymistä. Katson, että se tulee hylätä.

(Puhuja suostuu vastaamaan sinisen kortin puheenvuoroon)

Silvia Modig (The Left), sinisen kortin puheenvuoro. – Arvoisa edustaja Huhtasaari, sanoitte, että valtion yksi tärkeimpiä tehtäviä on taata kansalaisten turvallisuus. Olen kanssanne täysin samaa mieltä, mutta silti vastustatte vastalauseetta, vaikka tämä delegoitu säädös tarkoittaa sitä, että esimerkiksi Suomen ja Viron on vaikeampi päästä irti venäläisestä maakaasusta. Tämä taksonomiasäädös ei esimerkiksi tunnista Viron ja Suomen yhteistä kelluvaa LNG-terminaalia. LNG on se tapa, miten maakaasua voidaan muualta tuoda eikä putkea pitkin Venäjältä. Eikö puheissanne ole tältä osin aika paha ristiriita edustaja Huhtasaari?

Laura Huhtasaari (ID), *vastaus sinisen kortin puheenvuoroon*. – Kiitos edustaja Modigille hyvästä kysymyksestä. Se on totta, että tässä on ristiriitaa, mutta Suomelle ydinvoima on niin tärkeä asia, että me emme voi ottaa sitä riskiä, että se ei saisi vihreää rahaa. Ja pääsyyllisiä tähän tässä itse asiassa ovat nimenomaan saksalaiset, jotka haluavat luopua niistä kolmesta ydinvoimalasta, jotka heillä vielä olisi. Ydinvoima olisi nimenomaan turvallisempaa energiaa, ja ottaen huomioon, että esimerkiksi toukokuussa Saksan kauppataase oli alijäämäinen noin miljardi euroa. Meille on oikeasti energiakriisi tulossa ja sitä kautta ruokakriisi ja monet muut kriisit, ja siksi meillä ei ole varaa lähteä tässä asiassa pelleilemään.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, tomorrow's vote on taxonomy is crucial. Firstly, it is vitally important for the Green Deal. Some Member States cannot meet Paris targets without nuclear energy because their geographical conditions do not allow full-scale use of renewables. Secondly, taxonomy is vital for the future investment to deliver stable electricity for reasonable prices to our citizens. And thirdly, it is a test of to what degree our decisions are guided by solidarity and respect for the others. We do not press us the others who oppose the nuclear energy to use it, but please do not press us to stop using it if we are convinced that this is the only way how we can move forward.

There was something on France, so I will talk about Germany. Germany led us into this mess with 100% dependence on the Russian bastards. And now with disseminating this anti-nuclear hysteria, you are leading us to another mess. So please vote 'no' to the objections tomorrow.

Sira Rego (The Left). – Señor presidente, imaginen que en plena pandemia la Comisión Europea hubiera venido aquí a proponer una estrategia contra la vacunación. Pues eso es precisamente lo que defienden con la nueva taxonomía. A pesar de que el consenso científico señala que la vacuna para frenar el cambio climático es el abandono de los combustibles fósiles, quieren que el gas y la energía nuclear sean energías verdes por decreto.

Excede sus competencias, señora McGuinness, para seguir beneficiando al oligopolio eléctrico que seguirá parasitando los fondos públicos.

Ustedes defienden los intereses de las grandes energéticas y no los de la gente. Quizá por eso se esconden tras un perímetro de seguridad y no escuchan a los cientos de activistas a los que se ha impedido entrar en este Parlamento, la sede de la soberanía popular, por la que sí pasean los lobistas.

Necesitamos reducir el consumo de combustibles fósiles, también del gas. Necesitamos dar seguridad y certeza a las generaciones futuras. Por eso hay que abandonar la energía nuclear. Y necesitamos que este Parlamento tome una decisión valiente que no hipoteque nuestro futuro.

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich habe eine Bitte: Ich habe jetzt dreimal blaue Karten bekommen, von denen eine irrtümlich verlangt wurde und zwei erst erbeten wurden, als ich bereits dabei war, dem nächsten Redner das Wort zu erteilen. Ich hätte gerne eine klare Linie.

Normalerweise kommen Rednerinnen und Redner zur blauen Karte, wenn sie nicht gerade gesprochen hatten. Aber ich würde Sie bitten, mir rechtzeitig während der Rede oder am Beginn der Rede die blaue Karte anzuzeigen, damit ich Sie rechtzeitig, bevor der Redner das Rednerpult verlässt, aufrufen kann. Ansonsten ist es ein Problem, da ich ja nicht den neuen Redner zurückrufen will, wenn ich gerade eine blaue Karte zu einem vorhergehenden Redner, der bereits seinen Platz eingenommen hat, erhalte. Ich bitte Sie, ein bisschen früher – ich weiß, dass das nicht ganz leicht ist – und konsequenter mit diesem Instrument umzugehen.

Ich wollte das nur zur Erklärung sagen, warum ich zwei blaue Karten nicht aufrufen konnte, weil ich bereits dabei war, dem nächsten Redner das Wort zu erteilen. Ich bitte dafür um Verständnis. Wir werden zusammenkommen, aber ich muss den Vorsitz auch ein bisschen führen können.

Edina Tóth (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Tisztelt Biztos Asszony! A mai napon egy sorsdöntő javaslatról vitázunk. A tét nem kevés: megfizethető és fenntartható energiákat biztosítunk polgáraink számára, vagy veszélybe sodorjuk az eddigi eredményeket, s ezáltal elszálló rezsikárakat, kiszámíthatatlan energiaárakat szabadítunk a lakosságra. Bár a teremben sokan nem merik kimondani, a tény az tény marad. A klímasemlegesség eléréséhez és a rezsiköltségek alacsonyan tartásához igenis szükség van a nukleáris és földgázalapú beruházásokra. Ezek az energiaforrások környezetbarát technológiák, amelyek felhasználásával nagy mennyiségű olcsó, károsanyagkibocsátás-mentes villamos energiát lehet termelni, biztosítva a tagállamok rezsicsökkentő intézkedéseinek fenntarthatóságát.

Arra kérem képviselőtársaimat, hogy gondosan fontolják meg holnapi szavazatukat. A jelenlegi helyzetben az a legfontosabb, hogy hosszú távon és fenntartható módon megőrizzük az energiaellátás biztonságát és megfizethetőségét.

(A felszólaló hajlandó válaszolni két kékkártyás felszólalásra)

Radan Kanev (PPE), blue-card speech. – Mr President, colleague Tóth, you referred to electricity prices, which is really the most pressing issue at the moment. But the delegated act, in its part about gas, is all about gas-generation electricity.

And isn't it exactly electricity produced from gas that led us where we are with electricity prices? I think it's the main driver of the peak of electricity prices at the end of the previous year and during this year now.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE), Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Wenn Sie über bezahlbare Preise sprechen – ich höre das ja häufig von Anhängerinnen und Anhängern der Atomenergie: Wissen Sie zufällig, was dem zukünftigen Betreiber von Hinkley Point 3, was nun das modernste Kernkraftwerk ist, das in Europa ans Netz gehen wird, zugesichert wurde? Dass er 11,3 Cent pro Kilowattstunde erhält, 35 Jahre lang, inflationsgesichert – finden Sie das wirklich kostengünstig?

Edina Tóth (NI), kékkártyás válasz. – Köszönöm szépen mindkét képviselőtársamnak a kérdését. Én úgy gondolom, hogy két dolog miatt nagyon-nagyon fontos, hogy holnap ezt a kifogást elutasítsuk, és megmentsük a taxonómia delegált jogi aktust. Az egyik az az, hogy számos szakértő, többek között az Európai Bizottság szakértői is már kimondták, hogy elérhetetlen az, hogy az Európai Unió 2050-re elérje a klímasemlegességet nukleárisenergia és földgáz nélkül. A másik érv, ami nagyon-nagyon fontos: azt is teljesen egyértelmű, szintén rengeteg szakértői megnyilvánulást hallhattunk erről, hogy az alacsony energiaárakat rövid-, közép és hosszú távon, valamint azokban a tagállamokban, ahol vannak rezsicsökkentő intézkedések, azoknak a fenntarthatóságát csak evvel a két energiaforrással tudjuk elérni véleményem szerint.

Christian Ehler (PPE). – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Green Minister of Economics and Energy, Robert Habeck, placed on Saturday a press release on the taxonomy, and he was deliberately quiet on gas. And I do not use that triumphantly. It's simply 'welcome to reality'. We know that for a transitional time we need gas and nuclear in order not to destabilise the grid, to lead the pathway to renewable energy in 2030 and 2050. And the taxonomy simply reflects the fact that this is used as a transitional pathway, a sustainable energy source.

It is therefore right that the complementary delegated act and the taxonomy presented by the Commission defines electricity and heat generation with gas as energy sources as a sustainable transition technology. It's based on extremely strict cumulative criteria, which must be also verified by an independent third party. And in reality it will address a very few investments to stabilise the grid, reserve plants. But this is not a renewal of gas. Any prospection of gas is not the future, we all know. But we know that we need these transition pathways, and we all know that we need investment in transition pathways. And for that reason, I think it was a wise decision to stay with the delegated act.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, creo que, en primer lugar, es oportuno que seamos capaces de centrar bien el debate, y este no es un debate sobre si necesitamos o no invertir en gas o en energía nuclear. En política es importante, muy importante, diferenciar los instrumentos de los objetivos, y creo que estamos confundiendo ambos, porque la taxonomía, el Reglamento de la taxonomía, nace para crear un marco europeo, pero también, con vocación internacional, para definir qué es y qué no es verde. Y, sin duda, introducir el gas y la energía nuclear en ese marco, por cierto, en contra del criterio de los técnicos de la Plataforma sobre Finanzas Sostenibles, supone, como digo, introducir una piedra que reduce la credibilidad de nuestra regulación, que reduce la capacidad de que nuestra regulación sea un estándar internacional. Y, como digo, esto no prejuzga la necesidad o no de invertir en gas o en energía nuclear, sino de clarificar y denominar a las cosas por lo que realmente son. Y, por lo tanto, creo que es necesario rechazar este acto delegado.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Mr President, Madam Commissioner today we face the double challenge of the need to cut CO₂ emissions and a war in Europe. We must face both at the same time. Those who say we can meet these challenges without nuclear are wrong. At a time of energy crisis, we have even greater obligation to ensure that all citizens have a secure supply of energy in their homes. And that is what this vote is all about.

Nuclear is vital to our energy independence and economy. This is crucial for countries like the Czech Republic. For Sweden and Austria the answer might be hydro, but for the Czech Republic it is nuclear. You don't need to follow this path, but we must respect the choice. Now is the time to put ideology, politics aside and to act responsibly.

Therefore, I call on all colleagues to vote against this objection.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, nous ne pouvons pas accepter le détournement d'investissements verts vers des énergies non durables qui profitent en plus à la guerre de Poutine. Chaque euro qui coule dans la coûteuse construction ou dans l'interminable entretien d'un réacteur nucléaire ne sera pas investi dans les énergies renouvelables.

L'Autriche et le Luxembourg ont déjà annoncé une action légale contre cet acte délégué au cas où il passerait. Ces gouvernements dénoncent une incohérence avec plusieurs textes européens dans le règlement de la taxonomie même et un dépassement manifeste des compétences de la Commission. Les arguments juridiques sont forts et pourraient bien aboutir. La transition énergétique est urgente. Pourquoi alors prolonger ce débat pendant des années devant la Cour de justice si demain nous pouvons faire tomber cet acte délégué?

Chers collègues, il est clair que le vote sera serré, et chaque voix compte. Il en va aussi de la crédibilité de nos institutions. Alors, soutenez cette objection.

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

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE), intervention «carton bleu». – Monsieur le Président, chère collègue, vous faites partie du groupe des Verts et je crois que nous avons en commun de vouloir lutter contre la crise climatique. Que répondez-vous au fait que le nucléaire émet deux fois moins de CO₂ que l'éolien et dix fois moins que l'énergie solaire, et que répondez-vous au GIEC qui dit que nous ne parviendrons pas à résoudre le défi climatique qui est devant nous si nous ne faisons pas avec l'énergie nucléaire, qui est aujourd'hui l'énergie la plus décarbonée dont les pays européens puissent disposer pour affronter ce défi et préserver notre modèle énergétique?

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE), réponse «carton bleu». – Merci à vous pour cette question.

Premièrement, cet instrument, cette taxonomie n'interdit pas le nucléaire.

Deuxièmement, nous sommes tous d'accord sur le fait que l'énergie nucléaire n'est pas verte et augmente notre dépendance par rapport aux importations d'uranium. Je ne pense pas qu'il y ait de l'uranium en France, donc cela amène des importations massives. On sait très bien que la construction de réacteurs nucléaires prend de nombreuses années, donc ne répondra pas du tout aux objectifs climatiques. D'ici à ce qu'ils soient fonctionnels, on aura dépassé de toute façon les dates auxquelles les objectifs climatiques doivent être atteints.

Et troisièmement, vous savez très bien que les déchets nucléaires, pour lesquels il n'y a toujours pas de solution, doivent être refroidis pendant 80 ans. Donc, ce n'est pas durable ni écologique non plus. En effet, comment refroidissez-vous les déchets si ce n'est avec de l'eau froide, ce qui en plus nuit à la biodiversité?

Simona Baldassarre (ID). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, rimuovere gas e nucleare pulito dalla tassonomia significa aumentare il costo delle bollette per famiglie e imprese.

L'equazione è molto semplice: in un periodo di crisi energetica e di recessione economica, non possiamo permetterci di continuare a seguire l'ideologia del *green* a tutti i costi. Noi lo diciamo da tempo, ma finalmente se n'è accorta anche la Commissione europea. La transizione verde va gestita garantendo sostenibilità sociale ed economica. Dobbiamo aiutare le nostre aziende, che si trovano davanti a *competitor* globali senza le stesse limitazioni energetiche, dobbiamo scongiurare che il costo sociale della transizione vada a scapito di lavoratori e famiglie.

Certo che gli obiettivi ambientali sono condivisi, ma si devono raggiungere garantendo fonti energetiche stabili per gli Stati membri. Colleghi, di fronte a queste scelte strategiche valutiamo con cura quale direzione vogliamo prendere. Salvaguardare l'ambiente vuol dire anche ascoltare e preservare famiglie e imprese, accompagnandole verso una giusta transizione al rinnovabile.

(L'oratrice accetta di rispondere a un intervento «cartellino blu»)

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE), *blue-card speech*. — I would be very interested in knowing how nuclear energy can actually lower the prices for our citizens because, as I just told you, in the UK nuclear energy is only viable when you pay a premium which is about three times the premium which is paid for wind or solar energy. And all the more, I would like to know where in Europe would we be able to source the uranium we need to run those nuclear power plants?

Simona Baldassarre (ID), *risposta «cartellino blu»*. — Sicuramente c'è bisogno di tenerla l'energia nucleare, perché altrimenti sarà impossibile che non aumenti il costo energetico. Quali altre soluzioni abbiamo? Se vengono meno il nucleare e il gas, quali altre soluzioni abbiamo? Che cosa proponete? Come proponete di fare? Per un periodo, per una transizione, è necessario questo, perché i cittadini e le imprese non andranno avanti, i cittadini hanno le bollette più care. Si può rispondere diversamente? È necessario.

Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR). — Voorzitter! Door de geopolitieke context staan we meer dan ooit voor drie grote uitdagingen: eerst en vooral elektriciteits- en energieprijzen onder controle houden; zorgen voor een stabiele energiebevoorrading; zorgen voor een duurzame energietransitie.

Kernenergie kan een bepalende rol spelen in elk van die drie uitdagingen. In de energietransitie hebben sommigen op radicale wijze kernenergie de rug toegekeerd, met als gevolg dat we nu zelfs moeten terugvallen op steenkool.

De EU ontstond destijds als Gemeenschap voor Kolen en Staal. Gaan we echt terug naar die tijd of gaan we de moed tonen om te investeren in alle moderne, innovatieve technologieën waartoe ook kernenergie behoort? Als we energie willen die betaalbaar is, die zekerheid biedt met zo min mogelijk uitstoot, dan verdient kernenergie daar ontegenzeggelijk een plaats in.

Mick Wallace (The Left). — Mr President, calling something sustainable doesn't make it sustainable. Calling fossil gas and nuclear energy green. It's like me saying black is white. This taxonomy that you have proposed is a work of art and deception. And it suits some to accept it. We're not voting on whether nuclear and gas should be part of the energy transition. We're voting on whether we want to greenwash them, categorise them as green at the same level as renewables. No one in their right mind could agree with that. Expert analysis concludes that most Member States will not get any financial benefit from it, but France will. So we are just greenwashing. Just to please French nuclear interests. Can somebody explain to me? This resolution is calling for the Commission to respect science. Commissioner, you said your position is pragmatic for the uncertain times we're living in. But Commissioner, the war in Ukraine is not the biggest crisis facing this planet. Climate change is. Cop on to yourself.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). — Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, e bine să fii ambițios în viață, dar întotdeauna trebuie să te uiți la realitate.

Comisia Europeană spune că în 2030, 30% din energia necesară în Uniunea Europeană va fi produsă de gaz și de nuclear, plus 4% de combustibili solizi. Energia va crește în imaginea Comisiei cu 10%.

Eu cred că va crește necesarul de energie, va crește cu mult mai mult. Fără energie nucleară și fără gaz, la așa ceva nu se poate ajunge. Nici la 55% reducere de emisii nu se poate ajunge dacă nu utilizăm gazul și energia nucleară.

După părerea mea, utilizarea războiului din Ucraina și a presupusei absențe a LNG-ului din acest act delegat sunt argumente mincinoase. Nu puteți să folosiți declarații ale oficialilor ruși în timpul războiului. Nu puteți să folosiți războiul din Ucraina pentru a crea emoție și pentru a aduce argumente în favoarea obiecției. Sunt două lucruri complet diferite. LNG-ul bineînțeles că este acolo, pentru că este gaz.

Așa că, oameni buni, am votat deja o taxonomie, trebuie să o votăm și pe asta.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich habe den vorherigen Rednern sehr aufmerksam gelauscht und eigentlich sämtliche, die sich gegen die Ablehnung des delegierten Rechtsakts aussprechen, haben das mit der Begründung von Versorgungssicherheit, von steigenden Energiepreisen gemacht. Aber Investitionen in diese Brückentechnologie werden nicht verboten durch die Taxonomie, darum geht es nicht. Das ist eine Verzerrung der Debatte, und es geht Ihnen eigentlich darum, diese Investition greenzuwaschen. Und das ist eben nicht im Sinne dieser Antragsteller.

Nicht nur die Tausende Menschen, die uns gerade schreiben, haben diesen Zusammenhang verstanden. Auch der eigens von der Kommission in Auftrag gegebene Expertenrat der Kommission hat diesen Zusammenhang verstanden. Ziel der Taxonomie war es, ein gemeinsames europäisches Verständnis dafür zu implementieren, was eine nachhaltige Investition ist. Eine Taxonomie, die Kernkraft und fossiles Gas als nachhaltig bezeichnet, hat mit diesem Ziel nichts zu tun. Sie ist Greenwashing.

Nur wo nachhaltig drin ist, muss auch nachhaltig draufstehen. Darum geht es bei der Taxonomie. Lassen Sie uns Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher, die in nachhaltige Finanzprodukte investieren wollen, nicht in die Irre führen. Wir haben die Macht, hier dafür zu sorgen, dass es keine Irreführung gibt. Lassen Sie uns diese Macht nutzen!

Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, ydinvoima on päästötön energiamuoto. Huolta aiheuttaa kuitenkin se, että vain kahdessa maassa ydinjätteen loppusijoitus on ratkaistu: Suomessa ja Ruotsissa. Riskeistä huolimatta ydinvoima siis on, aivan kuten komissio sanoo, energiasiirtymässä tärkeä vaihtoehto ja ansaitsee positiivisen kohtelun taksonomiassa.

Komissio esittää kuitenkin samassa säädöksessä positiivista kohtelua myös fossiilille kaasulle. Komission kanta on, jos haluat saada ydinvoiman, sinun on hyväksyttävä myös fossiilinen kaasu ja päinvastoin. Poliittista kaupankäyntiä pahimmillaan, sanoisin tähän. Sitä vaikeampaa on ymmärtää komission kanta, kun muistetaan, että muutama kuukausi sitten EU päätyi asettamaan puuraaka-aineelle taksonomiasäädöksessä monia tiukkoja ehtoja. Jos fossiilinen kaasu saa nyt taksonomiatatukseen, on erityisen tärkeää, että jatkossa kaikki uusiutuvaksi raaka-aineeksi katsottava saa vähintäänkin saman kohtelun.

Rasmus Andresen (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Klimapolitik ist Sicherheitspolitik. Wir erleben gerade auf brutale Weise, wie unsere Abhängigkeit von russischem Gas und Uran uns verwundbar macht. Wir müssen deshalb alles dafür tun, dass wir unabhängig von fossiler Energie werden und Putins Einfluss zurückdrängen. Putin würde von der Taxonomie profitieren und das Klima verlieren.

Es ist doch kein Zufall, dass ausgerechnet die russischen Energiekonzerne Gazprom, Rosatom und Lukoil zu den größten Lobbyisten für von der Leyens Taxonomievorschlag gehören. Wir hören die Rufe von ukrainischen Abgeordneten und Stimmen aus der Zivilgesellschaft, die uns bitten, die Aufnahme von Gas und Atom zu stoppen.

Die Taxonomie ist das grüne Gütesiegel für Finanzinvestitionen. Das haben viele heute in der Debatte schon gesagt. Durch die Aufnahme von Atom und Gas würde dieses Siegel unbrauchbar gemacht werden. Es war ein Fehler, Kommissarin McGuinness, dass Sie diesen Vorschlag gemacht haben – sicherheits-, finanz- und klimapolitisch. Jetzt ist es an uns, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, diesen Fehler zu stoppen und Einspruch einzulegen. Deshalb möchte ich Sie bitten, das morgen mit uns gemeinsam zu tun.

Catherine Griset (ID). – Monsieur le Président, on pensait au début de l'année que la Commission avait réussi à trouver un compromis raisonnable entre États après le feu vert de son comité des experts. Mais manifestement, l'argument scientifique n'a pas suffi à convaincre les plus hostiles. Parmi eux, le Parlement tente de s'opposer à cette décision par tous les moyens. À l'obsession antinucléaire vient s'ajouter le prétexte bien trouvé de la guerre en Ukraine. Et pour quelle alternative crédible? Il s'agissait seulement d'accorder au gaz et au nucléaire un statut transitoire sous certaines conditions.

On ne peut pas vouloir atteindre les objectifs du pacte vert et se passer d'une énergie pilotable, décarbonée et bon marché. Cette objection est une mauvaise nouvelle pour l'Europe et méconnaît les enjeux fondamentaux que sont la décarbonation, la souveraineté énergétique et la compétitivité. Et dans le contexte actuel de hausse des prix de l'énergie, un rejet de la proposition de la Commission serait inacceptable puisqu'il aggraverait la situation.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il voto che stiamo per esprimere è la prova più evidente dell'ipocrisia, dell'estremismo ideologico e dell'ignoranza tecnologica che armano l'ambientalismo delle sinistre.

Escludere gli investimenti sull'energia nucleare dalla tassonomia europea è una scelta che favorisce il riscaldamento climatico dal momento che il nucleare non emette CO₂ nell'aria. Ugualmente, escludere gli investimenti sull'estrazione di gas dai giacimenti europei è una scelta ipocrita, perché ci costringe ad acquistarlo dagli Stati Uniti, dall'Algeria, dal Qatar e dalla Russia, mantenendo quindi invariato il saldo delle emissioni globali, anzi aumentandole, visto che le centrali a gas sostituirebbero le centrali a carbone, che emettono il triplo delle emissioni di CO₂ nell'aria.

E vi do una notizia: grazie ad alcuni ricercatori europei, italiani, fra poco tempo dal gas sarà possibile ottenere anche idrogeno pulito attraverso il processo di *cracking*, ma a voi che sognate di tornare all'età della pietra immagino interessi ben poco.

Petros Kokkalis (The Left). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the taxonomy is perhaps one of the greatest achievements of this House – a true innovation of climate policy and finance, a non-binding but powerful tool that uses science-based targets to eliminate greenwashing and to crowd private investment towards activities that significantly contribute to the Union's environmental and climate goals.

On the other hand, the delegated act to arbitrarily baptise fossil gas and nuclear power 'green' is perhaps the Commission's worst moment yet. It would terminally traumatise the integrity of the taxonomy by dynamiting its scientific foundation and destroy the Union's climate action credibility by sticking to the murderous fallacy of bending science to the experiences of markets, of expecting the earth system to enter into political compromises, of treating the climate emergency with 'business as usual'. Worse, it is an act of political chicanery as it lumps two different energy sources that may or may not have different transition uses into a single act in order to extract our votes.

Let us not allow this grave mistake. Let us object to this delegated act and let us save the taxonomy and wait for a better proposal.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Komisja określa najwyższe standardy środowiskowe dla nowych inwestycji w atom i gaz. Takie inwestycje gazowe będą musiały przejść na wodór lub zielony gaz do 2035 r., a kraje członkowskie muszą określić datę wyjścia z węgla. To dobre propozycje, zgodne z naszym Europejskim Ładem.

Trudno też posądzać Komisję i Parlament Europejski o sprzyjanie Rosji. To właśnie my od początku wojny wspieramy Ukrainę i sprzeciwiamy się barbarzyńskiej rosyjskiej wojnie.

To Parlament – byłem jednym z autorów tej poprawki – opowiedział się za całkowitym zakazem importu energii z Rosji. A w czerwcu, pierwszy raz w historii Unii, import gazu płynnego z USA przewyższył import gazu z Rosji. To efekt naszych parlamentarnych negocjacji z Kongresem i administracją Obamy prowadzonych w 2015 r.

I na koniec ważna uwaga dla nas. Rząd Ukrainy w oficjalnym stanowisku prosi nas, posłów, o poparcie jutro taksonomii. To nas zobowiązuje.

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, the taxonomy is the gold standard for sustainable investments. This is upheld by the existing very strict criteria for energy production. By adding nuclear at the same level as solar and wind, and having stricter criteria for biogas than for fossil gas, it's incomprehensible. This cannot be in line with the original law and its 'do no significant harm' principle. Not even the Commission's own experts are supporting it. They even believe that this inclusion risks the entire credibility of the taxonomy on the financial markets.

With a broader and weaker taxonomy, there will be less investment in solar and wind. The exact solution is to quickly become independent from Russia. Listen to Ukraine's Ambassador to Germany and reject this greenwashing of the taxonomy.

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

Emma Wiesner (Renew), inlägg ("blått kort"). – Även om det kanske inte är sista gången som du och jag debatterar, Jytte, så kanske det är sista gången på väldigt, väldigt länge. Därför vill jag ta tillfället i akt och tacka dig, Jytte, för ditt otroligt starka klimatengagemang, som kommer att saknas i detta hus när du åker hem till Sverige. Jag vill bara säga tack för din gärning och ditt starka klimatdriv! Ta med dig det hem och fortsätt kämpa för en taxonomi utan gas hemma i svenska riksdagen.

Jytte Guteland (S&D), blue-card answer. – Sorry I did not completely understand the first part of the sharing, so sorry, I did not have my headset. Thank you very much, Emma. I completely agree with you. We need to set a very high standard on all climate legislation, and that's exactly why we need to cooperate on this. And I really think the vote tomorrow is extremely important to make sure that we do not only have strict legislation that we work together on with the EU ETS, but that we also make sure that the financial markets support the sustainable solutions. And this is what we are doing tomorrow.

So please colleagues, listen to Emma and to us who really believe that this is important.

Linea Søgaard-Lidell (Renew). – Hr. formand! Kære kolleger. Det er nu, vi skal træffe et valg, der kan være fatalt for vores klimamål: Vi har nemlig sidste chance for at stoppe Kommissionens håbløse beslutning om at inkludere naturgas – et fossilt brændstof – i vores taksonomi for grønne investeringer. En beslutning, der er ren og skær greenwashing af naturgas. Det er ærlig talt en chance, som vi ikke må spilde! Ellers risikerer vi, at vi komme til at binde os til fossil energi længe efter, vi burde have udfaset det. Husk nu på, at taksonomien hverken bestemmer, hvad der skal investeres i, eller hvilken energi landene skal bruge. Den skal derimod sætte en guldstandard for, hvad der er en grøn investering, og den skal vise den private kapital, hvad man kan investere i, hvis man ønsker at hjælpe vores klimamål på vej.

Det skal ske rigtigt, for vi har brug for enorme investeringer, hvis vi som samfund skal lykkes med den grønne omstilling. Og hvis vi rent faktisk vil nå vores helt nødvendige klimamål. Det er alt, alt for vigtigt til, at sorte investeringer bliver kaldt for grønne. Så jeg håber, at I vil stemme ja til vores protest i morgen.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, just let me be clear, Commissioner, as far as I'm concerned, you have labelled fossil gas as a green investment, and this is the truth. So it now falls on us in this Chamber to stop this moral and economic madness.

These past few weeks, delegation after delegation of Ukrainian representatives have come to this House with one request: do not support more investments in gas. It only benefits Russian oligarchs. Our children and young adults are taking to the streets with one request: do not invest in more fossil fuels. It only benefits the wealthy. And yet tomorrow, many MEPs in this House will vote to define fossil gas as a green investment. Tomorrow, this House has the power to end this full-on, blatant greenwashing.

So I have another request in particular to some of my Irish MEPs: don't pander to the lobbyists, to the warmongers, to the oligarchs. Vote for real climate change by rejecting this proposal.

Georg Mayer (ID). – Herr Präsident, werte Kollegen! Jede Alternative zur Atomkraft ist eine bessere. Sogar die höchst ineffizienten Windkraftträder, die unsere Landschaften verschönern, sind eine bessere Alternative zur Atomkraft. Und ganz in der Nähe der österreichischen Grenze, nämlich in Krško, wird ein Atomkraftwerk betrieben, das noch aus sowjetischer Zeit bestand. Und wenn wir dort einen Zwischenfall erleben, dann brauchen wir uns in ganz Europa keine Sorgen mehr über CO₂-Verschmutzung zu machen.

Die Vorgehensweise der Kommission, wie wir sie hier sehen, ist wieder einmal eine demokratiepolitische Niederlage. Das ist eine Chuzpe der Sonderklasse, die wir hier erleben, ohne jetzt auf politische und wirtschaftliche Hintergründe eingehen zu können. Hier wird einer Atomenergie ein grünes Mascherl – eine Schleife – umgehängt, und das bedeutet de facto das Revival der Atomenergie im Jahr 2022, einer Atomkraft, mit der wir im Laufe unserer Geschichte nur negative Erfahrungen gemacht haben, und ich muss hier die Beispiele nicht alle aufzählen.

Fußten tut das Ganze auf einem *Inhouse*-Bericht der Europäischen Kommission, der nicht einmal darauf eingeht, wie man dann mit dem Atommüll umgehen könnte oder dass es auch eventuelle Zwischenfälle geben könnte. Von uns kommt hier ein ganz deutliches Nein zu dieser Taxonomie.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu antworten.)

Franc Bogovič (PPE), *dvig modrega kartončka*. – Gospod Mayer, eno enostavno vprašanje. Sem iz Krškega. V Krškem sem bil 13 let župan. Jedrska elektrarna v Krškem je Westinghouseova tehnologija. To je ameriška tehnologija. In ni korektno, da – tako kot že mnogokrat – zavajate javnost o neki ruski tehnologiji v Krškem.

Ta elektrarna je bila na stres testih uvrščena med najboljše jedrske elektrarne v Evropi. In prav tako je po vseh performansih, ki jih pregleduje stroka, med 10 % najboljših jedrskih elektrarn na svetu.

Georg Mayer (ID), *Antwort auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ja, geschätzter Kollege, da habe ich andere Informationen. Nachdem dieses Kernkraftwerk aus den 70er-Jahren stammt, wage ich doch stark zu bezweifeln, dass die Amerikaner im ehemaligen Jugoslawien ein Kernkraftwerk aufgestellt haben.

Robert Roos (ECR). – De poging van de linkse collega's hier om kernenergie uit de taxonomie te krijgen, is onverantwoord en hypocriet. Elke maand vergaderen we hier in Straatsburg en altijd zijn de notoire tegenstanders van kernenergie gewoon hier in Frankrijk aanwezig. Kennelijk voelt iedereen zich veilig genoeg om hier naartoe te komen. Dit land draait al veertig jaar veilig op kernenergie. Dat geldt ook voor de stroom in dit Parlement, en ook voor de stroom waarmee jullie hier je mobieltjes opladen.

Het eigen onderzoekscentrum van de EU zegt dat kernenergie niet schadelijker is dan *renewables*. Daarbij produceren kerncentrales continue energie. Het is dus beter dan zon en wind. Ook het IPCC en het Internationaal Energieagentschap zeggen dat we kernenergie nodig hebben.

Links gaat selectief om met de wetenschap. Ook dat is onverantwoord en hypocriet. Dag in, dag uit pleiten jullie hier om je eigen klimaatdoelstellingen te halen. Dan kunnen jullie jezelf alleen nog serieus nemen als jullie vóór kernenergie als deel van de oplossing stemmen.

Antonio Tajani (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'atto delegato della Commissione sulla tassonomia nella giusta direzione e trova il consenso del governo dell'Ucraina, che proprio oggi ha inviato un messaggio di sostegno a questa proposta al nostro Parlamento.

Includere il nucleare e il gas fra gli investimenti sostenibili serve ad accompagnarci verso una transizione energetica graduale e non ideologica. In questo momento serve serietà. L'autosufficienza energetica dell'Unione è una priorità, la guerra e l'inflazione ce lo dimostrano.

Approvvigionamenti energetici sicuri e a prezzi accessibili significa contrastare l'inflazione, rendere più competitive le nostre imprese e salvare migliaia di posti di lavoro. Va ricalibrato il mix di produzione energetica dell'Unione con il nucleare. Infatti, produciamo solo il 25 per cento dell'energia elettrica, questo è inaccettabile, ci vuole più coraggio, il nucleare servirà anche a paesi come l'Italia a recuperare un gap di decenni e utilizzare finalmente questa tecnologia. Per non parlare dei benefici che il nucleare produce alla ricerca e allo sviluppo creando potenziali nuove filiere e posti di lavoro, si pensi ai mini reattori di ultima generazione.

Lo stesso discorso vale per il gas, ma serve mettere un tetto al prezzo, perché questo diventa cruciale.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Als Europäisches Parlament haben wir bereits einmal die Rote Karte für Atomenergie und Gas gezeigt, und wir müssen das jetzt wieder tun. Die Taxonomie ist ein wichtiges Instrument zur Erreichung der Klimaziele, aber mit dem aktuellen Vorschlag wird die Glaubwürdigkeit der Taxonomie aufs Spiel gesetzt. Ein Grünfärben von Erdgas und von Atomenergie führt dazu, dass wir nicht nur das Vertrauen von Menschen verlieren. Wir verfehlen ganz klar das eigentliche Ziel der Verordnung.

Und es geht um noch mehr als den Umweltaspekt: Fragen aus der Arbeitswelt, der Sozialpartner, der Zivilgesellschaft. Wir wollen nicht nur, dass die grundlegenden Rechte von Umwelt und Mensch eingehalten werden, nein, wir wollen und wir fordern sozialen Fortschritt. Das kann nur mit einem ganzheitlichen Nachhaltigkeitskonzept, unter Einbindung von Gewerkschaften und der europäischen Zivilgesellschaft, erfolgen. Nur damit schaffen wir eine Taxonomie, wie wir sie wirklich brauchen und wirklich wollen.

Emma Wiesner (Renew). – Herr talman! Låt mig vara tydlig. Det finns ingenting hållbart med fossil energi. Det finns ingenting hållbart med fossilt. Det är enbart ett hyckleri att låtsas som det, och det är ett hyckleri som Liberalerna, Kristdemokraterna och Moderaterna nu ägnar sig åt genom att grönklassa och "greenwasha" fossil naturgas i EU:s taxonomiramverk. I sitt vurmande för kärnkraften har man förblindats i en sådan utsträckning att man väljer att anse den fossila energin vara hållbar.

Men låt mig vara tydlig. Det är daltandet och den naiva inställningen till fossil energi som har försatt oss i den klimatpolitiska och geopolitiska risk och kris som vi är i idag. Europas gaspolitik har havererat. Nu har vi chansen att äntligen göra upp med gasberoendet. Då hoppas jag att Liberalerna, Kristdemokraterna, Moderaterna – ja, alla svenska partier och alla parlamentariker här inne – väljer rätt sida om historien. Jag har valt sida för länge sedan. Jag vill se mindre fossil energi i Europa. Jag vill inte klassificera gas som hållbart för vi behöver ny energi.

(Talaren godtog att svara på ett inlägg ("blått kort").)

Tomas Tobé (PPE), inlägg ("blått kort"). – Det är ju välkänt att Emma Wiesner och Centerpartiet under lång tid har arbetat för en nedläggning av kärnkraften i Sverige. Men även ni har ju nu öppnat upp och ser att vi behöver ha mer kärnkraft för att vi ska kunna nå våra klimatmål. Det är åtminstone så ditt parti uttrycker sig numera hemma i Sverige.

Jag förstår ditt engagemang för att vi behöver komma bort ifrån gasen, men min seriösa fråga är följande: Även om vi nu satsar på förnybart, ser du inte behovet av mer kärnkraft och gas i den omställning som nu ska ske?

Emma Wiesner (Renew), svar ("blått kort"). – Men Tobé och Moderaterna, nu blandar ihop korten. Den här omröstningen handlar inte bara om kärnkraften, utan detta handlar om grön målningen av den fossila naturgasen. Och nej, jag tycker inte att det är värt det. Då får man göra om och man får göra rätt och lägga in kärnkraften i en separat fil. Men att blanda in den och grönklassificera fossil energi och kalla den för hållbar, och märka dina och mina pensionspengar med fossil gas som hållbara investeringar – det tycker jag är helt uppåt väggarna! Då måste man se klart och kunna hålla isär äpplen och päron. Det finns ingenting hållbart med fossil gas.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Ich appelliere an alle die noch nicht überzeugten liberalen und konservativen Abgeordneten hier im Haus: Wir haben morgen die einmalige Chance, Gas und Nuklear in der Taxonomie hier zu verhindern.

Jedes Kind weiß heute, dass Gas ein fossiler Energieträger ist und damit die Klimakrise verursacht und ganz bestimmt keine Lösung ist. Die Kriterien für Gas entsprechen im wesentlichen russischem Gas. Und die Erpressbarkeit und Energieabhängigkeit von eben diesem wird uns gerade zum Verhängnis. Jedes Kind weiß heute, dass Atomkraft gefährlich für Umwelt und Mensch ist, und Atommüll belastet unsere Generationen über Hunderte und Tausende Jahre hinaus.

Und es ist mittlerweile klar, dass Atomreaktoren zu bauen zu langsam ist, um die Klimakrise aufzuhalten, und zu teuer ist und es wesentlich günstiger ist, in erneuerbare Energien zu investieren. Und stoppen wir diese Verwässerung der Taxonomie, denn wir verlieren dadurch wertvolle Finanzierung durch Private. Wir verlieren dafür wertvolle Zeit und Glaubwürdigkeit gegen den Klimawandel.

Stimmen Sie mit uns für den Einspruch. Seien Sie Teil der Lösung und nicht Teil des Problems.

Filip De Man (ID). – Voorzitter, sommige collega's willen geen kerncentrales omdat we daarmee Poetin zouden steunen. Dat is een leugen, want er zijn veel andere leveranciers van kernbrandstof, bijvoorbeeld Canada en Australië.

Ondertussen heeft het groene fanatisme, waarbij kernenergie gediaboliseerd werd, het volgende resultaat opgeleverd: de Belgische premier moet bij ENGIE bedelen om kerncentrales open te houden. De Belgische groene minister moet gascentrales bijbouwen. Nederland gebruikt steeds meer steenkoolcentrales en in Duitsland gaat de regering nu volop bruinkool verbranden. Bruinkool! Straks moeten we misschien gedroogde koemest opstoken.

Voor wie zich afvraagt wat de overtreffende trap is van "stupid", is het antwoord "groen!" Erger is dat socialisten, christendemocraten en liberalen medeschuldig zijn aan die waanzin. Hopelijk worden de komende winters niet te streng, want dan zou voor de bevolking pijnlijk duidelijk worden hoe desastreus dit beleid tot nu toe is geweest.

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE). – Mr President, we all want to realise the transition to the green economy, we all want to pollute less, we all want to improve our energy efficiency, but we have to admit that reaching our climate targets is only possible if we use gas as a bridge technology and if we also use nuclear energy. Not compulsory for all Member States but allowing those Member States which wish to do so, allowing those Member States which, based on the conditions in their national Member States, choose to do so.

We are not imposing anything but we should allow Member States to choose their own energy mix. This should be the first thing that we realise. We can only realise the transition to a green economy, we can only reduce our energy dependency on Russia if we support this delegated act on taxonomy. Gas is a bridge technology, not from Russia but from other countries worldwide. We need more investments, which means that we need to give predictability to investors and this is what the delegated act will also allow for.

Furthermore, this delegated act is already a compromise. Indicators, they are tough. This is why it deserves the support of this House. It will bring more certainty and it will allow us to meet our long-term objectives.

César Luena (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, creo que se han equivocado. Se han equivocado en este acto delegado, se han equivocado en las formas, porque ni han seguido la consulta pública ni han hecho la evaluación de impacto y, sobre todo, se han equivocado en el fondo, porque lo están diciendo muchísimas diputadas y diputados: ni el gas ni la energía nuclear son verdes, y eso es evidencia científica. Por tanto, si no lo son, no se pueden meter en una taxonomía como tales. Pero, fíjese, es que incluso, aunque lo fueran, en el contexto actual, no nos conviene estratégicamente. Es absolutamente incoherente con la Ley del Clima, con el Pacto Verde y con la autonomía estratégica. Es que, aunque lo fueran, no nos conviene.

Se están ustedes equivocando y no rectifican. Y, por tanto, señorías, el Parlamento Europeo debe ayudar a la Comisión, por la buena imagen de la Unión Europea, a rectificar en la votación de mañana. Yo sé que hay muchas, muchos que tienen dudas, pero creo que se están dando aquí buenos argumentos. Y, sobre todo, la evidencia científica es uno de ellos. No son energías verdes, no deben estar en la taxonomía. El Parlamento debe corregir a la Comisión.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, la guerre en Ukraine a commencé il y a 130 jours, et depuis, nous avons acheté à M. Poutine près de 17 milliards d'euros de gaz et de pétrole. Nous sommes en pleine urgence climatique, confrontés à une crise énergétique inédite, mais aussi à une explosion du coût de la vie. Et certains dans cet hémicycle voudraient que l'on repeigne en vert le gaz et le nucléaire, avec ses déchets pour plus de 200 000 ans. À court terme, faire cela, c'est financer Poutine et donc prolonger cette guerre injuste. C'est financer le chaos. C'est dilapider des milliards d'euros dans des énergies du passé alors qu'il y a urgence à investir massivement dans les énergies renouvelables.

Le Secrétaire général des Nations unies, M. Guterres, a qualifié de folie morale et économique les investissements dans les productions des nouveaux combustibles fossiles et dans les centrales nucléaires. De tels investissements seront bientôt des actifs échoués et un fléau pour les portefeuilles d'investissement, avait-il ajouté. Nous avons une chance d'arrêter cette folie, c'est maintenant: rejetons cet acte délégué.

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Señor presidente, el desarrollo de las energías renovables es una pieza clave de la política energética de la Unión Europea. Pero, si realmente tenemos la determinación de alcanzar el objetivo de neutralidad climática en 2050, es indispensable contar con el gas y la energía nuclear. Así lo entiende la Comisión Europea en el acto delegado que se vota mañana. No cabe duda de que la energía nuclear está libre de emisiones y tampoco de que la capacidad tecnológica industrial para producir hidrógeno a gran escala necesita de instalaciones gasísticas. Pero, además, la Comisión no propone un cheque en blanco. En el caso del gas natural, solo se considerarían sostenibles, hasta 2030, las nuevas instalaciones para producir electricidad que sustituyan a otras más contaminantes. En cuanto a la energía nuclear, se consideran solo aquellas centrales que cuenten con un fondo para su desmantelamiento, así como instalaciones de almacenamiento de residuos.

Por todo ello, y teniendo en cuenta, además, la situación energética, económica y social en la que nos encontramos, creo que se debe apoyar el acto delegado de la Comisión.

SĚDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, ak by sme čelili situácii spred polroka, keď Komisia navrhla rozšíriť taxonómiu aj o plyn a jadro, námietku voči tomuto kroku by som podporil. Nové cenové a bezpečnostné výzvy v oblasti energetiky v dôsledku vojny na Ukrajine nás ale nútia pozrieť sa na celú vec trochu z iného pohľadu. Nezaradenie jadra a plynu by mohlo oslabiť našu energetickú bezpečnosť, vytvoriť tlak na ďalšie zvyšovanie cien a prehĺbiť chudobu. Mne je jasné, že nejde o zelené zdroje energie, ale v prechodnom období ich potrebujeme. Navyše, ak ideme nahrádzať ruský plyn, potrebujeme aj investície do infraštruktúry schopné prepraviť LNG od ďalekých termínalov aj do strednej Európy. Pokiaľ ide o jadro, zoberme si Nemecko, ktoré sa jadrovej energie nedávno vzdalo a teraz sa musí vracieť k uhlíu, čím asi znižovanie emisií neurýchli. Neschválenie tejto taxonómie vyšle signál súkromným investorom, že investovať do infraštruktúry súvisiacej s plynom a jadrom sa už neoplatí. Tým sa iba zvýši finančný tlak na také štáty ako Slovensko, ktoré budú o to viac musieť investovať do potrebných technologických zmien z peňazí svojich vlastných daňových poplatníkov.

In conclusion, I will summarise by saying that we have two choices. One is ideologically pure and the other is a compromise, but a rational and pragmatic one. I don't think that the second approach in any way reduces our decarbonisation targets.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Herr talman! Kommissionär! Kolleger! Europa står mitt i en energikris. Människor och företag drabbas hårt. Vi måste ställa om energipolitiken för att få rimliga kostnader, men också så klart för att vi ska nå våra klimatmål och komma bort från Europas beroende av Putin. Då måste investeringar styras inte enbart till förnybart och till energieffektiviseringar, utan även till kärnkraft samt i en övergångsfas också till gas under hårda kriterier. Allt annat vore oansvarigt att göra just nu.

Till alla er som säger att kärnkraften är för dyr eller att det tar för lång tid vill jag säga att ni ju heller inte har något att oroa er för. Men se då inte till att införa ett veto mot investeringar i kärnkraft. Det är därför jag hoppas att Europaparlamentet nu tar sitt förnuft till fånga och röstar nej till denna invändning.

Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, nous sommes tous d'accord pour affirmer que la lutte contre le changement climatique passera par la fin des énergies fossiles, objectif inatteignable sans le nucléaire.

Regardez la situation telle qu'elle est. D'ici 2050, rien qu'en France, la demande en électricité devrait augmenter de 35 % avec le développement des véhicules électriques ou d'une filière hydrogène propre. Parallèlement, la situation géopolitique nous contraint à faire de l'autonomie énergétique de notre continent une priorité absolue. Enfin, au moment où nous débattons, les moyens de production d'énergies renouvelables sont intermittents et ne peuvent répondre à une hausse soudaine de la demande. Face à cette réalité, les experts du GIEC et de la Commission européenne sont formels: la transition écologique ne se fera pas sans compléter les renouvelables par du nucléaire.

Alors demain, lors du vote, vous aurez le choix entre soutenir le nucléaire et le renouvelable pour sauver le climat, construire l'autonomie énergétique européenne et mettre fin aux énergies fossiles, ou bien enterrer le nucléaire, assumer notre dépendance au charbon et éteindre tout espoir de diminution de nos émissions de gaz à effet de serre.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Hr. formand! Altså, hvis vi nu hælder naturgas og kerneenergi ud af EU's taksonomi for bæredygtige investeringer, hvad er det så egentlig udtryk for? At vi, som dem der på vegne af vælgerne for kun to år siden, vedtog verdens mest ambitiøse klimalov, nu skyder målet om klimaneutralitet langt ind i fremtiden – langt efter det lovede 2050!

Så er vi også sådan nogle, som på trods af bedre og videnskabelig viden binder EU til kul og olie i længere tid end godt og muligt er. For det er jo faktisk sådan, at vi med netop taksonomien i hånden kan kræve, at gasværker, der modtager investeringer med taksonomien, skal benytte 100 procent vedvarende eller lavemissionsgas i 2036. Skal vi virkelig sige nej til den mulighed? Og skal vi se bort fra, at FN's klimapanel, IPCC, anbefaler os at inkludere kerneenergi på lige fod med andre vedvarende energityper? Og skal vi vende ryggen til EU's eget forskningscenter, som sidste år konkluderede, at kerneenergi er en bæredygtig energitype? Nej, det skal vi naturligvis ikke, og derfor skal vi sige nej til at sige nej!

Tom Berendsen (PPE). – Voorzitter, ons gemeenschappelijke doel is de wereld goed achterlaten aan onze kinderen. Daarvoor moeten we onze klimaatdoelen halen. De taxonomie is een uitnodiging aan private investeerders: investeer mee in ons schone energiesysteem van de toekomst. De taxonomie benoemt dus onder welke voorwaarden investeringen een positieve impact kunnen hebben op het klimaat. Voor kernenergie is dat vrij helder, want kernenergie speelt een belangrijke rol als stabiele en schone basis naast zon en wind.

Gas wordt in de taxonomie helemaal niet groen genoemd. De taxonomie stelt wel dat op sommige plekken in Europa onder strenge voorwaarden en waar geen alternatieven zijn, veel vuilere kolencentrales kunnen sluiten als we daar tijdelijk investeren in de schoonste gastechnieken, zodat mensen hun huis kunnen blijven verwarmen en we tegelijkertijd stappen zetten richting onze klimaatdoelen.

Het is een kwestie van realisme. Het is een kwestie van verantwoordelijkheid nemen. Als we onze klimaatdoelen willen halen, dan hebben we de luxe niet om technologieën uit te sluiten. Niet het eigen gelijk, maar het gemeenschappelijke doel dient voorop te staan.

Christophe Hansen (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, le vote sur l'acte délégué sur lequel on se prononcera demain ne sera pas un vote pour ou contre le nucléaire, ce ne sera pas un vote pour ou contre le gaz. Les deux sources d'énergie feront certainement partie de notre mix pour les dix années à venir.

Cependant, je suis d'avis qu'il est faux de dire que cet acte délégué diminuera les prix de l'énergie et les montants des consommations, parce qu'il s'agit en fait d'un instrument d'investissement. Et tout expert en investissement sait exactement que pour qu'un produit soit acheté, il faut que l'investisseur ait la confiance nécessaire. Werner Hoyer, le président de la BEI, dit que ce ne sera pas le cas, les fonds d'investissement le disent clairement aussi: il faut de la confiance. En plus, la Pologne, la Lituanie, la Lettonie, l'Estonie, la Belgique, l'Autriche ou encore le Portugal ne seront pas éligibles pour financer leur industrie du gaz. Pour le nucléaire, c'est encore moins, seuls trois États membres pourraient en profiter.

Je suis d'avis que cet acte délégué ne réduit nullement le problème de la dépendance énergétique et des prix de l'énergie. Il est obsolète avant même d'entrer en vigueur.

Radan Kanev (PPE). – Mr President, to save time. I will not discuss nuclear. Furthermore, I think nuclear has a place in the future of our energy, but definitely has no place in this package with gas.

So what about gas? There are certainly some gas projects that we could consider sustainable, namely those who are leading to less dependence on foreign suppliers. But we do not see those in this delegated act. What we see in the delegated act is the very technology which led us to today's prices of electricity and which led us, especially through TurkStream and Nord Stream 1 and 2, to the dramatic dependence on the Russian supply that we have now.

So, at the end of the day, I am not against nuclear and I am not against sustainable gas projects. But I see, frankly, no reason to support the delegated act as it is.

Цветелина Пенкова (S&D). – Г-н Председател, това не е дебат за ценности, това не е дебат за или против зелените цели, които всички ние сме си поставили и около които всички ние сме се обединили. Това е дебат дали да се даде възможност за временно финансиране на енергийни източници, които са от ключово значение за европейските граждани и индустрия.

Въпросът не е дали ще продължим да инвестираме в тях, защото те са нужни, въпросът е откъде ще дойдат средствата. Ще улесним ли възможността за частно финансиране на тези проекти? Ще създадем ли регулаторна рамка за генериране на свежи пари в енергийния сектор или ще натоварим държавните публични финанси, които в момента са ограничени и трябва да бъдат насочени за справяне с по-сериозни проблеми като икономическата и социална криза. Призовавам ви да гласувате за таксономията.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, I am supporting the objection. I listened carefully to the arguments on all sides and, while I am sure that gas and nuclear have a role in the transition, I cannot identify these as sustainable. I genuinely fear for the diversion of investment away from renewables. We have just completed the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive, directing companies to invest in a sustainable and clean future. So on the one hand we are taking away with the taxonomy, and then giving with the CSRD, and we're sending mixed messages to business.

On nuclear, the SCHEER Committee was asked by the Commission to review the Joint Research Centre. It referred to aspects of the JRC report as simplistic and incomplete, and concluded that it overlooked the potential impact on marine and coastal areas. So I'm supporting the objection because the EU must lead in this area, and I believe that the EU can do better.

Henrike Hahn (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Die EU-Taxonomie hat jetzt die Chance, ein echter EU-Goldstandard zu werden, eine Messlatte schlechthin für nachhaltige Investitionen. Wir brauchen eine Taxonomie, die wirklich glaubwürdig ist, ein Label, das zeigt: Wo nachhaltig draufsteht, ist auch nachhaltig drin.

Atomkraft und fossile Energie sind nicht nachhaltig. Jeder Euro, der für Strom und für Gas ausgegeben wird, festigt Strukturen, die wir langfristig so nicht wollen, und fehlt uns bei Sonne, bei Wind und bei Wasser.

In Zeiten eines Krieges in Europa sehen wir umso klarer, in welchen Schlamassel Erdgas und Atom uns bringen. Die Kernkraftwerke inmitten der Krisengebiete sind enorm gefährlich, und Putin benutzt die Gasversorgung als politisches Instrument gegen Europa. Wir wollen keine Abhängigkeit von Energieimporten aus Russland, weder bei fossilem Gas noch bei Uran noch bei nuklearen Brennstäben.

Was wir wollen, sind massive Investitionen in erneuerbare Energien und Finanzmärkte, die wirklich Appetit haben, mit glaubwürdigen Standards die Energiewende zu unterstützen. Deshalb kann es nur heißen: Ja zu einer Taxonomie ohne nukleare und fossile Energie.

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, vous avez parlé d'un moment de vérité. Et la vérité, en réalité, c'est que la planète est en train de brûler.

La vérité, c'est que dans ce contexte, vous êtes en train de mener une opération de greenwashing honteuse en classifiant le nucléaire et le gaz, qui est quand même la principale source d'émissions de gaz à effet de serre en Europe, comme des énergies vertes.

La vérité, c'est que même les experts de votre Commission ont déconseillé d'inclure le gaz et le nucléaire dans la taxonomie. La vérité, c'est qu'Emmanuel Macron est à la manœuvre en s'alliant avec l'extrême droite d'Orbán pour détruire la planète.

La vérité, c'est que la taxonomie est aussi un cadeau pour Poutine, qui va continuer à se faire une mine d'or en vendant son gaz pour financer sa guerre.

La vérité, c'est que les lobbies ne s'y sont pas trompés et que vous avez cédé à ces entreprises énergétiques en les rencontrant pas moins de huit fois.

Bref, la vérité, Madame la Commissaire, c'est que vous avez fait le choix de détruire notre avenir. Mais la vérité, c'est que vous avez dans cet hémicycle des groupes qui sont décidés à ne pas se laisser faire et qui sont décidés à bloquer la route à ce danger pour la planète et pour notre avenir.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Spoštovana komisarka, iskrena hvala za to, da ste pripravili delegiran dokument, s katerim v prvi fazi določamo zelene tehnologije, tehnologije, ki omogočajo proizvodnjo nizkoogljične električne energije, pa tudi tehnologije, ki omogočajo prehod v nizkoogljično družbo.

Zakaj bom podprl dokument? Zato, ker prvič sem/smo odgovorni za energetska varnost in neodgovorna energetska politika v Nemčiji, ki so jo kolegi socialisti in zeleni zastavili v letu 2000, nas je pripeljala ne samo v energetska, temveč tudi v vojaško odvisnost od Putina. Zato bom glasoval za ta delegiran akt.

Jedrsko energija je nizkoogljična energija. Danes je 50 % vse proizvedene nizkoogljične energije v Evropi jedrske. Podpiram tudi seveda širitev vetrne, sončne energije, vendar žal ne omogoča zelenega prehoda in ga lahko omogočamo samo s tem, da v prehodnem obdobju uporabimo plin, na malce daljši rok pa tudi jedrsko energijo.

Podpiram tehnološko nevtralnost. Podpiram tudi stroko, ki je za ta dokument, za razliko od baterij in sončnih celic, ugotovila, da ne vplivajo na našo varnost niti med obratovanjem niti ob primernem skladiščenju, ki je pogoj za jedrsko energijo tudi na dolgi rok. In želim enakopravno obravnavo teh tehnologij, samo še en stavek, na drugi strani pa tudi neodvisnost od Rusije, kajti danes je že več kot pol plina iz Amerike.

Michal Wiezik (Renew). – Vážený pán predseda, úloha zelenej taxonomie bola úplne jasný, jednoznačný a presný zoznam zelených, obnoviteľných a udržateľných technológií. Je veľký záujem investovať do takýchto technológií a je veľmi potrebné investovať do takýchto technológií, pretože definujú našu cestu za záchranu klímy. Zaradenie plynu a jadra do zoznamu tento zoznam oslabuje, používateľa zoznamu zneisťuje a zavádza. Preto hlasujem za námietku. Nie je to hlasovanie proti plánu či jadrú. V žiadnom prípade tieto zdroje nechceme zakázať, no je to hlasovanie proti natieraniu týchto technológií na zeleno. Každé jedno euro, ktoré v sebaklame vyčleníme na tieto technológie ako na zelené, bude v konečnom dôsledku chýbať pri podpore skutočne zelených technológií o ktoré v prvom rade ide. Preto hlasujeme za jasné pravidlá. Hlasujeme za fakty, za zeleného riešenia a nehlasuje za *Greenwashing*, hlasujem za námietku voči taxónov.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, a taxonomia insere-se numa abordagem da qual discordamos. Ela é parte de um processo de financeirização do ambiente que envolve, entre outros aspetos, a canalização de significativos fluxos financeiros para os negócios emergentes em torno do ambiente.

Segundo os defensores desta abordagem de mercado, o virtuosismo destes negócios levará à consecução das metas ambientais. Aos poderes públicos não consegue senão dar os adequados sinais ao mercado, ele tratará do resto. A taxonomia pretende ser esse sinal dado ao mercado.

A Comissão Europeia, como sempre, comporta-se como uma espécie de notário dos interesses económicos, que, neste caso, até são contraditórios. Já não surpreende ninguém, *business as Ursula*.

Ora, a esta visão errada, contraproducente e perniciosa, contrapomos uma outra que confere centralidade e protagonismo aos poderes públicos na tomada de decisão, na regulamentação, nos investimentos, no enquadramento normativo da ação do setor privado, na definição das metas e, muito importante, nas formas mais adequadas para a sua consecução. (Termino já)

O problema não está apenas numa qualquer lista de escolha implícita, vai muito para além dela.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, pour conclure ce débat, nous l'avons dit, c'est un moment de vérité qui se dessine.

Ce soir, nous avons entendu des collègues qui se disent écologistes et qui sont prêts à sacrifier la filière énergétique sans laquelle, dit le GIEC, nous ne pourrions pas sauver le climat.

Nous avons entendu des collègues socialistes prêts à sacrifier la filière énergétique qui permettra demain de maîtriser les coûts de l'énergie, qui sont en train de s'envoler aujourd'hui pour les ménages, pour les familles, pour nos entreprises, pour nos industries.

Nous avons entendu des collègues qui prétendent défendre la démocratie et qui pourtant sont prêts, en supprimant la filière nucléaire, à nous rendre encore plus dépendants de ces États autoritaires qui possèdent aujourd'hui le gaz, le pétrole et les terres rares.

Chers collègues, demain nous serons tous devant notre responsabilité. C'est un vote historique qui se dessine. Ce sera l'occasion de montrer non seulement notre engagement dans l'avenir de notre continent, qui a commencé avec l'union de l'énergie, de la Communauté européenne du charbon et de l'acier, mais ce sera aussi le moment de montrer la sincérité de nos convictions, notre capacité à regarder en face la réalité, à prendre en considération les faits, à écouter la raison. C'est aussi une certaine idée de la démocratie qui se dessine dans notre vote de demain.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Czasami jeżdżę samochodem do Brukseli albo do Strasburga. Tysiąc kilometrów jadę przez Niemcy, po lewej i prawej stronie widzę farmy fotowoltaiczne albo farmy wiatrowe. Częściowo jadę czasem samochodem przez Holandię i także widzę same farmy wiatrowe. Ostatnio słyszałem, że Islandia, która jest całkowicie niezależna od gazu i od węgla, kupowała energię, bo zabrakło wiatru i słońca.

Proszę Państwa, o czym my rozmawiamy? Rozmawiamy po prostu o tym, że czasem są sytuacje bardzo niebezpieczne, bardzo nieprzewidywalne w Unii Europejskiej. Ja popieram i mój rząd także popiera stanowisko Komisji Europejskiej, że my musimy w Unii Europejskiej być przygotowani na kryzysy. Te kryzysy po prostu się zdarzają.

A wszystkim tym, którzy chcą, żeby odrzucić finansowanie inwestycji gazowych czy inwestycji w energię nuklearną, chciałbym zadedykować informację, ile osób w Unii Europejskiej nie ma ciepłej wody, ile osób mieszka w nieogrzewanych mieszkaniach. Weźcie to, Państwo, pod uwagę. Jeśli zlikwidujecie tego typu inwestycje, to zapanuje w Unii Europejskiej bieda i to jest przerażające.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komissaari, jotta pääsemme eroon fossiilisesta energiasta, Euroopan on investoitava kaikkiin vähäpäästöisiin energialähteisiin, mukaan lukien ydinvoima. Jo tällä hetkellä puolet Euroopan päästöttömästä sähköstä tulee ydinvoimasta ja tiedämme, että sähkön tarve tulee tulevaisuudessa vain kasvaamaan. Näin ollen on syytä tukea tässä komission linjaa, jossa katsotaan, että ydinvoiman uudisinvestoinnit, samoin kuin käyttöajan pidennykset tietyillä edellytyksillä, ovat kestäviä investointeja. Se on oikea linja, mutta ymmärrän hyvin myös niitä kollegoita, jotka ovat huolissaan ydinjätteen loppusijoituksesta niissä maissa, joissa sitä ei ole ratkaistu, ja se on syytä myös ratkaista. Omassa kotimaassani Suomessa on ensimmäisenä maailmassa järjestetty ydinjätteen loppusijoitus. Siitä tehtiin päätös jo 30 vuotta sitten. Ydinjätettä tullaan hautaamaan peruskallioon, ja tuo alue tullaan ottamaan käyttöön muutaman vuoden kuluttua. Komissaari on käynyt siellä vierailmassakin. Näitä ratkaisuja tarvitaan.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, what we have here is another example of EU doublespeak. We say we want to move away from fossil fuels, but to do that we're going to allow essentially free money to invest in fossil fuels by allowing gas into taxonomy and therefore ensuring their continued use at the expense of other green alternatives. It's absolute nonsense, and it's nonsense put forward by the same people who are responsible for our over-reliance on gas in the first place, by our failure to invest in renewables and our failure to pursue a strategy of degrowth.

But when we see the lobbying that has gone on around this vote, we really get to understand the vested interests that are at stake here. But invoking Ukraine, I have to say, is the last straw for me. We talk an awful lot in here about foreign interference, but the lecture from the Ukrainian Government which we received at lunchtime, telling us to support this greenwashing in order to show support for Ukraine, I think is a new low. Calling for the promotion of Ukrainian gas is no less economically damaging than that of Russian gas. The planet won't distinguish. We have to support the objection.

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigas.)

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you very much and thank you, colleagues. Thank you for this debate. It was long, it was well argued, and it was important that we had this conversation. I think the last speaker referred to a letter from the Ukrainian Minister of Energy, and I want to thank the Minister for the statement he made and I will quote the letter where he says, 'I strongly believe that the inclusion of gas and nuclear in the taxonomy is an important element of the energy security in Europe, especially with a view to replacing Russian gas.' And I don't think we should second-guess this letter. We should read and hear what he has said.

My second clarification is around this accusation that what we are doing is a gift to Vladimir Putin. I hope we have enough respect for each other in this Chamber to say that that is not the case, that this is, in fact, a realistic proposal to deal with great urgency, the matter of our transition towards a more sustainable future.

I repeat the very fact that our taxonomy, which is law, already – already! – points to renewables as the priority. We need to invest immediately more money in the renewable energy sector, but we also need to be realistic and accept that we will need to invest in gas and nuclear in transition. And very few who oppose this work on the CDA have listened to that word 'transition'.

My next comment refers to those who have concerns for the financial sector because they might not be clear. Well, frankly, the financial sector has a duty to channel investments in renewables, and they are well able and well-staffed to understand our taxonomy in all its nuances. I don't think they need our sympathy. And separately, investors will have clarity, absolute clarity, if there is a financial product that contains an investment in gas or nuclear. There will be no greenwashing. And that is something that you must accept, what I am saying here today.

What's been interesting for me is that there are different views right across this House. So families are divided. Families at home are divided on these energy sources. We would like immediately to stop using all fossil fuels, but let's understand what's happening today because of the war, the illegal invasion and the horrors that are inflicted in Ukraine. Member States that had closed coal-fired power plants are re-opening them. And this is not something we want to see.

Equally, we do not want to see that there will be only investments in gas and nuclear, but we want them to happen in the transition. More importantly, we want them to happen with conditions that are strict. There will be No Wild West in terms of private investments.

If this delegated act is rejected – and I stand in front of this House and will accept fully the vote of this House as a former Member and will watch it very carefully – it means that we have nothing to say on these energy sources. There will be no conditionality because there will be investment.

I urge all of you who took a pragmatic and realistic approach to the Climate Delegated Act, which is now law, which I thank you for, to take the same pragmatic and realistic approach to this issue, the Complementary Delegated Act, and reject this motion of rejection. This is important for our future and I ask you to consider your vote, which I am sure you will, with the care and attention it absolutely deserves.

President. – Thank you very much, Commissioner. The debate on this issue is closed and the vote will take place tomorrow.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Andrus Ansip (Renew), *kirjalikult.* – Euroopa Komisjon tegi märtsis ettepaneku lisada gaasi- ja tuumaenergia investeeringud keskkonnasäästlike majandustegevuste loetellu. Ettepaneku eesmärk on hoogustada rohelist investeeinguid. Juunis hääletas aga Euroopa Parlamendi majandus- ja keskkonnakomisjon Euroopa Komisjoni ettepaneku vastu. Komisjoni määrus jõustub automaatselt juhul, kui Euroopa Parlament ei esita sellele vastuväidet. Taksonoomia finantsmaailmas tähendab majandustegevuste liigitust vastavalt sellele, kas investeeringud on kestlikud või mitte. Põhimõtteliselt taksonoomia ei keela ega käsi kellelgi midagi teha. Kestliku rahastamise taksonoomia järgimine on turuosalistele vabatahtlik. Küll aga peavad börsiettevõtted teavitama, kas ja millises ulatuses nad taksonoomiat järgivad, nii et finantsturgudele seal otseselt kindlasti mõju on. Võrreldes loodusliku gaasiga saastavad kivisüsi ja põlevkivi keskkonda neli korda rohkem. Komisjon on ette pannud klassifitseerida üleminekumeetmena investeeringud maagaasi kestlikeks. Tuumaenergia puhul ei väida keegi, et tuumaenergiajaamad emiteerivad süsinikdioksiidi. Aga samas kõik teavad ka seda, et ega tuumakütus taastuv kütus ei ole. Küsimus on, kas seda kestlikuks lugeda või mitte. Pean praeguses energiakriisis vajalikuks liigitada investeeringud tuumaenergiasse ning üleminekukütusena looduslikku gaasi kestlikeks. Mitmed finantsasutused on juba teatanud, et ei plaani taksonoomia liigitust järgima hakata. Mingit väga radikaalset muutust sellest hääletamisest tulemas ei ole. Hääletan sellele vastuväitele vastu.

Gunnar Beck (ID), *schriflich.* – Der EU Green Deal und das Programm Fit for 55 sehen vor, dass die EU bis 2050 klimaneutral werden muss. Das wird natürlich seine Folgen für Investitionen haben.

Europäische Finanzinstitute und Unternehmen werden massiv in nachhaltige Technologien investieren müssen. Aber wer entscheidet, was nachhaltig ist und was nicht? Hier kommt die EU-Taxonomie ins Spiel: Sie klassifiziert alle möglichen Wirtschaftstätigkeiten in der EU nach ihrer ökologischen Nachhaltigkeit. Die Kommission schlug vor, Gas und Kernenergie als Übergangsenergiequellen zur Erreichung der CO₂-Neutralität in die Taxonomie aufzunehmen. Das Europäische Parlament lehnt diese Einbeziehung entschieden ab und stimmt nun gegen die Einbeziehung von Gas und Kernenergie. Das bedeutet, dass man nicht mehr in diese Energiequellen investieren kann.

Die AfD ist der festen Überzeugung, dass Gas und Atomkraft Teil der Lösung für eine grünere Wirtschaft sind, nicht Teil des Problems. Wir brauchen mehr Investitionen in die neueste Generation von Kernkraftwerken und mehr Forschung für die Einrichtung von Thoriumkraftwerken. Indem wir Investitionen in Gas und Kernkraft verbieten, versetzen wir Europa zurück in die Steinzeit.

Laura Ferrara (NI), *per iscritto.* – La scelta di includere gas e nucleare nell'elenco delle attività ecosostenibili della tassonomia verde rischia di minare l'intera credibilità di tutto l'impianto normativo che punta sulla green economy. Come M5S ribadiamo il nostro NO deciso a tale inclusione.

Il gas è un combustibile fossile che emette CO₂, una fonte energetica climalterante che ci crea dipendenza dalla Russia e da altri Stati terzi. Le centrali nucleari pongono rilevantissimi problemi di sicurezza e di gestione delle scorie radioattive. Le nuove tecnologie nucleari che garantirebbero maggior sicurezza e una produzione ancora più verde, di fatto ancora non esistono. I costi di costruzione e manutenzione degli impianti rimangono elevati e lunghi sono i tempi di realizzazione.

Pur consapevoli dei problemi di approvvigionamento energetico che l'Europa ed il mondo sta fronteggiando, riteniamo tuttavia che chi vuole contribuire a contrastare il cambiamento climatico e tutelare ambiente e salute debba fare scelte coraggiose, non più rinviabili, puntando sulle fonti rinnovabili e non distraendo copiosi investimenti dalle energie pulite.

Solo perseguendo i reali obiettivi del Green Deal europeo e tralasciando i compromessi al ribasso, la tassonomia sarà un riferimento per il mondo della finanza, per i governi e per le aziende.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), *na piśmie.* – Uzupełniający akt delegowany wprowadza do systemu taksonomii energetykę jądrową i gaz. To dobra wiadomość. Taksonomia – określając, które działalności mogą być uznane za „zielone” – wpływa na możliwości uzyskania finansowania na rynku. Wskazuje więc, które technologie są dopuszczalne.

Nie ma racjonalnego wytłumaczenia dla pozostawienia poza systemem taksonomii energii jądrowej. Spalanie gazu ziemnego emituje gazy cieplarniane. Natomiast energetyka jądrowa jest technologią praktycznie bezemisyjną i przyjazną dla środowiska podobnie jak technologie odnawialne. Rozwój energetyki atomowej przyczyni się do zwiększenia bezpieczeństwa energetycznego państw członkowskich UE. Jest odpowiedzią na obecny kryzys energetyczny. Może zapewnić taką ilość energii elektrycznej, która pozwoli zmniejszyć zależność od importu paliw kopalnych z państw trzecich, w tym w szczególności z Rosji.

Fakt, że Zielony Ład nie uwzględnia energetyki jądrowej, to kolejny dowód, że to projekt skrajnie ideologiczny. Dotknie wszystkie dziedziny gospodarki, a zapłacą za to oczywiście społeczeństwa. Nic sobie nie robi z bezpieczeństwa energetycznego, wzrostu cen energii czy inflacji. Nie można tu nie wspomnieć, że wciąż nowe cele klimatyczne forsowane są w sytuacji, kiedy cała UE odpowiada za mniej niż 9% światowych emisji CO₂. Energetyka jądrowa jest szansą na ustabilizowanie cen, a co za tym idzie nie tylko na bezemisyjną, ale i tanią oraz powszechnie dostępną energię.

Mihai Tudose (S&D), *în scris*. – În plin război energetic, unii vor ca Europa să-și tragă singură un glonț în picior. Cam asta înseamnă, în opinia mea, contestarea propunerii Comisiei Europene de a include sectoarele gazelor naturale și energiei nucleare în taxonomia UE.

Obiecția pusă pe agenda acestei sesiuni plenare e determinată fie de inadecvarea la noua realitate geopolitică, fie de individualismul unor state lipsite de resurse naturale, ca să nu bănuim și alte implicații...

Votul din Parlamentul European lasă, însă, cale liberă actului delegat al Comisiei Europene, prin care investițiile în gaze naturale și energie nucleară pot fi finanțate din fonduri UE, ca activități de tranziție, pentru a înlocui cărbunele și petrolul. La urma urmei, se redeschid mine de cărbune în UE, pentru a face față crizei energetice, și unora le repugnă gazul și nuclearul, mai puțin poluante!...

Se apropie o iarnă fără precedent în Europa postbelică, în care utopia verde nu va ține de cald cetățenilor și nu va alimenta economia. De aceea, consider periculoasă intenția declarată a guvernelor austriac și luxemburghez de a ataca actul delegat al Comisiei Europene la Curtea de Justiție a UE.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Europa gaat voor een historische groene transitie, maar we moeten rekening houden met de geopolitieke turbulentie en onzekerheid over onze energiebevoorrading die Poetin uitlokt door de oorlog in Oekraïne.

De taxonomie is een handboek voor investeringen om Europa op weg te helpen naar haar klimaatdoelstellingen en klimaatneutraal te worden tegen 2050. Op dit moment verschilt de energiemix in Europa van lidstaat tot lidstaat. Sommige landen zijn nog intensieve gebruikers van steenkool, terwijl andere landen al verder staan in de omslag naar hernieuwbare energie. Het voorstel houdt daarmee rekening. Om lidstaten te helpen in hun transitie naar klimaatneutraliteit, stelt de Europese Commissie voor om gas en kernenergie deel uit te laten maken van de taxonomie als overgang naar hernieuwbare energiebronnen. De voorwaarden zijn streng en beperkt in de tijd, het is voor alle duidelijkheid geen wildcard voor gas en kernenergie.

De EU-taxonomie is een instrument dat meer transparantie zal verschaffen en op vrijwillige basis door marktdeelnemers gebruikt kan worden, het verplicht de lidstaten niet tot de ene of de andere investering, want de energiemix blijft een nationale bevoegdheid. Gezien de aard en focus van het instrument, steun ik het voorstel van de Europese Commissie en stemde ik tegen het blokkeringsvoorstel.

Iuliu Winkler (PPE), *în scris*. – Comisia Europeană propune includerea energiei nucleare și a gazelor naturale în taxonomia UE privind finanțarea durabilă. Acest pas este crucial pentru capacitatea UE de a-și atinge obiectivele de mediu. Doar cu această completare și prin noi investiții, UE va fi pregătită pentru „Fit for 55”.

Statele membre au început să se îndepărteze de gazul rusesc, dar pentru a putea renunța definitiv, avem nevoie de noi investiții în terminale pentru GPL și în infrastructura energetică. Pentru transformarea industriei și a mix-ului energetic, statele membre au nevoie de energie nucleară și de gaz natural, care este combustibilul de tranziție.

Ucraina, stat candidat la aderare, tocmai a început să exporte energie în UE, evoluție esențială acum când dezbatem planurile de reconstrucție ale acestei țări. Industria nucleară ucraineană are nevoie ca taxonomia UE să includă prevederile prezentate de Comisie.

În privința României, includerea energiei nucleare și a gazului natural în taxonomia UE sunt esențiale pentru securitatea energetică și capacitatea țării noastre de a asigura populației și întreprinzătorilor resurse de energie la un preț acceptabil care să păstreze competitivitatea economică și să prevină întreruperea lanțurilor de aprovizionare.

Voi vota împotriva obiecției și susțin cu fermitate includerea energiei nucleare și a gazului natural în taxonomia europeană.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – O Parlamento Europeu deve manifestar a sua objeção nos termos do artigo 111.º, n.º 3, do Regimento à alteração do Ato Delegado relativo à dimensão climática da Taxonomia e do Ato Delegado relativo às revelações em matéria de Taxonomia, desde logo pela forma legislativa escolhida para proceder a uma alteração determinante como a classificação como energias sustentáveis do gás e da energia nuclear. Uma decisão como esta, num contexto em que é tomada, deveria ser debatida previamente na sociedade europeia, e em particular no Parlamento Europeu.

O gás natural é importante para a transição energética. A diversificação de abastecimento é uma prioridade imediata. Mas a diversificação como resposta ao contexto de guerra tem que ser combinada com a autonomia que só as energias renováveis, e designadamente o hidrogénio verde, podem assegurar. Essa articulação é fundamental, sob pena de uma parte substantiva do investimento classificado como sustentável ser canalizado para as energias fósseis de transição e não para as energias verdes de solução, fragmentando o mercado.

Também o nuclear não deve ser tabu, mas os modelos de exploração e distribuição no território devem ser debatidos antes de se poder considerar o nuclear uma solução sustentável para a transição energética.

15. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Bośni i Hercegowiny (debata)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Paulo Rangel ziņojumu Ārlietu komitejas vārdā par 2021. gada ziņojumu par Bosniju un Hercegovinu (2021/2245(INI)) (A9-0188/2022).

I would like just to remind you that I will not read all the procedural points which everybody knows, so just please take into account that we are working through the ordinary topics on the agenda as regards where to speak. I will tell you how long you have to speak when I give you the floor.

Michael Gahler, *deputising for the rapporteur*. – Mr President, Bosnia and Herzegovina is at a crossroads in its European path. After a year of political deadlocks and secessionist movements, the political agreement reached in Brussels on 12 June and the most recent Council conclusions are strong signs of the EU's commitment to the European and Euro-Atlantic future of the country. The European Council has declared its readiness to grant candidate status to Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is a crucial moment for the country, for the Western Balkans and for Europe.

While these are welcome developments, we must not forget the challenges ahead. The country still needs to implement a number of reforms and fulfil several necessary criteria. The Council has said so by inviting the Commission to report immediately on the implementation of the 14 key priorities. Strengthening the independence of the judiciary, the rule of law and the fight against organised crime and corruption will be central to this positive assessment. The two main challenges that Bosnia Herzegovina currently faces are not technical but political. The secessionist movements orchestrated by the leadership of the Republika Srpska and the impasse in negotiations on electoral and constitutional reforms which will bring Bosnia Herzegovina in line with European norms. These two challenges have caused an almost permanent deadlock of state institutions that required the intervention of the High Representative and a reinforcement of Operation Althea. Solving these blockages and bringing functionality back to the state is of paramount importance. Therefore, the Council must follow the example set by the US and the UK and sanction Milorad Dodik, someone who, only days after committing himself to reforms in Brussels, flew to St Petersburg to meet Vladimir Putin and continues to refuse to condemn the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. The Kremlin's assets around Europe and the world are being sanctioned. Mr Dodik must be as well.

The withdrawal from state institutions and the creation of parallel ones are a violation of the Constitution and the Dayton Peace Agreement and inevitably prevent any advance towards EU integration. That is also why we must support the Office of the High Representative and Operation Althea, which are vital to maintain the peace and stability of Bosnia Herzegovina. Their mandates must be renewed and if they are not, other means must be explored and be at our disposal, including NATO. The European Union's funding must also be modulated in light of these threats.

The electoral and constitutional reforms have also not yet been realised, despite significant mediation by the EU and the US. There was a lack of political will to overcome differences and reach a balanced agreement. That is why we welcome the political agreement reached in Brussels, which will allow the country to progress decisively on its European path. The legacy of the Dayton Peace Agreement must be preserved, but the country must also implement repeated rulings by national and international courts and bodies to guarantee equality and non-discrimination.

Most importantly, we must acknowledge the long-standing European aspirations of all citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Bosniaks, Croats, Serbs, Jews, Roma and all other citizens who will benefit immensely with these key reforms. It is their legitimate choices and aspirations that need to be respected. And that is why free and fair elections must take place next October. Funds have now been secured, and we call on all political actors to take part and allow the citizens to express their democratic choices.

And so, despite these challenges, we should appreciate the renewed European focus on the Western Balkans and understand its unmistakable importance in Europe's new strategic and security context. The peace, stability and prosperity of Bosnia Herzegovina depend on our support and on the country's European perspective.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first let me thank the rapporteur, Paolo Rangel, for his work and the honourable Mr Gahler for his presentation.

The European Council on 23 June has been very clear. EU leaders are ready to grant the status of candidate country to Bosnia and Herzegovina if the country meets the substantial set of reforms that are necessary. Now Bosnia and Herzegovina has to deliver. We expect to see tangible reforms in view of fulfilling the 14 key priorities from the Commission's opinion. These key priorities, as we know, cover reforms in the areas of democracy and functionality, the rule of law, fundamental rights and public administration reform.

The Commission stands ready to report, as requested by the European Council, on the implementation of the opinion's key priorities. Let there be no doubt that Bosnia and Herzegovina has a clear European perspective as a single, united and sovereign country. The full functioning of state institutions is key for its EU path. Following Russia's war of aggression on Ukraine, Bosnia and Herzegovina has confirmed its European commitment by aligning with EU statements and sanctions on Russia and Belarus. The Commission welcomes this.

However, this year was one more lost year. Instead of concrete progress, we have seen growing political divisions throughout the country, which are affecting also the everyday life of people and businesses. We need constructive dialogue and political will from all sides to move forward on the EU path.

Bosnia and Herzegovina's institutions have remained blocked for too long. The continued boycott has jeopardised significant investments, including investments coming from the Economic and Investment Plan for the Western Balkans. I expect the representatives of Republika Srpska to put an end to the political crisis and to ensure the full functioning of the state institutions. Only then will the Commission sign the contribution agreements for the Corridor Vc road and rail investments located in the Republika Srpska entity.

In the past few months we have seen many reforms stalled or voted down in the parliament. This was the case of the amendments aimed at improving electoral standards, those aimed at enhancing integrity in the judiciary and of the draft law on conflict of interest. Also, a lot of hope and efforts have been put into the talks on the electoral and constitutional reform, but a solution could not be found. Now fair, free and inclusive elections must take place in October as scheduled. Only by concretely delivering on reforms will Bosnia and Herzegovina demonstrate that it deserves candidate status.

Bosnia and Herzegovina needs to move forward on all key priorities. Bosnia and Herzegovina is key for the future of the Western Balkans. The region's future is in the European Union. Instead of in-fighting, the country should focus on the positive and constructive European agenda. This is the agenda with real gains and real benefits for everyone. It is the agenda that brings prosperity, stability and peace, and it is the agenda on which we need to work together.

The Commission stands ready to support Bosnia and Herzegovina in this endeavour with all its instruments. I thank you for your attention and I am looking forward to our discussion.

Željana Zovko, u ime kluba PPE. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani povjereniče, mi smo se nekada razumjeli. Živjeli smo u jednoj zemlji gdje je zakon većine donio do velikog raspada te iste zemlje. Nije to tako davno bilo, nisam ni ja tako stara, ni vi. Još se sjećamo tog trenutka.

Bosna i Hercegovina je zemlja koja je nastala na Daytonsko-pariško mirovnom sporazumu, sporazumu koji je označio mir jednog krvavog sukoba kojega danas gledamo. To je bilo '95. Ja sam kao izbjeglica bila u Londonu do '99. kada su bombe prestale, u londonskom *tubeu* kada je napravljen *Good Friday Agreement*. Ovdje raspravljamo o tome da li trebamo čuvati Daytonsko-pariški mirovni sporazum ili da li trebamo ući u još jednu novu krizu.

Sutra se sastaju čelnici političkih lidera Srba, Bošnjaka i Hrvata u Bruxellesu. Ja očekujem jedan pozitivan dogovor da se nakon izbora, koji se održavaju u 10. mjesecu, koji će biti, nažalost, implementirani bez dogovora o izbornom zakonu. Da li ćemo ući u još jednu dublju krizu ili će izbori označiti nastavak mira, nastavak jednog dugog puta prema Europskoj uniji ili ćemo ostat... (*Predsjedavajući je govornici oduzeo riječ*)

Dietmar Köster, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, Bosnia and Herzegovina need an EU perspective. The Bosnian citizens want to belong to the EU. Bosnia and Herzegovina should be granted candidate status to achieve this. BiH has to implement reforms against corruption and strengthen the rule of law.

Following the 14 key priorities, BiH needs due functioning of democratic institutions, good governance and fundamental rights. Bosnian leaders must focus on the reforms to provide all people decent living conditions, regardless of what ethnic group they belong to. Abusing different ethnic origins and feelings, most of the leading politicians keep the country in limbo. I'm happy that the election will take place in October, and I hope that as many citizens as possible will participate.

BiH must have a future in the EU. In view of the current fundamental geopolitical upheaval this would be in the interests of BiH and the EU, but we should bear in mind that in the context of the enlargement process, the EU must reform itself.

Klemen Grošelj, v imenu skupine Renew. – Spoštovani! Po več kot dveh letih dela na Bosni in Hercegovini lahko ugotovim, da naše evropsko delovanje v BiH ni niti geopolitično niti strateško. Zamudili smo zgodovinsko priložnost, da bi državi, ki je kljub vsem grožnjam, oviram, napovedim secesije, željam po tretji entiteti, še kaj bi se našlo, ohranila stabilnost in bi skupaj z vlogo, ki jo zaseda v regiji, več kot zaslužila status kandidatke. A ne, v EU tega ne zmore ne Svet EU, ne ta hiša, ne Komisija.

Kot pijanec plota se oklepamo 14 reformnih pogojev, ki so nastali v povsem drugačnem političnem in predvsem varnostnem kontekstu. Medtem ko Nato jasno in nedvoumno opredeljuje strateški pomen BiH za varnost in stabilnost ne samo Zahodnega Balkana, ampak celotne Evrope, se mi Evropejci opotekamo v gozdu različnih interesov, ki so v veliki meri zastrupili ali onemogočili enotno evropsko delovanje v Bosni in Hercegovini. Gre za popolno odsotnost zavedanja, da BiH, če se nekateri v tej hiši še tako trudijo dokazovati, ni zgodba o neuspehu izključno zaradi lastne kompleksnosti, ampak tudi zaradi naše nezmožnosti enotnega delovanja. Zaradi česar smo obsojeni na neprestani krizni menedžment.

Kar danes potrebujemo v BiH, poleg statusa države kandidatke, je jasna in odločna evropska intervencija. BiH potrebuje enotno evropsko posredovanje pri vzpostavljanju vladavine prava, boja proti korupciji in proti organiziranemu kriminalu, pri zagotavljanju neodvisnega pravosodja in svobodnih medijev. EU mora odločno, z jasnimi okvirom pogojevanja v širitveni metodologiji prekiniti igre mačke z mišjo, ki jo igramo z različnimi lokalnimi politikami. Namesto besed morajo slediti dejanja, reforme in spremembe, ki bodo v dobrobit tako ljudi v BiH kakor tudi v Evropski uniji. Te spremembe mnogim lokalnim politikom ne bodo po volji, a z njimi se brezplodno že tako ali tako ukvarjamo predolgo.

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, the rapporteur is not here, unfortunately. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Rangel, for his work and genuine efforts to find compromises, and it has resulted in a strong, unified position of the Parliament. With this report, the Parliament makes very clear that the future of Bosnia is in the EU and it urges for a serious revival of the EU enlargement agenda.

The Russian aggression has made this integration process even more urgent, as destabilisation of the region is a real threat. But we are also frank: for Bosnia to advance on its path to the EU, commitment is needed from both sides. Mr Dodik cannot maintain to be in favour of EU accession and at the same time support Putin and try to dismantle the state of Bosnia. HDZ cannot insist on cementing ethnic division through a discriminatory electoral law which undermines the principle of one person, one vote.

Leaders need to overcome the past and implement the highly needed reforms transforming Bosnia into the functional, multi-ethnic state that the citizens so much want and deserve.

Bernhard Zimniok, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Bosnien und Herzegowina hat alleine bis 2020 rund 1,5 Milliarden Hilfe und Unterstützung durch die EU erhalten. Zuletzt gab es noch 250 Millionen COVID-Hilfen obendrauf. Bedingung dafür sind vor allem die Stärkung der Demokratie und die Korruptionsbekämpfung.

2007 lag Bosnien noch auf Platz 84 des Korruptionsindex. Nach der Milliardenhilfe rangiert das Land auf Platz 110. Genau wie im Fall Griechenlands kann Bosnien machen, was es will. Die Gelder werden ohnehin überwiesen, und zur Belohnung will man das Land jetzt auch noch in die EU holen, obwohl es hoch korrupt ist, obwohl es quasi nichts gegen die unkontrollierte Massenmigration in der EU über sein Territorium unternimmt, obwohl es auf Jahrzehnte Nettoempfänger wäre. Ich frage mich: Woher soll das Geld kommen, und wieso will man eigentlich ein gescheitertes Land überhaupt in die EU holen? Der Beitrittsprozess gehört umgehend beendet. Die Gelder müssen stattdessen für die europäischen Bürger eingesetzt werden.

Assita Kanko, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – In het gewijzigde Europese veiligheidskader van vandaag ijvert de ECR-Fractie voor een vreedzame Westelijke Balkanregio die het Europese pad verder kan bewandelen zonder Russische bemoeienissen. Wij verwelkomen het politieke akkoord van 12 juni over de beginselen voor het verzekeren van een functioneel Bosnië en Herzegovina dat nodig is voor de stabiliteit van dat land. Wij dringen er bij de politieke leiders van Bosnië en Herzegovina met klem op aan om dit akkoord onverwijld uit te voeren. Ook steunen wij de maatregelen voor het verzekeren van de veiligheid van Bosnië en Herzegovina die werden aangekondigd in de verklaring van de NAVO-top van Madrid.

Het verslag dat wij nu bespreken, tendeert echter naar een meer unitaire staat voor Bosnië en Herzegovina met uitvlaking van het concept van de samenstellende volkeren dat werd neergelegd in het Dayton-vredesakkoord. Als volksvertegenwoordiger uit een plurinationale staat weet ik dat dit een averechts effect zal hebben. Het niet-eerbiedigen in dit verslag van de bevoegdheidsverdeling inzake onderwijs tussen de EU en de lidstaten baart ook in mijn deelstaat Vlaanderen zorgen. Een federaal bestel waarin de gelijkwaardige samenstellende volkeren hun eigen bevoegdheidsdomeinen kunnen beheren en kunnen samenwerken, lijkt ons een meer aangewezen weg.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, as the main outcome of the last European Council, we have applauded the decision to give Ukraine and Moldova EU candidate status. While this was an essential political message aiming at reaffirming our undiminished commitment for the future membership of the countries in the Western partnership, this fast track is causing turbulences in the Western Balkans.

For this reason, the Council's readiness to grant candidate status to Bosnia is a very important step as we cannot risk further disenchantment and we cannot give the impression that we are leaving the Western Balkans behind. The implementation of the commitments, as set out in the political agreement reached on 12 June 2022, will be paramount and I strongly hope that after the Commission reports on the 14 key priorities, as requested by the Council, we'll swiftly welcome Bosnia Herzegovina as an official candidate.

Dear colleagues, delaying further the inevitable EU perspective for the Balkans in the EU is like playing with fire as there is a concrete risk that they will look elsewhere. As we perfectly know where this 'elsewhere' is, I am sure we don't want that to happen.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, na ovo izvješće, zajedno s kolegama, uložila sam 61 amandman i mogu reći da su neki usvojeni, kao što su jačanje medijskog pluralizma na svim jezicima u Bosni i Hercegovini, pozivanje na jačanje prekogranične suradnje u borbi protiv kriminala i osiguravanje europske perspektive Bosne i Hercegovine.

Međutim, još jednom želim ponoviti: Bosna i Hercegovina mora ostati jedinstvena, teritorijalno cjelovita, uz jednakopravnost tri konstitutivna naroda. Jednako tako osuđujem i nepoštivanje međunarodnih i nacionalnih normi i obveza, svaku destabilizaciju u zemlji. To mora biti snažna poruka.

Politika Bosne i Hercegovine, s druge strane, mora finalizirati ustavnu i izbornu reformu i napredovati na svom europskom putu, svjesni da im je potrebna suštinska transformacija.

Europsko vijeće, što pozdravljam, prvi puta je izrazilo spremnost, i to na poticaj hrvatske vlade i hrvatskog premijera, da se Bosni i Hercegovini dodijeli status kandidata. I to pozdravljam. Za nas Hrvate i hrvatsku vladu to je posebno važno. Kolegice i kolege, i za nas Europljane. Bosna i Hercegovina je europska zemlja, naša susjedna zemlja, u njoj živi pola milijuna Hrvata.

Poruka je također Bosni i Hercegovini da se pristupi reformi Ustava i izbornog zakona, kako bi se taj ključni preduvjet koji često spominjemo mogao dovršiti za izbore u listopadu na najbolji mogući način.

Završit ću: izazovi, mogućnosti i rješenja – da, ali ne samo mogućnosti. Mi moramo Bosni i Hercegovini ponuditi rješenje jer ona je i sigurnosno prvorazredno pitanje za Europu.

Andreas Schieder (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, the last good year of Bosnia-Herzegovina's path towards the European Union, on its European path, was 2016, when Bosnia submitted its candidacy application for the membership in the European Union; six years ago.

And the current political situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina is also the best indicator that progress cannot be found without consensus. Bosnia must use the new circumstances, which are those of the Ukraine crisis and the candidate status for Ukraine and Moldova.

But it's up to the Commission to submit also its evaluation as soon as possible, and it's on the other side up to Bosnia-Herzegovina to finally fulfil the main part of this obligation. But in order to succeed in doing so, it takes also a significant change in the behaviour of the political leaders in Bosnia-Herzegovina, especially of the leaders of the specific entities, to overcome divisions and to work towards a European future.

This is what is necessary, and what is about Bosnia.

Romeo Franz (Verts/ALE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sind uns alle einig, dass eine nachhaltige Stabilisierung Bosniens und Herzegowinas im europäischen Interesse liegt, nicht erst, aber gerade vor dem Hintergrund des russischen Angriffskriegs in der Ukraine. Wir wissen, dass Putin seinen Einfluss auf den Westbalkan und auf Bosnien und Herzegowina ausweiten will. Daher ist es notwendig, dass wir in der Europäischen Union gemeinsam mit unseren internationalen Verbündeten unserer Verantwortung gerecht werden und Frieden und Stabilität sichern. Gleichzeitig müssen die Anstrengungen auf bosnischer Seite erhöht werden, um den EU-Kandidatenstatus zu erlangen. Denn sie sind für den Demokratisierungsprozess im Lande essenziell.

Wir verurteilen diejenigen, die das Land spalten wollen. Die Blockade der Institutionen und die Spaltungsversuche der Republika Srpska müssen unverzüglich beendet werden. Die Menschen sind den Ethnonationalismus der politischen Eliten im Lande leid. Sie wollen ein Leben in Frieden und Sicherheit und eine Zukunft für sich und ihre Kinder. Umso wichtiger sind die Wahlen im Oktober. Diese müssen transparent und fair stattfinden, und die Europäische Union muss alles daransetzen, dies zu gewährleisten.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu antworten.)

Karlo Ressler (PPE), intervencija zatražena podizanjem plave kartice. – Kolega Franz, čini mi se da se slažemo oko toga da su Bosni i Hercegovini potrebni stabilnost, funkcionalnost... Kolega Franz, slažemo se oko toga da su Bosni i Hercegovini potrebni mir, stabilnost, funkcionalnost i europska perspektiva.

Čini mi se bitno naglasiti Vam još jednom da su također Bosni i Hercegovini potrebni uvažavanje prava sva tri konstitutivna naroda, ne kao nešto što je bitno samo po sebi radi nekakve apstraktnosti, nego zbog toga što bez tog uvažavanja, bez dogovora o budućnosti zemlje nemoguće je ostvariti takvu stabilnost i europsku perspektivu.

Ono što vas želim pitati je kako mislite... *(predsjedavajući je govorniku oduzeo riječ)*

Romeo Franz (Verts/ALE), Antwort auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Wir müssen ein Ethnosystem auf jeden Fall überwinden. Bosnien und Herzegowina ist das einzige Land in Europa, das dieses System hat, und das hat keine Zukunft.

Ich sage Ihnen das aus eigener Erfahrung. Wir haben in meiner Familie sechs Familienangehörige im Holocaust verloren, weil wir einer Ethnie angehörten, nämlich den Sinti. Und wir wissen, dass ein ethnisches System keine Zukunft haben kann und auch keine Menschenrechte garantieren kann. Deswegen ist es wichtig für Europa und für die Menschen, dass wir das überwinden.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani kolege, zanima me jeste li svjesni što radite? Jeste li svjesni da pokušavate ugasiti vatru benzinom?

Vi želite problem srpskog nacionalizma i ruskog utjecaja riješiti nametanjem takozvanog građanskog, a ustvari bošnjačkog unitarizma, u kojem se Srbi osjećaju ugroženo i zbog kojeg jačaju svoj separatizam. Dakle, vi pojačavate problem umjesto da ga rješavate. Ovo izvješće ide u potpuno pogrešnom smjeru!

Pa zar je građanski pristup zaustavio rat u Bosni i Hercegovini? Nije, nego Daytonski sporazum koji podrazumijeva konstitutivnost sva tri naroda. Jednako kao i u Belgiji u kojoj većina vas radi. Možete li si, recimo, zamisliti da Valonci biraju političke predstavnike Flamanaca kao što Bošnjaci biraju političke predstavnike Hrvata? A vi hvalite visokog predstavnika Schmidta koji je glavni krivac za propast Neumskih pregovora o novom izbornom zakonu.

Dakle, zapamtite, jedino što može donijeti trajni mir za Bosnu i Hercegovinu je pravedan odnos među narodima!

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the European integration of the Balkans is a story of missed opportunities. We all know that the current war in Ukraine is not the first war in our lifetime. Chilling images of the Yugoslav war in the 1990s burnt into our memories. Back then it was the United States, in the end, that brokered peace. Because Europe failed to do so. And still the EU does not seem to have learnt from that lesson. Instead of speeding up the process, Brussels keeps on lecturing those countries – this report being a good example.

The EU should stabilise and pacify the region, and a real prospect of EU membership can do that. However, the proposition of sanctions, for instance, against elected leaders, leads nowhere. It's not the right thing to do. Political threats create distrust and are counter-productive.

Moreover, Bosnia Herzegovina lies exactly on the Balkan migration route. Therefore, its integration into the EU with enforced border protection would contribute to stability for the local people as well as for Europe as a whole.

We cannot waste any more opportunities. The EU must give membership-candidate status to Bosnia-Herzegovina now.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Erweiterungspolitik findet nicht in einem luftleeren Raum statt. Wir sehen, wie russische, aber auch chinesische Einflussnahme die Region destabilisiert. Und wir sehen in Bosnien-Herzegowina, wie ein Ethnonationalist boykottiert und spaltet, wie Minderheiten verfolgt werden und mühsam erkämpfte Fortschritte unter Druck geraten. Es wäre nun an der EU, solidarisch zu sein mit den demokratischen Kräften im Land, Druck zu machen, dass die Wahlen im Oktober stattfinden können, dass sie frei und fair sind.

Doch was macht unser Erweiterungskommissar? Entspannte Kaminabende mit genau den Kräften, die das verhindern. Und das prägt das Bild der EU bei den Menschen in der Region. Bei Ihnen sind wir nicht Hüterin von Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit.

Mein Appell an die Kommission: Lassen Sie nicht weiter zu, dass Erweiterungspolitik ein Spielball mitgliedstaatlicher Interessen bleibt, sondern sorgen Sie dafür, dass er ein mächtiges geopolitisches Instrument wird. Auch Sie – viel Arbeit ist in Bosnien-Herzegowina, aber auch Sie haben es in der Hand, dass die EU nicht nur die Hoffnung, sondern das Versprechen für eine bessere Zukunft der Menschen in Bosnien-Herzegowina wird.

(Die Rednerin lehnt eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Ladislav Ilčić ab.)

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani kolege, poštovani građani, Bosna i Hercegovina je izuzetno slična jednoj državi Europske unije, a to je Belgija. Belgija je također sastavljena od tri nacionalna entiteta – Francuza, Nizozemaca i Nijemaca. Svaki od njih ima jednaka prava, a to je upravo ono što narodi Bosne i Hercegovine nemaju.

Najviše je zakinut hrvatski narod. Tko mu bira predstavnika? Bira mu drugi narod. Kao što je kolega Ilčić spomenuo, to je kao da Francuzi biraju predstavnike Nizozemaca.

Pretvaranje Bosne i Hercegovine u takozvanu građansku državu bez priznavanja nacionalnih entiteta – može, ali onda neka na Belgiji pokažemo taj primjer, neka se Valonci, Flamanci i Nijemci odreknu svojih prava i ja vjerujem da će Bosna i Hercegovina slijediti njihov primjer.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, stabilnost i dugoročni opstanak Bosne i Hercegovine mogu se postići samo reformom izbornog zakona kojom bi se osiguralo da i Hrvati, kao jedan od tri konstitutivna naroda, mogu sami izabrati vlastite političke predstavnike. U tom smislu, ovo izvješće nedvojbeno poziva na provedbu izborne reforme i implementaciju presude u predmetu Ljubić, što podržavam.

Njime se, s druge strane, nažalost podržava provođenje izbora po sadašnjem protuustavnom izbornom zakonu, čime se nagrađuju oni koji ne žele postići pravedan dogovor, a to su prvenstveno bošnjački političari predvođeni Strankom demokratske akcije i Bakirom Izetbegovićem. Hrvatima, građanima Europske unije nameću se nelegitimni predstavnici na razini Predsjedništva BiH i Doma naroda Parlamenta Federacije BiH, a sve zbog hegemonističkih težnji iz redova Bošnjaka.

Nažalost, najveću odgovornost za ovakvu situaciju snosi takozvana međunarodna zajednica, uključujući EU, koja je oduzela Hrvatima mehanizme zaštite vlastitih kolektivnih prava još prije dvadeset godina. Moralna i politička dužnost Europske unije i Sjedinjenih Država riješiti je problem koji su sami stvorili i spasiti Hrvate u BiH od političke likvidacije koju pripremaju u Sarajevu.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Myślę, że wszyscy w tej izbie zgadzamy się, że nie będzie bezpiecznej, stabilnej Europy bez bezpiecznych i stabilnych państw regionu Bałkanów Zachodnich. Stąd też Polska aktywnie wspiera europejskie aspiracje tychże państw i dlatego wyrażamy bezwzględne poparcie dla jedności Bośni i Hercegowiny. Poważny kryzys polityczny, z którym Bośnia i Hercegowina zmagają się od jesieni 2021 roku, uniemożliwia dalsze postępy w procesie reform, w szczególności realizację wszystkich 14 priorytetów określonych przez Komisję jako warunek do rozpoczęcia negocjacji z tym krajem.

Polska podkreśla potrzebę przeprowadzenia wyborów powszechnych zgodnie z planem w październiku bieżącego roku. Wspieramy działalność oraz pełną realizację mandatu misji EUFOR Althea. Popieramy decyzje o jej wzmocnieniu i obecności w Bośni i Hercegowinie. Mamy nadzieję, że rezolucja ONZ przyznająca mandat operacji EUFOR Althea zostanie odnowiona przed jej wygaśnięciem w listopadzie bieżącego roku. Chciałbym tutaj odnieść się do wystąpienia mojego przedmówcy: w pełni zgadzam się, że nie będzie stabilnych Bałkanów, nie będzie stabilnej Bośni i Hercegowiny, jeżeli nie będzie wzajemnej i pełnej współpracy między trzema narodami stanowiącymi dzisiaj to państwo.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, neki od kolega u ovoj današnjoj raspravi posrdno se odnose prema Ustavu države o kojoj razgovaramo, prema Ustavu Bosne i Hercegovine nazivajući temeljne postavke tog dokumenta, koji je zaustavio krvavi rat u Bosni i Hercegovini 1995. godine, nekakvim plemenskim sustavom, nekakvim etničkim sustavom koji bismo trebali nadići i zamijeniti s nekakvim svijetom fantazije, svijetom u kojem će se izgubiti ti etniciteti koji postoje, u kojem se neće uvažavati prava tri konstitutivna naroda. I to je pogrešno.

To je potpuno pogrešno jer ohrabruje takve tendencije koje su dosta često u Bosni i Hercegovini samo prikrivene, tendencije najvećeg bošnjačkog naroda u kojem sudjeluje na način preglasavanja, nadglasavanja i izbornog inženjeringa. To nije nešto što je europski koncept.

Europa poznaje nešto sasvim drugo – supsidijarnost koja postoji i u institucijama europske unije, jer je to realnost. To je danas realnost i Europske unije, ali je to i realnost Bosne i Hercegovine.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, с огромно съжаление трябва да се каже и да се отбележи, че този доклад е слаб. Този доклад е слаб, защото прикрива фактите на терен, на място. Той не разкрива обстоятелствата такива, каквито са, а те са следните: хърватската общност в Босна и Херцеговина няма гарантирани своите права на представителство. Хърватските интереси в Босна и Херцеговина не са гарантирани и те са застрашени, те са нарушени. Разрушено е равновесието между трите етнически общности.

И този доклад, вместо да покаже нещата такива, каквито са, си служи, както обикновено с хубави, но празни приказки, с клишета, с пожелания и с прочие алабализми, които целят да представят една захаросана картина, която обаче не е вярна. За да има стабилност в Босна и Херцеговина, хърватската общност трябва да бъде представена равнопоставено, да бъде защитена равнопоставено. Всичко друго е в услуга на Белград и на Кремъл.

(Brīvā mikroфона uzstāšanās beigās.)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, many thanks for this debate. Calls were made concerning the candidate status for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Let me underline that the Commission will recommend Bosnia Herzegovina for candidate status. The Commission will make such a recommendation to the EU Council once a substantial set of reforms will have been implemented in line with the 14 key priorities that are set out in the Commission's opinion, following which, as we know, the Council decides unanimously on granting candidate status.

Concerning the rights of constituent peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, I would like to underline that EU law explicitly forbids ethnic discrimination. Collective rights can be made compatible with respect for individual rights, but all power-sharing arrangements that result in discrimination need to be revised as European standards have to be respected. Bosnia and Herzegovina needs to remove from its Constitution all ethnic and residence-based discrimination in the election of the Presidency and the House of Peoples, as highlighted in the jurisprudence of the Court of Strasbourg.

The 2019 Commission opinion provides a detailed screening on what needs to be done. Solutions should be in line with the EU's values and standards and should not lead to further divisions.

The upcoming 2022 enlargement package will be the occasion to take stock of our relations with Bosnia and Herzegovina. We expect to see concrete reforms on the 14 key priorities set out in the Commission's opinion. Only by delivering on a substantial set of reforms will Bosnia and Herzegovina demonstrate that it can advance on its EU path.

Let me conclude by noting that next week we will commemorate the 27th anniversary of the genocide in Srebrenica. With our work in support of the European future for Bosnia and Herzegovina we are also paying tribute to all the persons who perished in the war and in that genocide and to all survivors. It is also for this reason that the Commission will continue supporting Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Michael Gahler, *stellvertretender Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident! Ich werde dem Berichterstatter Paulo Rangel mitteilen, dass die Debatte hier den erwarteten Verlauf genommen hat. Und das heißt, dass wir, denke ich, hier als Plenum in der großen Mehrheit den Ansatz unterstützen, der hier auch von Kommissar Lenarčič zum Ausdruck gebracht worden ist, nämlich, dass es noch einiger Arbeit bedarf seitens der Zuständigen in Bosnien-Herzegowina, bevor sie diesen Kandidatenstatus erlangen.

Interessant ist ja, dass man feststellt: Es gibt die 14 Punkte, aber es wird gar nicht verlangt, dass man sie alle erfüllt haben muss, sondern einen substanziellen Teil davon. Und ich denke, dass man – wie das immer der Fall ist – dann, wenn man bei den Betreffenden Kompromissbereitschaft findet, wenn man legitime Anliegen vorbringt und gleichzeitig auch auf der anderen Seite Angebote annimmt, zu Kompromissen kommen kann. Ich denke, wenn auf der einen Seite das Wahlrecht im Sinne der Wünsche der kroatischen Bürger verändert wird, dann auf der anderen Seite vielleicht der Umfang des Vetorechts im *House of Peoples* auf die tatsächlich essenziellen Punkte reduziert werden könnte – wenn das ein *do ut des* sein könnte –, dann kann man da vorankommen.

Ich denke, wir sind alle dafür, dass es keine Diskriminierung gibt. Wir sind alle dafür, dass alle Bürger sich in dem gesamten Land zu Hause fühlen. Und wir sind alle dafür, dass dieses Land beisammen bleibt. Deswegen müssen wir denjenigen, die dieses Land auseinandertreiben wollen – und da ist in erster Linie Herr Dodik zu nennen –, sagen, dass damit Schluss sein muss und dass damit eben kein zukünftiger Weg beschriftet werden kann. Ich denke, wenn Kompromissbereitschaft und Druck von unserer Seite in angemessenem Umfang kommt, können wir auch vorankommen. Ich wünsche mir das – im Interesse der Bürger in Bosnien-Herzegowina.

President. – The debate on this issue is closed. The vote will take place tomorrow.

16. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Serbii (debata)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Vladimír Bilčík ziņojumu Ārlietu komitejas vārdā par 2021. gada ziņojumu par Serbiju (2021/2249(INI)) (A9-0178/2022).

So, colleagues, I don't want to repeat what you already know about the procedure for the debate, but just to remind you that for the blue cards we normally leave it for the first group representatives, so no asking for blue cards then, and then later on we can start with the blue cards.

Vladimír Bilčík, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, dear colleagues, it is my pleasure to present to you the 2021 report on Serbia. Let me begin by thanking all of those who have contributed to the report, especially my shadows.

It was my ambition to set out a fair, realistic and accurate report on the current political developments in Serbia with a particular focus on Serbia's EU path. The draft of this report was prepared as Russia's aggression against Ukraine unfolded. And, as for most issues linked to world affairs, February 2022 was a defining moment that will change Europe's history and certainly Europe's future.

We are committed to Serbia's European Union accession. This is very clear and it is stated in the first paragraph of the report. The European Parliament's political priority has not changed over the years. It remains solid. This House remains a staunch supporter of EU enlargement. As the European Parliament reiterates its support for Serbia's EU membership, it also recalls that a credible enlargement perspective requires political will, sustainable efforts and irreversible reforms in all areas, particularly those linked to the rule of law, as well as unwavering commitment to European standards and values.

How do we measure the accession pace? The report reiterates that the progress on the rule of law and fundamental rights chapters, full alignment with EU foreign security and defence policy, including sanctions against Russia, as well as the normalisation of Serbia's relations with Kosovo, will determine the pace of accession. This is no news to our partners in Serbia. The EP's position has been clear on this point in many years and in other EP reports during previous years. And while repetition might sometimes seem a bit dull, it remains important to be consistent. Certain open issues remain as open as they were at the opening of the accession negotiations. This regards improving electoral conditions, fight against corruption and organised crime, improving media environment, and repeated calls for cross-party consensus on EU-related reforms for ensuring the country's progress on its EU path.

And we do not have to look far in history. We can just look at this year's events when we do regret that even after three months since the elections in April, we are still weeks away from forming a parliamentary majority in Serbia. The official results were announced today and this is good news, I welcome it. And this happens, however, at a crucial time in Europe's history, marked by major geopolitical shifts, socio-economic problems, and as war in Ukraine rages on, Serbia is without a new government. So, I do believe valuable time is being lost. A time to make strategic choices is value even more.

EU accession is Serbia's strategic priority and it is Serbia's strategic decision. So we need to see it treated strategically by political leadership in Serbia. It is therefore important to start moving towards the EU, not sideways. This report is a complex political document that tackles the most pressing issues linked to Serbia's reforms and EU accession path. It is meant to be read as such. It is not a single-issue report, and credit is given where credit is due. For instance, in the successful conduct of the 2022 referendum on constitutional amendments. Also, the April elections were a step forward compared to the 2020 elections, and rightly resulted in a more pluralistic parliament. We welcome the constructive role of the opposition and, as parliamentarians, are glad that an electoral boycott was averted. This resulted in a more pluralistic parliament, which is ultimately the most important thing in a modern parliamentary democracy.

And I would like to take this opportunity to thank my former colleagues, Tanja Fajon and Knut Fleckenstein, for their work in the inter-party dialogue and pay tribute to the late Eduard Kukan, who worked on issues related to Serbia's EU future until the very last days of his life. I am sure he would like to see Serbia moving forward on its European path, and as this report underlines, there is a clear map and a clear plan how this can be achieved. But the ball is very much in the hands of the new leadership, in the hands of the new government. And this relates to all the key issues which I have outlined: rule of law reforms, dialogue with Pristina, as well as full alignment with the EU's international positions.

I hope we can make progress on this, and as the standing rapporteur of this House, I stand ready to help to work together with our partners in Belgrade. And, of course, I look forward to listening to the Commission, and also to colleagues, and I look forward to a fruitful debate on this report.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first, let me thank the rapporteur, Mr Bilčík, for his work on this report. We are facing unprecedented challenges in Europe that make it clear that EU membership is the most important and most reliable tool for peace, stability and long-term prosperity. This was reflected clearly in the European Council conclusions adopted last week. There is once more, and rightly so, enormous attention given to EU enlargement policy. And I thank this honourable house for its continued strong support for the European perspective of our partners in the Eastern Neighbourhood and also for the whole of the Western Balkans. Today's discussion follows the elections that were held in Serbia in April and the participation of all political forces was of key importance there. And allow me also to acknowledge the important role and the value of the participation of the members of this House in the election observation mission.

There have been significant improvements, including those that allowed the participation of all political forces. But the challenges remain. Therefore, the work needs to continue to further strengthen the functioning of democratic institutions. I welcome that final election results have been published earlier today by the Central Election Commission, thus paving the way for the constitution of the new Parliament. The Commission is determined to work with Serbia's leadership and the new government to make further progress on accession negotiations. The progress made by Serbia on EU-related reforms has allowed us to open, last December for the first time, a cluster of four chapters on the green agenda and sustainable connectivity. This was an important signal for Serbia. It confirmed that the EU responds positively to reform progress. And it also sent a strong message that the EU is stepping up engagement on the green agenda for the benefit of all citizens. However, reforms need to continue. Building on the momentum of last December and on the successful January referendum on the constitutional amendments, we expect Serbia to deliver real and tangible results, in particular in the area of the rule of law and on dialogue with Pristina. Both are essential and they will determine the overall pace of Serbia's EU accession negotiations. Serbia needs to continue to accelerate and deepen reforms on the independence of the judiciary. The fight against corruption and organised crime, media freedom and the domestic handling of war crimes. The Commission will continue to report on and assess Serbia's progress in this respect.

The recent agreement reached under the EU facilitated dialogue on the energy agreement's implementation roadmap is an important step forward that will hopefully unlock discussions on other outstanding issues. In the current geopolitical context, Serbia has demonstrated its commitment to EU values by aligning with the number of EU declarations and by supporting relevant UN General Assembly resolutions on Ukraine. We now expect Serbia to continue to show this commitment and step up its efforts in progressively aligning with the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy, including declarations and restrictive measures in line with the EU-Serbia negotiating framework.

In this regard, it is also important that Serbia decreases its dependence on Russian gas. The beginning of works on the Serbia Bulgaria gas interconnector, for which the EU provided almost EUR 50 million, is an important joint step toward securing and diversifying gas supply for Serbia. We are also supporting cybersecurity and EU oriented strategic communication, including fighting Russian disinformation across the region.

Let me underline that the EU is and will remain Serbia's main political. And by far the main economic partner. We will continue to support Serbia's economic recovery, energy, food security and society, including through the significant support made available under the Economic and Investment Plan for the Western Balkans. Thank you for your attention and I look forward to our discussion.

Андрей Ковачев, *от илето на групата PPE*. – Г-н Председател, на три основни точки искам да се спра. Сърбия е единствената страна кандидат за членство в Европейския съюз, която все още не се е присъединила към общата външна политика и политика за сигурност на Европейския съюз, особено сега по отношение на Русия и агресията на Русия в Украйна.

Белград дава много често сигнали, сега в момента също, за близко сътрудничество с Русия, както политическо, икономическо, енергийно и военно. Сръбският политически елит трябва ясно да избере – с Европейския съюз или с Кремъл, или може би търси нещо подобно, както по времето на Тито, за необвързаност. Когато говорим за Сърбия, много често на хартия ситуацията изглежда добре, но в действителност, за съжаление, нещата не са така.

Пример за това са т. нар. национални съвети на малцинствата. Те са подчинени изцяло на Белград чрез инсталирането на близки до партията на г-н Вучич хора, чийто приоритет е да прокарат политиката на Белград, която невинаги отговаря на конкретните интереси на конкретното малцинство, както икономически, така и социални.

В случая с българското малцинство съществува наистина риск от екологична катастрофа, допълнително към икономическата и социалната такава. Очакваме също в най-скоро време решителен напредък по отношение на Косово с ясна цел за взаимно признаване на двете страни.

Δημήτρης Παπαδάκης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Σερβία είναι κομμάτι της Ευρώπης και το μέλλον της είναι αναπόφευκτα να γίνει πλήρες μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ήδη υπάρχει σημαντική καθυστέρηση σε αυτή την πορεία. Υπεύθυνη για αυτή την καθυστέρηση, δυστυχώς, είναι η ίδια η κυβέρνηση της χώρας. Αυτό διότι οι μεταρρυθμίσεις καθυστερούν να γίνουν πράξη, η κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη απουσιάζει, ο σεβασμός της άλλης άποψης είναι στοιχείο που λείπει και οι φημώσεις δημοσιογράφων και μέσων ενημέρωσης που δεν ελέγχονται από την κυβέρνηση γίνονται πράξη. Αδράνεια σε φαινόμενα ακραίας και απάνθρωπης εκμετάλλευσης ξένου εργατικού δυναμικού. Επιθέσεις από παρακρατικές ομάδες στους ηγέτες της αντιπολίτευσης.

Την ώρα που προσδοκάς να αποτελέσεις μέρος των ευρωπαϊκών αρχών και αξιών, οφείλεις να ταυτίζεσαι με αυτές και να συμπλέεις στην επιβολή κυρώσεων κατά της Ρωσίας, χωρίς πολλά λόγια. Κάποια βήματα, βεβαίως, οφείλουμε να παραδεχτούμε πως έχουν γίνει. Στέλνω το μήνυμα προς τον λαό της Σερβίας ότι εμείς συνεχίζουμε τη στήριξή μας για μια πραγματικά δημοκρατική Σερβία, μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Klemen Grošelj, *v imenu skupine Renew*. – Spoštovani! Poročilo o napredku ali bolje manku napredka Srbije v približevanju Evropski uniji, ki je pred nami, žal ne pove celotne zgodbe države, ki nekako ne more ali pa ne želi izvesti političnega napora, da se dokončno opredeli za evropsko pot.

Vprašanje sankcij zoper Rusijo je samo vrh ledene gore dilem, na katere v procesu pogajanj in približevanja EU Srbija in njena aktualna oblast nimata odgovorov. Sprašujem se, še posebej po zapletih s parlamentarnimi volitvami in trimesečni zamudi pri objavi rezultatov, kateri so dejanski razlogi, ki Srbiji preprečujejo približevanje EU v zvezi s sankcijami? Navkljub raznovrstnim pojasnilom oblasti v Beogradu se ustvarja vtis, da gre pri vsem bolj kot za vprašanje sankcij in približevanja EU, za vprašanje preživetja aktualne oblasti.

Srbija mora, v kolikor se ne želi pridružiti klubu držav večnih kandidatk za članstvo, nujno in odločno stopiti na pot globokih reform na področju vladavine prava, temeljnih demokratičnih standardov, neodvisnosti pravosodja in medijev, delovanja civilne družbe in drugih temeljnih vrednot in načel, na katerih temelji EU. Pri tem ne zadostuje več dosedanja praksa formalnega izpolnjevanja zavez, ampak je potrebna dejanska implementacija vseh reform v dobrobit državljanov in državljanov Srbije in šele nato za doseganje pogojev za vstop v Evropsko unijo.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, despite all efforts of the European Parliament, Serbia is not much more democratic than it was after the 2020 election boycott. It is a country that still lacks genuine democratic plurality, media freedoms and political culture, which will prepare it for the EU.

Yet I do not want to go into details of the report, but instead I would like to remind President Vučić about the utmost need to align with Europe on our common stance. I truly believe that the Russian invasion of Ukraine is a watershed moment in modern Europe. The EU expects from the new government full alignment in terms of foreign policy and introduction of sanctions against Russia. We must use this momentum to break Serbian ties with the Kremlin and help the country turn clearly towards the EU.

There are indeed forces in Serbia that represent progressive critical voices, either in politics or in civil society, academia and media circles. Our task is to make sure that they are heard, protected and have international support.

Susanna Ceccardi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se prendiamo in mano una cartina, vediamo che l'allargamento ai Balcani appare come una questione inevitabile da un punto di vista geopolitico, eppure il vertice sui Balcani del 23 giugno scorso è stato un fallimento. Nessuno dei paesi oggi in attesa ha visto sostanziali passi in avanti, con una grande delusione di tutti i leader l'Unione europea non è riuscita a rispettare le promesse ai Balcani occidentali.

La domanda sorge spontanea: in quale direzione va la politica estera europea? Apriamo all'allargamento di due nazioni come Ucraina e Moldova al lato più a Est, ma non ci siamo occupati con sufficiente attenzione di cosa succede al nostro centro. Lasciare un vuoto ai confini del nostro spazio, se non addirittura al proprio interno, lascia inevitabilmente campo libero ad altri attori. Per rispondere allora al processo di allargamento nei Balcani dovremo prima chiederci chi siamo e che cosa vogliamo fare domani. Darci una risposta seria, chiara, decisa, senza però illudere nessuno.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Zgadzam się oczywiście z ogólną linią przyjętą przez pana posła sprawozdawcę i dziękuję panu Bilčíkowi i kontrsprawozdawcom za pracę nad tym sprawozdaniem.

Sprawozdanie przedstawia wiele słabości Serbii z punktu widzenia Unii i procesu integracji, nie pomijając przy tym kontekstu wojny na Ukrainie i reakcji Serbii na nią. Zawiera wiele słusznych uwag. Trudno jest się oprzeć jednak wrażeniu, że czasami ingerencja w sprawy wewnętrzne Serbii idzie za daleko, że nasze zatroskanie przeradza się także w tym przypadku – jak w wielu innych – w moralistyczny interwencjonizm, by nie powiedzieć w moralistyczny imperializm. Zwłaszcza, że wiele z tych moralistycznych wymogów nie jest spełnianych w samej Unii – np. czytamy w tej rezolucji, iż „ubolewa się, że pracę Zgromadzenia Narodowego utrudniał brak prawdziwej debaty politycznej między większością a partiami opozycyjnymi”. A czy w tym Parlamencie naprawdę mamy debaty między ugrupowaniami, które uznały się za jedynie proeuropejskie, a autentycznie proeuropejskimi frakcjami takimi jak ECR? Co najwyżej w kulisach.

Inny przykład: w rezolucji słusznie wytyka się Serbii jej powiązanie z Rosją, w tym wojskowe, nieprzyłączenie się do sankcji wobec Rosji. Tylko że swoim krytycyzmem zapominamy, że Unia była mniej zasadnicza wobec niektórych państw członkowskich, które po 2014 roku omijały unijne embargo, sprzedając Rosji, mimo sankcji, sprzęt wojskowy. A więc stosujemy te same standardy.

Emmanuel Maurel, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, le Parlement souhaite-t-il réellement encourager la Serbie à rejoindre l'Union européenne? Parfois, quand j'entends nos débats ou quand je lis nos textes, j'en viens à douter, parce que ce sont des textes systématiquement à charge, sans nuances – nuances dont nous faisons preuve quand il s'agit d'autres pays des Balkans occidentaux.

On adresse à Belgrade des remontrances, des exigences qui sont intenable, en continuant de nier le poids de l'histoire, en méconnaissant la culture politique du pays, et surtout en faisant fi des progrès réalisés. Bien sûr que la situation n'est pas satisfaisante. On l'a dit: la corruption, la société civile entravée, les médias. Mais des progrès ont quand même été réalisés suite à nos recommandations. Je pense notamment au référendum constitutionnel sur la justice, aux élections législatives qui se sont tenues dans de bonnes conditions, à la lutte contre les conflits d'intérêts ou aux garanties nouvelles pour l'indépendance de la justice.

Et parfois, je me dis que nous devrions nous adresser à la Serbie en saluant d'abord ces avancées. Parce que la Serbie, c'est le plus grand pays des Balkans. Elle n'a pas besoin de nos leçons, mais de nos encouragements. Alors, faisons preuve de la même bienveillance avec tous les pays des Balkans occidentaux.

Andor Deli (NI). – Köszönöm, Elnök Úr, Biztos Úr, Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Az előttünk lévő jelentés arról kellene, hogy szóljon, miként fogja az Európai Parlament segíteni Szerbiát abban, hogy mielőbb az Unió tagjává váljon, de ehelyett a jelentés inkább kioktat, előír és olyan elfogadhatatlan túlzásokat tartalmaz, amelyek csak tovább fékezik az ország csatlakozási folyamatát, megkérdőjelezik az EU szavahihetőségét és elidegenítik Szerbia polgárait. Ez pedig egyaránt ellenkezik Szerbia és az EU stratégiai érdekeivel. Hihetetlen, hogy amikor azt látjuk, hogy egy EU-val szomszédos országban háború dúl, egyesek nem látják át, hogy Szerbia mielőbbi csatlakozásával megszilárdulna az Unió stabilitása. Magyarország kormánya és a kormánypárti képviselők teljes mellszélességgel kiállnak Szerbia EU-csatlakozása mellett. Épp ezért számunkra a jelentés elfogadhatatlan. Meggyőződésünk, hogy Szerbia több támogatást és megértést érdemel, sokkal többet.

Finally, let me send a warm welcome to Her Excellency Ms Ana Hrustanović, who is following our debate here in the plenary.

(The speaker concluded in a non-official language)

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, felicit raportorul. Cred că Serbia trebuie să înțeleagă că nu există dublu standard atunci când îți asumi acest drum pe care vrei să îl parcurgi privind aderarea la Uniunea Europeană.

În acest context, este esențial ca politica Serbiei să demonstreze prin fapte că este aliniată la standardele europene și trebuie să aplice sancțiunile pe care le-am aplicat Rusiei tocmai pentru că acest război ne-a oferit o nouă realitate, care ne permite să înțelegem că doar uniți, doar împreună, putem face față tuturor provocărilor.

Iar eu cred că Serbia are obligația de a se alinia și a răspunde la toate așteptările pe care le avem față de acest stat puternic încercat, dar care trebuie convins că singura cale corectă este calea europeană a acestui stat. Belgradul trebuie să înțeleagă această misiune.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Alessandra Moretti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, finalmente oggi la Serbia, dopo tre mesi dalle elezioni dello scorso aprile, ha comunicato i risultati ufficiali delle urne e da domani potrà lavorare alla formazione di un governo. Ciò che questo esecutivo dovrà affrontare nel critico periodo che stiamo vivendo sono decisioni importanti, complesse, oltre che urgenti, azione, insieme al processo di integrazione europea, che solo un governo responsabile e lungimirante potrà portare a termine.

Comprendiamo le difficoltà e le peculiarità delle ragioni storiche, apprezziamo gli sforzi già compiuti sulle riforme, così come l'impegno di accogliere rifugiati ucraini, eppure non basta. Chiediamo alle autorità serbe di avere coraggio e di schierarsi senza ambiguità dalla parte del popolo ucraino, invaso senza giustificabile motivazione e violato nella sua sovranità. Questo significa anche difendere i valori europei della democrazia e della libertà contro la propaganda russa, che continua a infiltrarsi nei media serbi per condizionare in modo subdolo l'opinione pubblica.

Infine, invito il governo serbo ad avere il coraggio di raggiungere un accordo che realizzi la completa normalizzazione dei rapporti con i paesi vicini, un passo essenziale per accelerare sul percorso europeo. Prendete coraggio e l'Europa sarà al vostro fianco per sostenervi.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, θέλουμε την Σερβία στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Νομίζουμε ότι έχουμε κοινή ευρωπαϊκή προοπτική. Αλλά πρέπει να πούμε ότι δεν είναι η ώρα για εκπτώσεις σε ζητήματα αρχών και σε ζητήματα στρατηγικής. Η ηγεσία της Σερβίας, δυστυχώς, κλείνει το μάτι στη Ρωσία σε μία περίοδο που υπάρχει σε εξέλιξη ο πόλεμος της Ουκρανίας με ευθύνη του Putin, ο οποίος αποσταθεροποιεί το σύνολο της Ευρώπης.

Επίσης, η επίθεση που έκανε η Ρωσία κατά της Ουκρανίας έχει σχέση και με το καθεστώς του Putin, δηλαδή δεν θέλει τον ευρύτερο εκδημοκρατισμό γειτονικών χωρών για να μη φτάσει ο εκδημοκρατισμός στη Ρωσία και αυτό έχει σημασία για μας. Επίσης, υπάρχει ρωσική επιρροή και ρωσική αποσταθεροποίηση στα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια. Και όταν μιλάμε για Σερβία, μιλάμε για διεύρυνση προς τα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια. Και υπάρχει και μια τάση να ακουμπάει η Ρωσία στην Κίνα για να αντιμετωπίσει τη διεθνή πίεση, και έχουμε και τη Σερβία να ενθαρρύνει τη σχέση και με τη Ρωσία και με την Κίνα. Νομίζω ότι, με αυτό το μείγμα, η Σερβία δεν μπορεί να ελπίζει σε γρήγορες και θετικές εξελίξεις σε ό,τι αφορά την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Madam President, the countries in the Western Balkans need a sincere and credible European perspective. From their side, the enlargement countries should show their willingness to adhere to European values, standards and principles. Serbia has made considerable progress on its reform agenda, but still has not delivered on a few critical aspects.

While facing the security threats in the east of Europe, it should be clear that no further integration can happen without clear alignment with our common foreign and security policy. I welcome that the representative of the Croatian minority was elected in the recent election to the Serbian Parliament. However, minority rights of the Croatian community in Serbia, and especially the status of non-discriminatory use of the Croatian language, are still below European standards. This must change.

Finally, we are still asking Serbia for the truth about missing persons from the Homeland War in order to move forward and to allow families to grieve with dignity.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Madam President, we want Serbia to advance on its EU path. Instead, Serbia's President Vučić is pulling his country away from the European Union, even if he says something else. Serbia's leadership chooses regression on the rule of law over pro-European reforms. Its handling of this year's elections demonstrates democracy is in clear peril. And while Russia bombs Ukrainian hospitals, Vučić's government tried and failed to fly the Russian Foreign Minister out to Belgrade.

Let us be very clear. The EU is Serbia's largest donor. Our support has long been steadfast. But we need to change tack; minimising Vučić's clear autocratic tendencies and focusing on investment projects instead is a dead end. Accession negotiations with Serbia should only continue on two conditions: clear progress on the rule of law and full alignment with our sanctions on Russia.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, één rotte appel in de mand maakt al het gave fruit te schand. Aan die uitdrukking moest ik denken toen ik het verslag las over Servië. Servië doet namelijk precies wat de Europese Unie niet doet. Het steunt Rusland. Servië is in de ban van Rusland, al meer dan honderd jaar. Daarom heeft Servië zich niet aangesloten bij de EU-sancties tegen Rusland. Ook zet Servië de vluchten van Belgrado naar Moskou gewoon voort en heeft Servië veel wapens gekocht in Rusland, in Belarus en in China.

Servië heeft lak aan de Europese Unie. Ook loopt de Servisch-orthodoxe kerk als een blind paard achter de patriarch van de Russisch-orthodoxe kerk, Kirill, aan. Bovendien zijn de banden tussen de maffia in Servië en Rusland al heel innig en intensief. Kortom, laten we eensgezind blijven. Dit land hoort absoluut niet bij de Europese Unie.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, тясното сътрудничество на Сърбия с Русия, особено във военната сфера, представлява опасност за европейската сигурност. Дори и след военната агресия на Русия срещу Украйна, в Белград доминират прокремълските настроения. Тревожат и проявите на краен национализъм. Тази неевропейска политика оказва влияние и в съседна Северна Македония поради традиционната обвързаност на политическите елити, а наскоро сръбският министър на вътрешните работи заговори и за т. нар. „сръбски свят“ – една националистическа доктрина, копи-пейст на доктрината „руски свят“, която няма нищо общо с ценностите на европейската интеграция. Необходимо е Сърбия да осъществи реален процес на раздяла с националистическите и кремълските митове, защото Европейският съюз не се нуждае от руски троянски коне.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, činjenica je da pristupni pregovori o ulasku Srbije u EU stagniraju. Mnogo je razloga za takvu situaciju.

Jedan od njih sastoji se u tome da Srbija danas nije demokratska zemlja, već u njoj vlada političko jednomylje odnosno potpuna dominacija jedne političke opcije, Vučićevih naprednjaka. Slika Srbije danas je slika zemlje u kojoj se krše ljudska prava, koči se razvoj civilnog društva, a neovisni mediji praktički ni ne postoje. Osim toga, ne postoji vidljiva želja ni napredak kada je u pitanju vladavina prava, borba protiv korupcije te provedba reformi.

Srbija je kroz svoju povijest često pokazivala težnju za hegemonijom nad susjednim zemljama. Ambicije i želja za srpskom dominacijom očito i dalje postoje, a recentni srpski hegemonizam ponajbolje vidimo na primjeru destabilizacije susjedne Crne Gore kojoj prosrpski političari često negiraju pravo na vlastiti identitet. I tu, naravno, radi u dosluhu i u dogovoru s Rusijom.

Prije ulaska u EU Srbija i njeni političari moraju prihvatiti europske vrijednosti i riješiti temeljna pitanja vezana uz vladavinu prava, stanje demokracije, procesuiranje ratnih zločina, prestanak agresivnog miješanja u politiku susjednih država te rasvjetljavanje sudbina nestalih osoba iz agresije na Hrvatsku.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani przewodnicząca! Po bardzo udanym dla procesu akcesyjnego Serbii roku 2021, za rozczarowujący należy uznać jej brak reakcji na rosyjską agresję przeciwko Ukrainie. Padały tu już argumenty, że Serbia jako jedyna spośród państw regionu nie przystąpiła do żadnych unijnych sankcji przeciwko Rosji przyjętych po 24 lutego. I oczywiście jest, że Serbia, której bliżej będzie do Putina, Cyryła Ławrowa, do morderców z Buczy, z Mariupola, Serbia, której bliżej będzie do tych bestialstw, których dzisiaj rosyjscy żołnierze dopuszczają się na cywilnej ludności ukraińskiej, do Unii Europejskiej wejść nie będzie mogła.

Ale przecież my kibicujemy naszym przyjacielom w Serbii, tym, którym bliżej jest do Brukseli, bliżej do Rzymu, bliżej do Belgradu, Sofii czy Warszawy, a nie politykom, którym bliżej do Putina. I warto powiedzieć też w tym miejscu, że takie rezowerskie pouczanie dzisiaj Serbii w kontekście tego, co robiły Niemcy, Francja po 2014 roku, też w Serbii jest odrzucane tak samo, jak powinno być odrzucane tutaj, w tej izbie.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, dok se ukrajinski narod bori za svoju vlastitu opstojnost, za slobodu, ali i za naše europske vrijednosti, u Srbiji u Beogradu svjedočimo jednom otužnom, besramnom kalkuliranju koje još uvijek traje i svjedočimo svim različitim načinima zaobilaznja sankcija. Na taj način Srbija se ne udaljava samo formalno od Europske unije, nego se udaljava i civilizacijski od cijele Europe.

Drugo, ono što svjedočimo u našem neposrednom susjedstvu, nažalost, su elementi stare ofucane politike Srbije iz 1990-ih godina gdje nedostaje iskrene, prave suradnje, prije svega na pomirenju, i na onim svim ostacima otvorenih pitanja iz devedesetih. Svjedočimo neprihvatljivom širenju jurisdikcije, nerješavanju sudbine nestalih, problematičnom odnosu prema manjinama unutar Republike Srbije, ali također i neskrivenim posezanjem za kulturnim naslijeđem drugih država.

To je potpuno neprihvatljivo i dok je god tako Srbija neće biti spremna za Europsku uniju!

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Madam President, Serbia is a beautiful country with great people, with a lot of cultural heritage. Serbia is a large country compared to the others in the Western Balkans and an economically strong country. It could serve a lot for the region and for all Europe.

But I have to remind all of us about our decision in the plenary with a large majority on 1 March, about our deepest concern about Serbian behaviour when it comes to war on European soil. This is why I highly appreciate the work of the rapporteur, Vladimír Bilčík, because it must be extremely hard to conduct a report on such a country with such leadership.

We all have to learn our lessons from history. Even we Austrians had to learn our lessons from history, and we still have to. And it is also on Serbia to learn the lessons from history, to align with Europe and European values, to align with the sanctions which are the unbloody defence against the bloody war, and take the first in history, the status of our civilisation, for the sake of the Serbian people themselves.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolegice i kolege, zahvaljujem prije svega kolegi Bilčku na njegovom izvješću. Međutim, željela bih se osvrnuti na nekoliko problematičnih stvari koje u svakom slučaju ne pokazuju iskrenu i istinsku predanost Srbije na njezinu europskom putu.

Prije svega, to su zatiranje medijskih sloboda u Srbiji, zbog čega njihovi građani, doista smatram, nemaju pravi uvid u ono što se u njihovoj zemlji događa. S druge strane, nemamo jasne dokaze i jasna opredjeljenja, prije svega vanjsko-političko, što je jako važno, kuda Srbija zaista želi ići. Kada govorimo o vladavini prava i demokraciji, bojim se da su to još uvijek nepoznati pojmovi za brojne srpske političare.

Srbija mora jasno pokazati želi li istinski europski put. To znači jednako tako i da mora odgovoriti na pitanje nestalih u velikosrpskoj agresiji na Republiku Hrvatsku, a što je obveza, podsjećam, ugrađena u pristupne pregovore.

Nod po žici i sjedenje na dvije stolice nije iskrena predanost na europskom putu. Jednim okom prema Rusiji, a drugim okom prema Europskoj uniji i uzimati od jednih što im odgovara i od drugih što im odgovara, a to je prije svega novac europskih građana, nije iskren i dobar put.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, да, съгласен съм, тази Сърбия няма място в Европейския съюз. Това е тази същата Сърбия, която прави провокации в Косово. Това е същата Сърбия, която прави провокации в Босна и Херцеговина. Това е същата Сърбия, която поддържа руската пропаганда по време на войната на Русия срещу Украйна. Това е същата Сърбия, която поддържа най-големия логистичен разузнавателен шпионски център на Русия на Балканите, в цяла Европа, това се намира в град Ниш, предполагам всички знаете това. Това е тази Сърбия, която мачка националните малцинства.

Тук в тази зала много често много от вас защитават различни малцинствени права, къде основателно, къде не, но днес ги няма, мълчат си, защото става дума за истински проблеми. Да, тази Сърбия потиска хърватите в държавата си, потиска българите, нарушава техните права, мачка ги, гледа да ги разселва, да ги асимилира, да ги изгони и продължава да се държи по начин, който е неприемлив и недопустим. Това е тази, днешна Сърбия. И аз се учудвам, тук има хора, които са грамотни. Как си мислите, че ако продължавате да се подмазвате на тези, на управляващите в Белград, които са прокси на Кремъл, те какво, ще станат европейци изведнъж? Не, няма да станат. Тази Сърбия, която е проводник на Кремъл и на Путин, няма място в Европейския съюз, разберете го.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you very much for this discussion. I believe that these unprecedented times call for even stronger engagement with our Western Balkan partners, including Serbia, in order to support the strategic decision to join the European Union, which is also Serbia's strategic decision.

I also believe that the Russian aggression against Ukraine is a wake-up call on the need to accelerate the accession process for the Western Balkans. We have no time to lose.

The Western Balkans remain a priority for the European Union. At the EU Western Balkans leaders meeting on 23 June, the EU leaders reiterated their full and unequivocal commitment to the EU membership perspective of the Western Balkans. They called for the acceleration of this process – however, based on credible reforms by partners, fair and rigorous conditionality and the principles of own merits.

The European Union will therefore continue its strong support – political, technical and financial – to all six partners in the Western Balkans to help them advance the key political, institutional, social and economic reforms which are necessary to achieve progress on their path towards EU membership.

Speaking about reforms, let me underline that the rule of law is a cornerstone of European values and it is a fundamental condition in the accession process. In 2020, the Commission adopted the revised enlargement methodology, which puts fundamental reforms – especially the rule of law – even further at the heart of the process and of our engagement. This is also the case with Serbia.

The assessment of the progress of the countries on the EU reform path is subject to a long and thorough process. The final decision is made by the college as a collegial body, and this will also be the case for this year's report.

Concerning alignment, let me repeat that Serbia has demonstrated its commitment to EU values by aligning with several EU declarations and by supporting the relevant UN General Assembly resolutions on Ukraine. Nevertheless, as a candidate country, Serbia is expected to progressively align its policies towards third countries with the policies and positions adopted by the European Union, including restrictive measures. We are in contact with Serbian authorities to help them to increase the alignment rate with the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy, including restrictive measures against Russia.

We count on Serbia, as a sincere European partner to stand with us and our common values, security and prosperity. On the Commission side, we will continue to do all we can to speed up Serbia's pace of negotiations and support the EU perspective of the Western Balkans as a whole.

Vladimír Bilčík, *rappporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, I want to thank all of you who took the floor today. I would like to thank those who see Serbia as a strategically important partner in the Western Balkans, and who understand that Serbia's successful EU path is more important now than ever.

I have noted all of your concerns and I will communicate them to the Serbian political leadership. Let me just say three things. One: accession talks are not single issue talks. Serbia did open Cluster 4 last year and can make progress on accession talks if it makes progress on domestic reforms.

I do believe – and this is my second point – that Serbia belongs in the European Union. But much has to be done by the leadership and the new government and new parliament in Belgrade.

Third point, when I look at the past 100 years of Serbian history, I certainly do not see Russia as playing a dominant role. I hope that all the relevant pro-European and Serbian political forces can discover and rediscover this part of their history and base their decisions on this when looking to the future.

I am convinced that Serbia has a European future and Serbia's place is among the EU Member States. But at the same time, after the April 2022 elections and Russia's war aggression, there is a real sense of urgency that all parties in Serbia move forward decisively on their European path. This report reflects factually on the complex political reality in Serbia and encourages all pro-European forces in that country to focus fully on progress in rule of law reforms, the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue and alignment with EU international positions.

We note – and I think all of us heard it today – that much can be done for Serbia's move towards the European Union. As the European Parliament's *rappporteur*, I stand ready to engage with the new leadership in Belgrade in order to work on the European future of Serbia.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt. Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna 6. heinäkuuta 2022.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 171 artikla)

Kinga Gál (NI), *írásban*. – Különösen ilyen nehéz időkből kiemelt érdekünk a Nyugat-Balkán stabilitása és biztonsága. Meg kell tennünk mindent, hogy megfelelően kezeljük a régió integrációját. Nem lassítani, hanem lendíteni kell a bővítési folyamaton. Természetesen minden országnak elegendő kell, hogy tegyen a csatlakozási feltételeknek, csak így tud az EU hiteles maradni. Az országok tagjelöltségét azonos értékek és feltételek mellett szükséges mérlegelni. Szerbia már évek óta vár előrelépésre a csatlakozási folyamatban és igyekszik megtenni az uniós feltételekhez szükséges lépéseket. A jelentés azonban nem segíti elő Szerbia uniós csatlakozási folyamatát, túlzásokkal teli szöveg lassíthatja ezt, elidegenítve Szerbiát az Uniótól. Mindeközben megkérdőjelezhetővé válik az EU szavahihetősége is.

Elfogadhatatlan ugyanakkor a bővítésért felelős biztost ért alaptalan kritika és vád, hogy részrehajló lenne Szerbia viszonylatában. Amikor a Nyugat-Balkán stabilitása kulcskérdés kellene legyen az Unió számára, elfogadhatatlan az is, hogy Magyarország-ellenesség sem maradhat ki a Szerbia, Bosznia, vagy Koszovót érintő jelentésekből. Függetlenül attól melyik országjelentésről legyen szó, abszurd módon szerepel a szövegekben, hogy Magyarország Szerbiával együtt lehetővé teszi Oroszország és Kína geopolitikai céljainak megvalósulását. Ezeket a neveléses állításokat elutasítjuk. Magyarország a Nyugat-Balkán, így Szerbia uniós csatlakozásának egyik legfőbb támogatója, Szerbia mielőbbi EU-tagságát a leghatározottabban támogatjuk.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle (ID), *par écrit*. – Le rapport 2021 concernant la Serbie contient une série d'incohérences et d'inexactitudes, et montre, par ailleurs, une véritable ingérence dans la politique intérieure et extérieure du plus important pays des Balkans occidentaux. Parmi les nombreux passages «intéressants», nous avons choisi deux perles: le constat que le parlement a parfois été dissout de manière anticipée et le regret quant au fait que la Serbie ne se soit pas alignée complètement sur la politique étrangère de l'Union. Tout d'abord, le rapport critique de manière malveillante une soi-disant instabilité politique du pays. A notre avis, ce n'est rien d'autre que le signe d'une certaine vitalité démocratique. D'ailleurs, le rapport semble oublier que le champion de l'instabilité politique ne se trouve pas dans les Balkans occidentaux, mais parmi les pays fondateurs de l'Union, avec un record de 67 gouvernements depuis 1946. Enfin, la critique de non-alignement est paradoxale, quand on sait que Belgrade, après en avoir été à l'origine, a accueilli en 2021 le XIXe sommet du Mouvement des non-alignés. Une critique révélatrice de la volonté de l'Union de réduire les souverainetés nationales au profit d'une superstructure fédérale destinée à soumettre les nations européennes à la doxa dominante.

17. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Kosowa (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Viola Von Cramon-Taubadelin ulkoasiainvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö Kosovoa koskevasta vuoden 2021 kertomuksesta [2021/2246(INI)] (A9-0179/2022).

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear friends of Kosovo, let me thank all colleagues who contributed so actively to this report. This year's Kosovo report comes at a special moment, the one when we see again the horrors of war in Europe. As Kosovo has also recently experienced war, its government demonstrates full solidarity with Ukraine, for which I want to thank them.

This year's report only scratches the surface of the challenges and issues that are ahead for the Kosovo Government. Yet it also clearly underlines the long path Kosovo has made in the reforms and its euro integration. Kosovo keeps proving its democratic capacities by organising free, fair and transparent elections. It is indeed a great example for all Western Balkan states of how to promote and nurture democratic standards, political dialogue and freedom of expression. The media landscape is diverse and represents the real control mechanism for the ruling parties. However, we need to do more to ensure that journalists remain independent and are protected from the party-affiliated tycoons.

Significant results have been achieved in the areas of the fight against corruption and organised crime. The rule of law reforms need to be continued in line with the Venice Commission opinion and EU standards and for the benefit of all Kosovo's citizens. These reforms, including the judiciary and anti-corruption agency reinforcement, are crucial for the European reform agenda and Kosovo's advancement on the EU accession path. Yet the rule of law means equality for all. Therefore, I call on the Government of Kosovo to implement the Constitutional Court judgment regarding the Visoki Dečani Monastery and demonstrate that it does not have a selective approach when it comes to the application of rule of law.

An essential element on Kosovo's EU integration path is certainly the dialogue between Kosovo and Serbia, which conditions the EU membership of both countries. Let me emphasise once again that without a comprehensive, legally binding agreement on the normalisation of relations between Kosovo and Serbia, accession to the Union will not occur. Finding a way to accommodate it within Kosovo's constitutional framework will lead one big step closer to the end of the dialogue and finalisation of this lengthy process with the mutual recognition.

Furthermore, environmental protection must become a priority for Kosovo. One of the main big steps on that pathway is the energy transition. It is high time to finally adopt and start implementing the long-awaited energy strategy, which will pave the way for decarbonisation of Kosovo's energy mix and open the door for more renewables. We need to think in the longer perspective and realise that the cold not only kills citizens but will also kill the economy once the carbon adjustment mechanism enters into force.

The citizens of Kosovo are well aware they have a strong ally in the European Parliament and me personally, as I have repeatedly reiterated the need for immediate granting of visa liberalisation, which is long overdue despite the fact that Kosovo has met all the criteria. I wish to see the harvest of our joint efforts in the future, since Kosovo's citizens deserve to live in a country that enjoys full international respect and a clear European integration perspective.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, first let me thank the rapporteur, Viola von Cramon-Taubadel, for her report on Kosovo in the light of the challenging and changing geopolitical context.

It is worth noting that Kosovo has made a clear choice and reconfirmed its commitment to European values and to our Union. The government has condemned the Russian military aggression and demonstrated solidarity with Ukraine and with its people. Kosovo has also aligned with EU statements and sanctions against Russia and Belarus. I very much welcome Kosovo's support and commitment in this sense.

We too need to keep our commitments. In July 2018, the Commission reported that Kosovo had fulfilled all the benchmarks to be granted visa liberalisation. The decision is still pending in the Council and we need to deliver on this long-overdue promise. I thank the Members of the European Parliament for being supportive and vocal on this matter.

While the Commission confirms the assessment again that Kosovo has fulfilled all the criteria to grant visa liberalisation, the decision remains in the hands of Member States and therefore the Commission is ready to support Kosovo in addressing the remaining concerns voiced by Member States. We are not talking here about any new roadmap or any new conditions, but about additional support from the Commission to find a pragmatic solution to clear the remaining obstacles.

Now let me turn towards the assessment of the reform progress. Kosovo's government continues to be resolute in its efforts to deliver EU-related reforms, including in key areas such as the fight against corruption and organised crime. We would like to see a faster pace of reform, including in the Assembly, which has a critical role to play in advancing the government's EU agenda. We welcome Kosovo's efforts to improve the efficiency, integrity and professionalism of the judiciary.

As you note in your report, these efforts should respect the recent Venice Commission recommendations on the matter, which we have welcomed. The Commission stands ready to continue discussions with the authorities on this important issue.

On the economic front, the EU and Kosovo are facing common challenges: increase of the prices of energy and other commodities, inflation and concerns about the future. The energy sector remains a cause for concern, especially after the difficult winter Kosovo has been through. Kosovo should finalise its energy strategy for the next ten years and begin its transition towards decarbonisation and green energy sources as soon as possible.

We remain committed to help Kosovo in every way we can, including through our financial assistance. Kosovo needs to redouble its efforts to take full advantage of the unique opportunities offered under the Economic and Investment Plan and IPA III, not least in the energy sector. For these investments to deliver fully, we need the region to push ahead with regional economic cooperation. The name of this cooperation is not important as long as it is built on EU rules and is inclusive for the whole region. We need Kosovo to engage constructively in its implementation.

When it comes to the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue, the adoption on 21 June of a roadmap for the implementation of past energy agreements is a major step forward. More broadly, we expect Kosovo and Serbia to make rapid and concrete progress on the full normalisation of their relations. A comprehensive, legally-binding normalisation agreement is key for Serbia and Kosovo to advance on the European path.

Let me end on this note: the entire region belongs in the European Union. They are part of the European family. Thank you for your attention.

Lukas Mandl, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sehr geehrter Herr Lenarčič! Der gesamte Westbalkan – alle sechs Staaten – sind wichtig für die Zukunft Europas. Heute debattieren wir über die Republik Kosovo und den Kosovo-Bericht.

Ich möchte Sie daher darauf hinweisen, dass das ein Staat ist mit Menschen, die für ihre Freiheit einen hohen Blutzoll bezahlt haben, ein Staat, der überhaupt nur durch die Europäische Union und die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika seine Unabhängigkeit erlangen konnte, ein Staat, der in einer beeindruckenden Geschwindigkeit Demokratie und Rechtsstaat aufgebaut hat, eine Demokratie, die heute stabil ist und die eine hohe Diversität im Land aufweist, ein Rechtsstaat, ja, der noch Reformen braucht, aber eine der modernsten Verfassungen der Welt im Hintergrund hat, ein Staat, der von weit über hundert Staaten dieser Welt und mittlerweile auch vom Staat Israel anerkannt ist, was lange eine offene Frage war.

Aber ein Staat, der noch immer von einer kleinen Minderheit mitgliedstaatlicher Regierungen in der Europäischen Union nicht anerkannt wird, ein Staat, der Bürgerinnen und Bürger hat, die als einzige im gesamten Westbalkan nicht visumfrei reisen dürfen, ein Staat, dem immer und immer wieder Zusagen gemacht werden, die dann nicht eingehalten werden, dem Versprechen gemacht werden, deren Einhaltung dann verschoben wird. Das ist die Republik Kosovo.

Dennoch haben die Menschen dort die größte Zustimmung zur europäischen Integration, verglichen mit allen Westbalkanstaaten. Dennoch ist dort eine Zuversicht vorhanden, von der alle anderen in Europa viel lernen können – vom jüngsten Staat Europas, nicht nur in seiner Staatlichkeit, sondern auch in der Bevölkerung.

Deshalb ist das Signal aus dem Europäischen Parlament heute so wichtig.

Andreas Schieder, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, I can simply continue where my colleague Lukas Mandl also stopped. In a summary, Kosovo is moving forward, is making progress. It's more stable than it was before politically. And also it undertook a lot of reforms, but much more have to come also.

And I think there are two important things. The one is the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue, which has to be strengthened and emphasised, and the other one is the visa liberalisation. Every precondition is fulfilled, but still what we are missing is the green light for visa liberalisation. And this blocking is stealing the young generation of Kosovo its future chances and therefore it's unacceptable.

And also, we discussed this issue with the background of a European Council, which was concerning the Western Balkans European perspective, slightly saying disappointing. It was a Council which did not give the answers which the Western Balkans citizens expect from the European Union and what they deserve from the European Union. There was no answer, only disappointment.

And I would say even today, looking at the Commission – not to you Commissioner Lenarčič – but the absent Commissioner for Enlargement is of high symbolic value that the European Union is missing a Western Balkan politics. And honestly, it is unacceptable that the Enlargement Commissioner is not here and it is symbolic of how we do also our politics. Not enough.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, I will try not to repeat what was said already, but also I will try to avoid my frustration and to focus on positive developments for Kosovo. But before that, let me start by thanking our rapporteur for bringing such a balanced report in front of the European Parliament.

Indeed, Kosovo is among the countries in the region where the EU integration process enjoys strong support among the citizens and all political actors. Without any doubt, Kosovo is arguably one of the most dedicated and loyal partner countries for the European Union.

And again, it was a year that was dynamic and full of important political developments. But despite this, Kosovo has confirmed its strategic commitment to the European pact with the decision to formally apply to join the EU by the end of this year.

Kosovo has proactively aligned with the EU's common foreign and security policy and gave a great example by strongly condemning Russia's aggression in Ukraine and became the first country from the region to join EU sanctions. Therefore, I urge the leadership of the EU to stop the years of unfulfilled EU promises and lost opportunities and finally grant Kosovo visa liberalisation.

It is so important, not for us as the European Union, but it's important for our strategic relationship with Kosovo. And most importantly, we deserve that promise to the younger generation of Kosovo with so much potential and we are there looking forward for such a message coming from the European Council.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle, *au nom du groupe ID.* – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, après la gifle du Brexit, l'Union européenne cherche fanatiquement à se convaincre qu'elle reste une force d'attraction, en cherchant à tout prix à intégrer en son sein de nouveaux pays.

Peu importe qu'ils soient sous le coup d'une sécession armée comme la Moldavie, ou carrément en guerre comme en Ukraine. Peu importe qu'il s'agisse d'un territoire notoirement mafieux, islamiste, en proie aux trafics, comme l'illustre le cas présent du Kosovo.

En fait, vous souhaitez ouvrir les portes de l'Europe à l'afflux massif d'armes, au trafic de drogue, au trafic d'êtres humains ou encore au terrorisme islamiste. Je vous rappelle que c'est le Kosovo qui a fourni le plus grand nombre de djihadistes à la Syrie et à l'Iraq en Europe, proportionnellement à son nombre d'habitants. Pourtant, vous préconisez sans délai l'adhésion du Kosovo à l'Union européenne, ainsi que la libéralisation des visas pour les Kosovars, sans vous soucier que cinq États membres de l'Union européenne ne reconnaissent toujours pas l'existence du territoire.

Ce rapport, comme à l'accoutumée, est un ramassis idéologique qui ne tient aucun compte des conséquences réelles qu'une adhésion du Kosovo aurait sur l'ensemble des pays européens.

Selon une enquête menée par le Conseil européen des relations étrangères, une large majorité des citoyens des États membres de l'Union européenne est opposée à un élargissement aux pays des Balkans. Mais vous vous en moquez.

D'autre part, le gouvernement kosovar souhaite à terme l'intégration du Kosovo dans une Grande Albanie qui se retrouverait de facto membre de l'Union européenne, en pleine contradiction avec la résolution 1244 du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies. Et ça, vous vous en moquez aussi.

En conclusion, face à cette désinvolture hallucinante, le Rassemblement national s'opposera toujours à cette volonté expansionniste acharnée et défendra toujours fermement l'intérêt et la volonté de nos peuples.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от илето на групата ECR.* – г-жо Председател, г-жо Докладчик, поздравявам Ви с ползотворната работа. Този доклад е доста по-различен от предишните два, които разгледахме преди малко. Това, което аз, разбира се, веднага ще подчертая, че с подкрепата на колеги от различни групи бяха приети нашите поправки, които призовават правителството в Прищина да разгледа петицията от над 500 българи в районите на Гора и Жупа и техните права да бъдат гарантирани и уредени нормативно. Сигурен съм, че проевропейското правителство в Косово ще обърне внимание на този въпрос и българите ще бъдат равнопоставени и добре приети в обществото, което е приятелски настроено към тях, и ще имат възможност да запазят своята уникална култура и самобитност.

Това обаче, което ме притеснява, е липсата на ясно посочване на истинския проблем. Истинският проблем е проксито на Русия на Балканите, Сърбия. Тя дестабилизира и се опитва да дестабилизира Косово и продължава с провокациите, както беше в началото на тази година. Видяхме няколко пъти сръбски провокации и напрежение по границата, а за повод служежа полицейски акции на косовската полиция, които действат срещу организираната престъпност от сръбска страна, така че там трябва да се обърне внимание. За другото мога да Ви поздравя.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, thanks to the rapporteur for a good report. Kosovo is a stress test for Europe but self-determination is the route to solve conflicts peacefully and democratically, and hence it is sound geopolitical policy. If we look down on Kosovo as an experiment in new forms of good-faith colonialism as a nuisance to bear and despise for strategic reasons, then we will just repeat the historical mistakes in the Balkans.

Almost all Member States recognise Kosovo, except a select few that align with Russia and drag the EU away from the only way forward. Among them Spain, the EU champion against self-determination. Europe pays a very heavy price for Spain's internal insecurities. How much longer will Spain deny Kosovo's existence just to get a warrant against the Catalans? Year after year, this charade grows more absurd. Self-determination is a fundamental right in Kosovo, in Sahara, in Scotland, and, yes, also in Catalonia.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, Косово показва ангажираност в прилагането на необходимите реформи, има огромна обществена подкрепа за европейската интеграция и сега е моментът правителството да използва стабилното си мнозинство в парламента и да продължи с необходимите реформи.

В същото време, както много често сме казвали, европейската интеграция е двупосочна улица. Европейският съюз, Европейският съвет трябва да изпълни своето обещание и най-накрая гражданите на Косово да имат възможност да пътуват без визи за краткосрочни пътувания за туризъм в Европейския съюз. Това го дължим да се случи колкото се може по-бързо, бих казал веднага.

Очаквам от правителството и решителни действия за напредък с отношенията със Сърбия, като тук ясна цел, преди малко го казахме и по време на дебата със Сърбия, е, че крайната цел е взаимното признаване на двете страни. Щастлив съм, че в текста на проекторезолюцията има и параграф за българското малцинство в Косово, в което се призовава тяхната петиция към косовския парламент да бъде уважена и техните права да бъдат зачитани и вписани в законите.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Madam President, Kosovo's people deserve this liberalisation and this is nothing new. They have deserved it since 2018. Kosovo played by the rules and fulfilled all the Commission benchmarks. Yet last month, the European Council failed them, failed all of the Western Balkan countries again. And I'm embarrassed. It is also my home country, the Netherlands, that continues to block what the Kosovars clearly deserve.

Let us be very clear: any Franco-Dutch demands for yet another Commission report or road map are absurd. If we want to retain any remaining credibility in the Western Balkans, the Council must put an end to this habit of changing the rules in the middle of the game. All Member States and the Commission need to hold obstructers accountable. Our leaders need to realize Europe's geopolitical reality does not leave room for unending roadmaps. So I call on the Council and on the French and Dutch governments, in particular, to be resolute: end this irresponsible obstruction.

Just like finally opening accession negotiations with North Macedonia and Albania, Kosovo's visa liberalisation will be a sign of hope that will resound across the Western Balkans and it will demonstrate to all that EU enlargement is alive and kicking if you deliver on what you were asked. We need to do this together.

Lars Patrick Berg (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich begrüße diesen Bericht, der meiner Meinung nach sowohl ausgewogen als auch fair ist. Meine Sorge ist, dass wir es wie im Falle Georgiens versäumen, unsere Freunde in einer großen Zeit der Instabilität zu unterstützen. Es ist unverzeihlich, dass das Kosovo von einigen Mitgliedstaaten immer noch nicht anerkannt wird, und zwar aus Gründen, die mehr mit innenpolitischen Erwägungen als mit Fragen der kosovarischen Souveränität zu tun haben.

Wir müssen die Fragen der Visaliberalisierung auf der Grundlage des Prinzips der Fairness und gleicher Wettbewerbsbedingungen für die Staaten des westlichen Balkans lösen. Die kosovarische Regierung hat lobenswerte Fortschritte bei der Bekämpfung der Korruption, der Durchsetzung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit und der Förderung der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung gemacht. Lassen Sie uns unsere Beziehungen endlich auf die nächste Stufe heben.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ha ragione questa relazione quando chiede che il Kosovo sia ammesso come paese candidato all'adesione all'Unione e ha ragione quando chiede agli Stati membri di non porre il veto alla richiesta che il Kosovo intenda formalizzare in questo senso alla fine del 2022. Se quando questa richiesta arriverà Stati come la Spagna si opporranno, si scontreranno frontalmente contro la volontà di questo Parlamento.

Il Kosovo ha compiuto passi importanti dal 2021 verso la democratizzazione del suo sistema politico e se gli chiudiamo la porta, questi sforzi perderanno slancio. Cosa preferiamo? Un Kosovo democratico all'interno dell'Unione o uno Stato kosovaro fallito vicino, ma al di fuori dell'Unione?

La Spagna e gli altri Stati che ancora non riconoscono la legittima dichiarazione unilaterale di indipendenza del Kosovo ostacoleranno il suo percorso europeo, una dichiarazione che è conforme al diritto internazionale secondo la Corte internazionale di giustizia. Se una dichiarazione unilaterale di indipendenza può essere legale in conformità con il diritto internazionale, va contro i valori europei che attualmente ci siano cinque Stati membri dell'Unione, inclusa la Spagna, che non vogliono riconoscerlo.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, thank you very much. I'm glad to see that in this report, we welcome Kosovo's efforts to advance the reforms that will bring the country closer to the EU, that we recognise progress being made in a number of areas, and that we praise the support of institutions and the majority of the population to become members of the EU. But despite all of this, five member states, including Spain, are stubbornly resisting to recognise Kosovo as an independent state, a state that very soon will formally ask us for membership. The situation is absurd, even more so when the non-recognition is looking at internal situations and for the fear of setting precedents regarding the ways to achieve statehood, as is clearly the case with Spain.

The independence of Kosovo is irreversible legal, democratic, and it has been a reality for years. Hindering Kosovo's European perspective by not recognising its independence is selfish and weakens our Union.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Za nami debata. Rozmawialiśmy o aspiracjach takich państw jak Bośnia i Hercegowina, Serbia, a teraz Kosovo. Oczywiście jest bardzo wiele merytorycznych argumentów, bo też nie ma co udawać – chować głowy w piasek – że od elementów historycznych, ale też od sytuacji w innych państwach, tak jak w Hiszpanii, zależy proces akcesji Kosowa, który wzbudza kontrowersje.

Proszę Państwa, jesteśmy na określonym etapie historii. Churchill mówił kiedyś o miękkim podbrzuszu, wskazując Bałkany. Jeżeli nie będzie jasnej drogi, jasnego światła, aby te państwa Bałkanów Zachodnich mogły wejść do Unii Europejskiej, to w tym kotle bałkańskim będzie mieszał Putin, będą mieszać wahabici z Arabii Saudyjskiej, będzie mieszać Turcja – i będziemy mieli cały czas problem. Jest to jedyna nadzieja, aby przezwyciężyć również te wszystkie animozje wynikające z różnic narodowościowych, z walk, z dominacji Serbów w Bośni czy Hercegowinie. Ale również, powiedzmy to uczciwie, tak jak upominamy się tutaj o Bułgarów w Kosowie, należy się upomnieć również o Serbów w Kosowie. Przecież Kosovo to historyczny rdzeń dawnej Serbii. Miejmy to w pamięci, otwierając drzwi do Europy. Bo innej drogi nie ma. Jeżeli do UE nie wejdzie Bośnia i Hercegowina, jeżeli nie wejdzie Serbia, nie wejdzie Macedonia Północna, nie wejdzie Kosovo, to Putin będzie zacierał ręce, będą zacierać ręce w Pekinie, będą zacierać ręce w Arabii Saudyjskiej.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to tell you that Commissioner Várhelyi would very much wish to be here with us on these items, but he was prevented due to medical reasons.

Thank you for raising all the various issues in this extremely interesting debate. On visa liberalisation, let me just clarify and reiterate once again that we continue to stand behind our assessment of July 2018 that Kosovo has fulfilled all the requirements for visa liberalisation, and it is now for the Council to move this issue forward.

On the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue, I would like to underline that we fully support the efforts of the High Representative and his Special Representative Lajčák to facilitate the talks between Belgrade and Pristina. And I think it is time for this process to come to a successful end. We expect both parties to make rapid and concrete progress on the full normalisation of their relations.

I would not want now to go into details of all the other issues. Let me just say that the upcoming 2022 enlargement package will be an opportunity to assess Kosovo's progress. We expect to see concrete action from the government on many of the key areas that were also highlighted in today's discussion. These reforms that are necessary will help bring prosperity, stability and peace to Kosovo and also to the wider region. This is a message that we need to repeat to all our partners in the Western Balkans and I do count on the support of this House to echo these messages and to remain engaged with Kosovo.

It is really important, perhaps more than ever before, that the European Union and this House express their full and unequivocal commitment to the EU membership perspective for all of the Western Balkans, including Kosovo.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, I would like to thank you mainly for your very positive feedback on this report, but also for your continued support for possible to advance on its reform and EU integration path. Kosovo has made a significant progress in recent years in many areas, maturing as a democracy and as an international partner. The success of the Kurti Government will be measured in delivering on key issues. Judiciary, rule of law, energy transition, but also on education and health. And that is my main message for the Kosovo Government: you have a stable majority and still a fresh mandate – use this!

Kosovo's international priority remains the Brussels-led dialogue with Serbia. The deals on energy in the north of Kosovo and on missing persons are important as they will contribute to the further normalisation of the situation and mutual trust between Albanians and Serbs. EU Special Envoy Miroslav Lajčák has our full support and we wish to end this process soon, since there is a unique transatlantic alignment on this. My second message is for Kosovo's international partners. The last EU summit created excuse me, a major disappointment for Kosovo, but also the whole Western Balkan region. I honestly hoped that when delivering this speech I would be congratulating Kosovo's citizens on visa liberalisation. Yet not a single delivery was made to any of the countries of the region. Dear French and Dutch colleagues, citizens of Mexico, Nicaragua and Qatar can travel freely to Europe, but still Kosovo's can't. I deeply regret that as it sparks Euroscepticism and undermines our credibility in the eyes of our partners in Kosovo. We do need to do our homework here. I invite you all to convince your national governments to finally deliver what Kosovo deserved a long time ago. Free movement for its citizens.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt. Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna 6. heinäkuuta 2022.

18. UE i obrona multilateralizmu (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Javi Lópezin ulkoasiainvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö EU:sta ja monenvälisyyden puolustamisesta [2020/2114(INI)] (A9-0172/2022).

Javi López, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, hoy debatimos el informe, en el que hemos estado trabajando en la Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores durante el último año, sobre la Unión Europea y la necesaria defensa del multilateralismo. Un último año en el que, especialmente, los ponentes alternativos han estado contribuyendo de forma decidida para tener un buen informe. Querría agradecerles a todos ellos sus contribuciones, que han hecho que tengamos un texto útil y especialmente pertinente; lo es tanto el debate como el texto que vamos a aprobar. Pertinente por el contexto internacional en el que nos encontramos: un mundo en convulsión, lleno y repleto de tensiones, propio de la lógica de los grandes imperios y donde algunas amenazas reales han demostrado cómo están dispuestos a pisar, mediante la fuerza, la organización de un mundo guiado por las normas. Y porque, además, durante los últimos años, y especialmente a través de la pandemia, hemos aprendido lo interconectados que estamos y lo necesarios que son la cooperación internacional y el multilateralismo para afrontar los actuales retos globales.

Este también es un informe que responde a la conversación interinstitucional que tiene la Unión Europea después de la Comunicación, que reconocemos, de la Comisión y el alto representante, sobre la Unión Europea y el multilateralismo.

Se trata de un informe que pretende hacer cinco cosas.

En primer lugar, señalar las razones y las causas de la crisis actual del multilateralismo, una crisis que calificamos de influencia, de relevancia y de legitimidad, y colocar una hoja de ruta para la reconstrucción del multilateralismo en el mundo. Un multilateralismo más eficaz, inclusivo, guiado por valores y, al mismo tiempo, orientado a resultados.

En segundo lugar, el informe subraya la simbiosis existente entre la Unión Europea y el multilateralismo. Forma parte de nuestro ADN. De hecho, nosotros, como organización política, somos también un producto multilateral de la voluntad de construir normas, diálogo e instituciones comunes. Y, para ello, reclamamos dos cosas: una mayor presencia de la Unión Europea como actor global en los órganos multilaterales, con una buena cooperación entre los Estados miembros y las instituciones europeas; y un mayor peso e influencia de los foros multilaterales en la toma de decisión global, algo que creemos que va a ir y va de la mano.

En tercer lugar, el informe contribuye al necesario debate sobre la actualización y la reforma de las Naciones Unidas, una organización que se ha visto superada durante los últimos años, especialmente por conflictos en los que estaban involucrados miembros permanentes de su Consejo de Seguridad. Por eso, reclamamos hoy un Consejo de Seguridad más inclusivo, más representativo del mundo actual, con una presencia real de la Unión Europea en la toma de decisiones y en el que se minimicen los poderes de veto.

En cuarto lugar, también habla el informe sobre el papel de esta Cámara y del parlamentarismo en los foros multilaterales, reclamando una diplomacia parlamentaria al servicio del multilateralismo y reclamando un rol relevante de las asambleas en estos foros multilaterales.

Y, en quinto lugar, reclamamos un multilateralismo orientado a resultados, a los desafíos que hoy todos conocemos que requieren cooperación, especialmente: el cambio climático, que, por su propia naturaleza, nos obliga y nos empuja a cooperar —y no vale la competición—; la gobernanza económica, hoy muy castigada; la necesidad de cooperar en el ámbito de la fiscalidad o, también, de la igualdad de género; y, por supuesto, la salud global, que ha sido una de las lecciones, sin duda, de esta pandemia.

Con todo, hoy reclamamos un compromiso firme de esta casa, de esta Cámara, para la reconstrucción necesaria de un multilateralismo en crisis que requiere una Unión Europea más fuerte, como actor global, para esa reconstrucción y para que tengamos un mundo guiado por normas, diálogo e instituciones comunes, para hacer frente a los retos que comparte la humanidad.

Άννα-Μισέλ Ασημακοπούλου, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on International Trade*. – Madam President, the recent ministerial conference of the WTO acts as a stark reminder of what exactly is at stake when we talk about the defence of multilateralism.

So was MC12 actually a success? What was genuinely achieved? After 20 years, there was an agreement on fishing subsidies, a compromise on the TRIPS waiver, and the long-standing position of exempting e-commerce from tariffs was maintained. But can these achievements be characterized as a success? Well, apparently they can, if not because of the achievements themselves, because of our excessively modest expectations. Set against the backdrop of war in Ukraine, growing protectionism, trade weaponisation, frankly, we're all relieved that MC12 managed to achieve anything at all. So yes, the answer is that MC12 was a success. But the long-term future of the WTO is still far from certain. And though a light continues to shine on the future of multilateralism and the WTO lives to fight another day, we must all intensify our efforts in defending multilateralism.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, this report on the EU and the defence of multilateralism could not be more timely and I thank the rapporteur, Jávi López, for raising the urgent need to defend multilateralism and for bringing this report together.

At the start of the year, the UN Secretary-General spoke urgently about what he called a 'five-alarm global fire' covering COVID, inequality, climate emergency, abuse of technology and violent conflict. Unfortunately, things have gone much worse since.

Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine has compounded problems that were already challenging our ability to adapt. It has damaged the international order and the global economy in ways that will have lasting repercussions. By threatening the territorial integrity and independence of a sovereign state, the war in Ukraine raises questions about the whole system of rules and norms underpinning international relations. This war has exposed gaps in global governance and underlined the need for reform of the United Nations.

At the same time, however, it has concentrated the minds on what is at stake and it has reminded us what we are capable of. Successive resolutions of the UN General Assembly have shown the strength of feeling around the world against Russia's aggression, and the EU has taken a leading role in rallying strong, swift and united international action. This has involved new forms of cooperation with the G7 partners, but also outreach around the world.

The EU has also been ready to assert its positive narrative in support of rules-based multilateralism in the face of the alternative vision presented by China through its global development initiative and the global security initiative, and it was restated in the China-Russia joint statement of 4 February.

The EU also maintains a strong profile on human rights, economic, social and cultural, as well as civil and political rights. Just recently, the EU coordinated a statement in Geneva about digital and access to education, which was supported by nearly 100 countries from all regions.

This willingness to work with partners on all issues is a hallmark of EU policy. It builds on the vital agreements and relationships that connect us with Latin America and the Caribbean, the Indo-Pacific, with Africa and the Gulf. It draws on a shared respect for the UN Charter, which is now more relevant than ever, as well as agreed values and principles.

Unfortunately, the more we learn, the more we grasp the scale of the challenges ahead. The UN's Global Crisis Response Group set this out with chilling clarity, and the EU is committed to working through this framework to mitigate the effects of the war for the most vulnerable. But even as we do so, we cannot lose sight of overarching priorities such as Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals.

This report is a valuable reminder of the breadth and depth of human endeavour covered in one word, multilateralism, and it will be a useful guide for our work.

Miriam Lexmann, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, let me start off by thanking the rapporteur and colleagues across this House for the cooperation on this report.

Multilateralism, as the peaceful organization of relations between states as well as the international organisations built over 75 years, is increasingly threatened. Today, non-democratic regimes, such as Russia under Vladimir Putin or the totalitarian Chinese Communist Party, are seeking to reshape multilateral forums and rewrite international norms to suit their malign interests from trade to human rights.

For too long, we have allowed non-democratic regimes to increase their influence across multilateral forums. This is why it is essential that we work closely with our democratic allies to rebuild multilateralism. Together, we must ensure that multilateral institutions function in accordance with the values and principles on which they were built, that they are accountable and they work in a way that is relevant to meet today's challenges.

First, we must utilise our existing networks and make full use of our new policy instruments, such as Global Europe or the global gateway. We must also not forget that we still exert important leverage on the biggest donor to multilateral institutions.

Second, we must press ahead with our reforms to the key institutions, including the WTO and WHO, as well as the Human Rights Council, to ensure that they are resilient to malign influence and work to defend the values on which they have been built. How we, the democratic world, respond to it will determine the world in which we will live in the future.

Margarida Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a prova de que o multilateralismo não está morto é evidenciada pela última reunião de ministros da Organização Mundial do Comércio, há três semanas, em Genebra.

Gostaríamos que se tivesse ido mais longe nos compromissos? Sim. Mas chegou-se a compromissos robustos. Registou-se uma vontade política, apoiada por 164 países, de reformar e modernizar a OMC. A OMC é uma organização multilateral essencial para regular o comércio mundial e, conseqüentemente, uma globalização mais justa. E a União Europeia tem de ter posições claras sobre estas reformas.

Precisamos hoje, e isso foi visível no quadro da pandemia, como está agora a ser no quadro da ação da Rússia e Ucrânia, de mais e não de menos multilateralismo. Precisamos de trabalhar para evitar a fragmentação do sistema multilateral.

Finalmente, a reforma da OMC no quadro do sistema multilateral é uma necessidade para continuarmos a trabalhar num comércio baseado em regras, justo e sustentável.

Dragoş Tudorache, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam Chair, Commissioner, dear colleagues, democracy does not just happen and freedom is not a given. We fought – and are still fighting – wars for the rules-based order. To strengthen it, we created multilateral institutions, and to this day they have kept us interconnected, provided us with an opportunity to solve issues through diplomacy and dialogue, and were meant to keep rogue regimes accountable.

So, first and foremost, we have a duty to keep multilateralism functional and effective. We must constantly update and reinvent its institutions so they remain in lockstep with our geopolitical realities. When they fail, particularly in securing accountability for breaking rules, we must find ways to reform them. It is true for the WTO and it is true for the UN.

From climate change to war on famine, we need to act our values stronger and we need to work closer with those who think like us. This is the essence of our report, and I praise the rapporteur and my fellow shadows for how we worked to achieve it.

Jordi Solé, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, despite the fact that we live in a context of intense geopolitical competition, that we are unfortunately returning to the politics of confronted blocs and that globalisation is being questioned due to some of its outcomes, we need to uphold more than ever multilateralism and its institutions. Never before have we been so connected with each other, and our challenges so interconnected. We must continue to find common solutions to common challenges within the framework of multilateral institutions. The EU must help to keep multilateral institutions and international organisations alive and functioning. However, they must be effective, operational and rules based. If this is not so, which is actually the case of some decades-old institutions, they must be reformed.

Finally, and importantly, the EU should be more active in building strong alliances with democratic counterparts, sharing our values which are increasingly under threat. We need to ensure that these values that have fostered progress, democracy, justice and human rights are the driving force of global governance.

Manu Pineda, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señora presidenta, ya es hora de que la Unión Europea reflexione sobre su política de alianzas. Mientras se le llena la boca de hablar de multilateralidad, sus acciones van en el sentido contrario. Lo vemos con cada conflicto internacional. La Unión Europea no duda en acatar los dictados de los Estados Unidos, un país que sigue sembrando el mundo de guerra y atacando a los pueblos que cuestionan su hegemonía.

La Unión Europea entiende que el nuevo orden mundial consiste en atacar a cualquier país al que los Estados Unidos pongan en su diana y, en este sentido, lleva años provocando y sancionando a China y Rusia, a las que los Estados Unidos han declarado sus enemigos sistémicos.

La Unión Europea debe abandonar esta subordinación y tener una política exterior propia, basada en la paz, la cooperación y el respeto de los derechos humanos y de la soberanía de los pueblos.

Lejos de esto, lo que vemos es seguidismo a un gendarme global que lo decide todo a base de bombas, intervenciones militares y sanciones. Y, enfrente, nuestros pueblos están sufriendo las consecuencias de esta sumisión.

David McAllister (PPE). – Madam President, Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine has been a wake-up call for all of us in the European Union. This war is a defining event for the future of our common foreign and security policy. Many challenges, as colleagues have already pointed out, lie ahead of us in this new era marked by increasing strategic competition, as well as a continued erosion of the rules-based international order.

Indeed, the European Union should strengthen its role as a global champion for multilateralism. It is about making this system more relevant, resilient and effective. Moreover, as the European Union we need to intensify ties with our strategic partners, partners with whom we share the same values, partners with whom we can work together to promote and defend the rules-based international order with the United Nations at its heart.

The European Parliament has a special role to play when it comes to parliamentary diplomacy and building global partnerships. Therefore, let us continue to develop our wide-ranging networks with third countries and international organisations to face common challenges. As Committee Chair, let me say to Jáví López, well done, your report will be voted tomorrow with a large majority.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Madam President, thanks to the rapporteur for this timely report. Each of Russia’s atrocities in Ukraine represents the brutal face of the crisis in multilateralism. And this crisis did not happen overnight. No, it is a culmination of coordinated efforts of autocrats to undermine the international rules-based order. And we simply cannot allow them to weaponise, hijack or destroy multilateralism for their own geopolitical purposes. The global crisis we face are many, whether of democratic decline, the ongoing pandemic or climate emergency. And this is the moment for the EU to step up together with like-minded partners. Our Union must place itself at the forefront of efforts to revitalise multilateralism. Doing so requires urgent strategic autonomy, and we must be much more assertive in promoting our values. We have no second to lose.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Herr talman! En värld utan internationellt samarbete skulle vara både farligare, fattigare och framför allt mindre fri. För att bekämpa pandemier, rädda klimatet, skapa spelregler för rymden eller värna mänskliga rättigheter så behöver vi multilateralism – organisationer och strukturer där stora och små länder får komma till tals. Alternativet är att mäktiga länder dikterar, att aggressiva länder hotar. Men vi kan inte acceptera att länder missbrukar de internationella samarbeten vi har för att trygga fred och frihet. Ryssland, permanent medlem av FN:s säkerhetsråd, bröt mot själva FN-stadgan. De attackerade, invaderade ett fredligt grannland.

Att Ryssland till slut kastades ut ur FN:s råd för mänskliga rättigheter var naturligtvis helt rätt – på samma sätt som de slängdes ut ur Europarådet. Det multilaterala samarbetet ska vi vara väldigt rädda om, men länder som själva vänder ryggen till ska veta att en plats i organisationer som ger inflytande och prestige inte är något man prenumererar på, utan det är något man kvalificerar sig för.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, el multilateralismo y el respeto del Derecho internacional son principios básicos de la acción exterior de la Unión Europea. La globalización y grandes retos como el cambio climático, las pandemias, el terrorismo, etc., requieren respuestas multilaterales, no respuestas unilaterales o imposiciones de grandes potencias. Desgraciadamente, otros actores favorecen el unilateralismo, el uso de la fuerza y las esferas de influencia. Necesitamos reforzar el multilateralismo y necesitamos reforzar a las Naciones Unidas y el imperio del Derecho.

Toda la comunidad internacional debe rechazar activamente la agresión rusa. No es posible una línea de indiferencia o neutralidad ante la tragedia que está ocurriendo en Ucrania. La agresión rusa significa dinamitar todo el orden internacional. No es un mero conflicto en el ámbito regional europeo. Es necesaria una respuesta común de todos contra el comportamiento inaceptable, criminal y anacrónico de Rusia.

En un mundo tan complejo, interdependiente y polarizado, necesitamos seguir avanzando para que la Unión Europea sea un actor global y eficaz. Apoyo también que la Unión pueda ocupar un asiento permanente en el Consejo de Seguridad en el contexto de una futura reforma consensuada de este organismo.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Daugiašališkumas kaip valstybių bendravimo priemonė šiuo metu patiria neeilinius išbandymus. Rusijos karinė agresija Ukrainoje yra sunkus tarptautinės teisės pažeidimas, o tarptautinė bendruomenė nesuranda instrumentų ją sustabdyti.

Kinijos 2021 m. pradėtos ekonominės prievartos prieš Lietuvą (o tai buvo reakcija į prekybos santykių su Taivanu stiprinimą) Europos Sąjunga negali įveikti nei viena pati, nei pasitelkdama tarptautinius formatus.

Šitoks didėjantis autoritarinių bei totalitarinių valstybių nesiskaitymas su bet koku daugiašališkumu kyla iš tarptautinės tvarkos, atsiradusios 1945 m., kuri, kaip šiame pranešime švelniai pasakyta, ne visiškai atspindi – o aš pasakyčiau, visiškai nebeatspindi – šiandienos pasaulio. Toji tvarka turi būti keičiama, ir, tikėkimės, kad šis pranešimas bent kažkiek prie to prisidės.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, I want to commend the report by Mr López, particularly the references to the Sustainable Development Goals. I think the report doesn't quite capture the degree to which the SDGs are in crisis. There is no way that we will achieve Agenda 2030. There is no way that we will be able to mobilise the finance for the SDGs or even to monitor the implementation of the SDGs when we don't even have a strategy and an implementation plan for the SDGs.

I want to also mention Syria. It's a conflict that once had the full attention of this House, and it's a conflict that we've turned our back on, quite frankly. The UN Security Council has until Sunday to renew the cross-border resolution that delivers food and humanitarian aid to 4 million people. I think all of us know, frankly, that there is very little chance that that cross-border resolution will be renewed. In my opinion, there is obviously no rationale for reducing humanitarian aid in circumstances where even more people are in need of it now and there is absolutely no alternative.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, merci à la Commission européenne. En fait, ce rapport se plaint d'une perte d'influence, d'une érosion d'influence des pays européens et de l'Union européenne dans le monde. Je pense qu'il sera applaudi au sein de la maison, mais je pense qu'en dehors, il fera un peu rire.

Premièrement, quand je lis que l'Union européenne devrait avoir un siège permanent en plus des sièges qu'ont déjà les pays européens au Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies, je me dis que l'Inde, qui compte 1 milliard d'habitants, va un peu rigoler en se disant «pourquoi pas nous?».

Deuxièmement, quand vous parlez d'une perte d'influence et du fait qu'on n'a pas assez d'influence dans le monde, je pense aux gens en Afrique de l'Ouest qui se battent contre l'impérialisme français ou l'impérialisme des pays européens pour se libérer. Ils riront aussi un peu jaune en lisant ce rapport.

Je pense que plutôt que de parler d'influence, il faudrait parler de respect, il faudrait écouter l'autre: c'est ça, le multilatéralisme. Ce n'est pas imposer sa volonté aux autres, mais écouter l'autre et avoir des relations d'égal à égal. C'est comme ça qu'on construira un monde de paix, de solidarité et de coopération, et non pas en imposant notre influence et notre rôle.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for these remarks. This debate shows that you maintain active interest and engagement in the role of the EU within the multilateral system. And I can only agree with many things that have been said about the need to rebuild multilateralism through global partnership and the need to ensure the respect of universal rules, rights and values. We need multilateralism to be inclusive. We need multilateralism to be effective and networked to address also the urgent global challenges. And we owe this to our young people in particular who are faced with rights reversals. They see their lives getting worse, not better. And they're rightly demanding their place at the table.

This is why the EU is working now on a Youth Action Plan to promote the participation of young people in the EU's external action. This is also our part of the strategy too to pursue the Sustainable Development Goals.

After the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the Commission, in Cooperation with the External Action Service, has deployed a range of measures to integrate the Sustainable Development Goals for its international partnerships and development cooperation. For instance, the 2017 European Consensus on Development marked a clear collective determination of the EU and the Member States to reorient our policies to support partner countries to progress towards the SDGs. This was shown in the new Global Europe financing instrument, which includes the objective to support the implementation and mainstreams it in relation to programming and monitoring. Our multi-annual indicative programmes integrate the pursuit of the SDGs and our monitoring results and report and combine the tracking of EU priorities in this respect.

And finally, the new European Global Gateway Strategy and our actions as Team Europe, meaning together with EU Member States, will be deployed as a contribution to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Javi López, ponente. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, creo que en el debate de hoy ha quedado clara la inquebrantable voluntad de compromiso de esta Cámara de continuar luchando por el método multilateral, una forma de organizar las relaciones internacionales.

Han quedado claras también algunas cosas. Una de ellas es lo que significa la guerra de Ucrania para el método multilateral; que una fuerza nuclear invada un tercer país levantando el derecho de conquista como método de resolución de conflictos y, sobre todo, que utilice la fuerza —la fuerza más bruta y atroz— para cambiar la lógica de las fronteras, la soberanía de los Estados. Y, por eso, obviamente, impugna directamente una lógica basada en normas, instituciones y diálogo como es el multilateralismo.

Pero no es el único episodio. Durante las últimas dos décadas se han mencionado también la guerra de Siria y la incapacidad que hemos tenido la comunidad internacional de dar una respuesta a ella. Son otras acciones unilaterales en el mundo que creo que han ido resquebrajando el método multilateral, que hoy está en profunda crisis y que, por ello, impugna e interpela a la Unión Europea. Y deberíamos ser capaces de reconstruirlo.

¿Reconstruirlo cómo, también se ha dicho? Con nuestros aliados, especialmente aquellos que comparten valores democráticos y esta visión multilateral del método internacional. Por eso es importante que aquellas democracias que quieren reivindicarse como tales trabajen de la mano para reconstruir las instituciones internacionales, hacerlas más efectivas, más inclusivas y orientarlas a resultados. Pero recordando que nuestras alianzas con las democracias no están para buscar divisiones en el mundo, sino para organizar un mundo multipolar que necesita del multilateralismo.

Muchas gracias a todos, a la gente que trabaja en esta Cámara, a los ponentes alternativos que han contribuido a este debate y a este informe.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 6. Juli 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Urmas Paet (Renew), kirjalikult. – Euroopa Liit on alati olnud mitmepoolsuse ehk multilateralismi kaitsja maailmas. Peame seda ka tulevikus jätkama. Eriti arvestades, et maailmakord on üha ebastabiilsem, polariseerunum ja seda varjutavad konkureerivad tegevuskavad ja poliitilised seisukohad ning suurenev õigusliku killustatuse ja konkureerivate regulatiivsete standardite oht. Ühtlasi tuleb silmas pidades, et demokraatia, inimõigused ja õigusriik on maailma eri piirkondades aina suuremas ohus ja et inimõiguste kaitsjad ja kodanikuühiskonna aktivistid peavad oma seaduslikku tööd tehes tulema toime aina suuremate ohtude ja riskidega.

19. Poprawa bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego w krajach rozwijających się (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Beata Kempa im Namen des Entwicklungsausschusses über die Verbesserung der Ernährungssicherheit in Entwicklungsländern (2022/2208(INI)) (A9-0195/2022).

Beata Kempa, sprawozdawczyni. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! W pierwszych słowach bardzo dziękuję sprawozdawcom ceniom i wszystkim osobom zaangażowanym w przygotowanie tego sprawozdania, również wszystkim osobom w sekretariacie, doradcom za bardzo owocną współpracę i za wypracowanie niezwykle ważnego w dzisiejszych czasach dokumentu.

Sprawozdanie na temat bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego w krajach rozwijających się stało się szczególnie ważne w ostatnich miesiącach w związku z inwazją Rosji na Ukrainę. Stoimy przed ogromnymi wyzwaniami związanymi z bezpieczeństwem żywnościowym. Co więcej, wraz ze skutkami kryzysu na Ukrainie mamy do czynienia ze scenariuszem, w którym biedni i bezbronni ponownie ucierpią najbardziej. Niczym niesprowokowana i nieuzasadniona wojna napastnicza Rosji przeciwko Ukrainie jeszcze bardziej zdestabilizowała i tak już niestabilną sytuację na rynkach rolnych i pogorszyła i tak już poważną sytuację spowodowaną pandemią Covid-19, a także wywarła dodatkową presję na trwające kryzysy żywnościowe i globalne bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe, powodując wzrost międzynarodowych cen żywności i pasz znacznie powyżej dotychczasowego, i tak już wysokiego poziomu.

Liczba osób potrzebujących pilnej pomocy w zakresie żywienia stale rośnie. Osoby najbardziej niebezpieczne w najbardziej niestabilnych krajach nie poradzą sobie same. Tylko dzisiaj przytoczono statystyki. Miliard 700 mln ludzi w 107 krajach na świecie może dotknąć głód, który może być wynikiem wojny na Ukrainie. Głód, który Rosja i Putin eksportują dzisiaj na cały świat. Jeszcze przed wojną 45 mln dzieci poniżej piątego roku życia dotkniętych było wyniszczeniem z powodu poważnego niedożywienia. To są dane, które zamieszczamy w naszym sprawozdaniu. Nasze sprawozdanie ma odpowiadać wyzwaniom, przed którymi stoimy. Mam nadzieję, że dzięki temu sprawozdaniu Unia Europejska utrzyma rolę lidera w zakresie wsparcia finansowego na rzecz walki z głodem poprzez priorytetowe traktowanie bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego w swoich programach rozwojowych i humanitarnych. Poprzez wskazanie kierunków mających na celu eliminację ubóstwa i nierówności to sprawozdanie ma na celu pomóc krajom rozwijającym się w budowaniu ich odporności na kryzysy.

Obecnie konflikty są najczęstszym powodem braku bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego. Dlatego tak ważne jest podkreślenie w sprawozdaniu powiązania pomocy humanitarnej z pomocą rozwojową i budowaniem pokoju w celu zarządzania skutkami kryzysu, jak i ograniczania ich ryzyka. Unia Europejska powinna wdrożyć bardziej skoordynowane podejście do przeciwdziałania wszelkim formom niedożywienia poprzez zintegrowanie humanitarnego celu ratowania życia w sytuacjach kryzysowych z długoterminowym naciskiem na zapobieganie wszelkim formom niedożywienia.

Niezbędne jest wspieranie lepszego dostępu do rynków i zabezpieczenia własności ziemi dla drobnych rolników i kobiet, a także zwiększenie ich dostępu do technologii i innowacji, co również zostało odpowiednio uwzględnione w sprawozdaniu. Zwiększanie dochodów drobnych rolników i zatrudnienie na obszarach wiejskich jest ważne dla walki z ubóstwem i wzmacniania odporności tych społeczności. Musimy pamiętać, że inwestycje i interwencje Unii Europejskiej powinny opierać się na dokładnej, wstępnej ocenie w celu opracowania sprawiedliwych działań wzmocnienia zdolności lokalnych, w tym zdolności organów niepaństwowych.

Unijna polityka na rzecz poprawy bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego powinna być dostosowana do potrzeb lokalnych i uwzględniać zróżnicowanie systemów żywnościowych na świecie. Chciałabym również zwrócić uwagę na to, że marnowanie żywności jest częścią światowego braku bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego i niedożywienia. Unia Europejska powinna zwiększyć wysiłki na rzecz ograniczenia strat i marnowania żywności. Niedożywanie w naszych czasach jest wstydem nie do zaakceptowania. Unia Europejska posiada odpowiednie środki i możliwości, aby sprostać obecnym wyzwaniom... *(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos)*

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I wish to thank the honourable Member Kempa for her work as rapporteur on this very important and timely report. Various points of reference, including the Global Network Against Food Crises, are raising alarm about the acute food insecurity, which has been greatly aggravated by the Russian aggression against Ukraine. And in this context, the report prepared by the honourable Kemper provides a very timely and comprehensive guidance.

As the Commissioner responsible also for humanitarian aid, I particularly appreciate the importance that the report gives to the humanitarian angle of this problem, because, let us not forget, rising food insecurity will hit the most vulnerable the soonest and the strongest. The EU has reacted quickly and resolutely. Let me mention some examples.

We have mobilised emergency funding of over EUR 620 million in additional humanitarian assistance on top of initial allocations, and these have an important food component. We mobilised EUR 225 million in a food and resilience facility for the southern neighbourhood. We have organised pledging conferences for the Sahel, for the Horn of Africa and Syria. These events helped raise funding also from other actors.

We are furthermore setting up solidarity lanes to help Ukraine export its grain through alternative routes. Rail, roads and inland waterways are to be used easier while the Black Sea ports remain blocked. And in this context, we do support the efforts by the United Nations for de-blocking these ports, because they remain the most feasible export route for significant amounts of grain.

Following the Commission's assessment, recently the Council adopted conclusions on a Team Europe response to global food insecurity. In this way, we have set up the framework for a joint response from the EU and its Member States in the following strands of action: firstly, a solidarity strand to step up emergency relief; secondly, a production and resilience strand to scale up support to sustainable production capacities; thirdly, a trade strand to get grains out of Ukraine; and fourthly, a multilateral strand to embed our response in effective multilateral partnerships.

President von der Leyen recently announced a proposal to mobilise an additional EUR 600 million from the reserves of the European Development Fund and this funding, if confirmed by the Council, should support African, Caribbean and Pacific countries to fight the food crisis.

In our efforts, we have to combine short-term action with longer-term measures. We have to support local production, ensure access to food while making food systems more sustainable and resilience. And I look forward to our exchange today.

Luke Ming Flanagan, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development*. – Mr President, the report calls on the EU to implement policies that guarantee the right to food security and sovereignty in developing countries. This, as you know, is an objective of the Sustainable Development Goals, which are, let's face it, tragically far from being achieved. In fact, the situation has worsened due to the ongoing war and its consequences on the food supply chain. It has also been worsened by financial speculation on food prices. This report, I am pleased to see, calls on the Commission to adopt measures to end financial speculation on food and agricultural commodities.

According to the 2022 Global Report on Food Crises, nearly 193 million people experienced crisis-level or worse food security in 2021, an increase of 40 million on 2020. The negative food security outlook is projected to continue or worsen this year, and the global food systems impact of the crisis in Ukraine will only contribute to further decline.

This report, if passed, needs to be acted upon. Our words here today won't provide a single extra calorie for people in developing countries. What will do it, though, is if we act on our words. We need action, and we need it now.

Marlene Mortler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Kollegen! Lange Zeit waren die Grünen in Deutschland der Meinung, nur eine schwache Armee ist eine gute Armee. Die Agrarpolitik der EU-Kommission macht einen ähnlichen Eindruck. Herr Timmermans hat eine Studie zur Ernährungssicherheit auf den Weg gebracht. Das Ziel steht wohl schon fest: Wie können wir europäische Landwirtschaft noch mehr schwächen?

Dagegen ist meine Frage elementar: Welchen humanitären Beitrag können wir in Europa für hungernde Menschen weltweit leisten? Immer mehr kämpfen ums nackte Überleben wegen Krieg, Hunger in Nordafrika, in Teilen Asiens. Wir in der westlichen Welt kämpfen um Kalorien und Kilogramm. Alleine 40 % der Lebensmittel werden in Privathaushalten weggeschmissen. Und die Kommission will „bio“ statt „konventionell“ und weitere Flächenstilllegungen ab 2023.

Aber Schickimicki-Diskussionen interessieren die armen und hungernden Menschen nicht. Die Realität wird uns auch hier sehr schnell einholen. Die Menschen wollen wissen, wer wann wie schnell Getreide liefert, wie sie satt werden. Wir dürfen nicht weiter zuschauen, wie Kriegstreiber Putin Geopolitik macht und gestohlenen ukrainischen Getreide als Hehlerware unter seine Freunde bringt. Ich fordere deshalb so schnell wie möglich einen Ernährungsgipfel. Wir brauchen nicht weniger, sondern mehr Landwirtschaft – weltweit.

Maria Noichl, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Der Hunger in der Welt beschäftigt uns alle. Wir haben zehn Finger. Wir haben zehn Finger, um zehn Dinge dagegen zu tun. Punkt 1: Sofort alle Hebel in Bewegung setzen, dass der Weizen raus aus der Ukraine kommt. Die Häfen entblockieren. Das muss gemacht werden. Wir brauchen dringend ein Verbot von Spekulationen auf Lebensmittel – weltweit. Wir brauchen dringend eine Debatte zum Thema „Tank – Teller – Trog“. Die Teller müssen mehr gefüllt werden – weniger der Trog und weniger der Tank. Wir brauchen dringend mehr humanitäre Gelder, zum Beispiel für Länder im Globalen Süden. Und wir brauchen einen Schuldenerlass. Diese fünf Dinge brauchen wir sofort.

Langfristig – und langfristig beginnt sofort, morgen – brauchen wir mehr Unterstützung hin zur Selbstversorgung, das heißt, Nahrungssouveränität für alle Länder. Wir müssen unbedingt Ernten besser schützen können, mit Infrastruktur, mit Lagerhäusern. Wir brauchen dringend mehr Regionalität, mehr Kreislaufwirtschaft. Wir brauchen dringend mehr ökologische Landwirtschaft. Wir brauchen dringend weltweit das Recht auf Saatgut und das Recht auf Nachzucht. Und wir brauchen dringend weltweit keine Privatisierung des Wassers.

Zehn Aufgaben. Wir kennen sie genau. Wir müssen nur anpacken.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, este es el primer informe de esta legislatura sobre seguridad alimentaria. Quiero dar las gracias a la ponente por su iniciativa.

La inseguridad alimentaria antes de la guerra de Ucrania afectaba en todas sus formas a más de 800 millones de personas en el mundo. Antes ya de la guerra de Ucrania estaban en una situación de inseguridad severa 17 millones de personas en Etiopía, 16 millones de personas en Yemen, 22 millones de personas en Afganistán... Y la guerra ha impactado como una cruel realidad: la utilización del hambre como arma de guerra en manos de Putin.

Debemos trabajar, por lo tanto, con nuestros países socios —países en desarrollo— para mejorar su autonomía alimentaria, trabajando en la resiliencia de sus sistemas alimentarios y apoyando a los agricultores, pero especialmente a las agricultoras, y debemos reforzar nuestra ayuda humanitaria porque, no lo olvidemos nunca: el derecho a la alimentación es, ante todo, un derecho.

Benoît Biteau, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la guerre en Ukraine a eu un impact immédiat sur les cours des matières premières agricoles et sur la sécurité alimentaire. Des dizaines de millions de personnes, en particulier en Afrique et dans le bassin méditerranéen, sont confrontées à la faim, voire à la famine.

Bâtir la sécurité alimentaire sur l'Organisation mondiale du commerce et la libéralisation des échanges a ainsi eu comme conséquence une dépendance accrue aux importations des biens de première nécessité. Lorsque les bateaux n'arrivent plus dans les ports, le spectre de la famine surgit et menace les plus pauvres.

Aussi, la sécurité alimentaire dans les pays du Sud ne doit plus dépendre d'importations de produits soumis à des logiques spéculatives, engendrant une forte volatilité des prix pouvant rendre périlleux l'accès à la nourriture. Elle ne pourra se construire que dans la promotion de la souveraineté alimentaire, qui s'appuie sur le développement d'une agriculture locale plus autonome et plus résiliente.

L'OMC doit donc être réformée d'urgence. Cette instance multilatérale est incapable de remplir son rôle dès que les guerres apparaissent. La spéculation que nous voyons se développer depuis le 24 février 2022 est inacceptable: les profiteurs de guerre sont de retour.

L'Union européenne doit renforcer la régulation de la spéculation. À ce sujet, j'invite mes collègues à voter en faveur de l'objection MiFID demain. L'Union européenne doit aussi taxer les profits abusifs des multinationales, comme l'a demandé David Beasley, directeur général du Programme alimentaire mondial, devant la commission de l'agriculture du Parlement européen.

Bernhard Zimniok, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Der Ukrainekrieg und damit Putin sollen für eine globale Nahrungsmittelversorgungskrise verantwortlich sein. Mit den Fakten hat das aber wenig zu tun:

In den drei am stärksten von einer Versorgungskrise betroffenen Ländern – Südsudan, Somalia und Jemen – ist der Krieg das Problem, aber nicht der ukrainische. Mit Ägypten und Indonesien sind nur zwei Länder mit über 10 % vom ukrainischen Getreideimport abhängig, die restlichen Länder nur im niedrigen einstelligen Prozentbereich. Und diese Länder könnten problemlos beliefert werden, wenn die Ukraine ihre Häfen von den eigenen Minen befreien würde. Das ist genauso Teil der unangenehmen Wahrheit wie die Tatsache, dass Afrika sich problemlos selbst ernähren könnte, wenn die Bevölkerung nicht immer weiter ins Unermessliche wachsen würde und nicht weiter fruchtbares Ackerland an China verscherbeln würde. Hier steht Afrika in der Verantwortung.

Wir wären gut damit beraten, wenn wir uns endlich auf die Fakten statt auf die Aufrechterhaltung eines einzigen russischen Feindbildes fokussieren würden. Das ist ein komplexer Vorgang, was hier läuft. Dann würden auch Probleme gelöst statt verschärft.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, en un mundo donde se produce suficiente comida para alimentar a toda la población, el hambre es una cuestión política o, más concretamente, de voluntad política.

No es un problema de falta de alimentos, sino de cómo se reparten los alimentos. La pandemia o la guerra en Ucrania son agravantes, pero las causas de la inseguridad alimentaria tienen otras raíces mucho más profundas: la especulación con alimentos, mercados de productos básicos desregulados, abusos de empresas multinacionales, tratados comerciales injustos, es decir, reparto de la riqueza, injusticia y desigualdad.

El capitalismo es incompatible con la soberanía alimentaria. Vivimos una guerra entre el capital y la vida, entre los beneficios y los derechos colectivos. Y no hay derecho más básico que el derecho a la alimentación. Si queremos defenderlo, atacemos de raíz las causas políticas y económicas del hambre. Si no, seguiremos igual.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señor presidente, hablemos de hambre, sin tecnicismos. Nada más frecuente para quienes comemos varias veces al día y, al mismo tiempo, nada más lejano para muchos de nosotros. Es este quizás el mayor fracaso que tenemos como civilización, con más de 193 millones de personas que sufren hambre y 24 000 personas que mueren al día.

Aunque la Unión Europea cumpla, no estamos logrando el objetivo ODS de la Agenda 2030. Como señala este informe, conflictos, cambio climático, plagas y finalmente la pandemia nos hicieron retroceder muchos años. El impacto de la guerra en Ucrania tras la invasión rusa añade más riesgos, como, por ejemplo, el bloqueo de los silos de los granos en Ucrania.

Sobre los efectos de la guerra también debemos luchar contra la desinformación. Hay que decirlo alto y claro: las sanciones no tienen ninguna responsabilidad en el incremento del hambre. El sector agrícola de Rusia no es objetivo. Nuestras sanciones no incluyen el transporte de productos agrícolas.

Como ponente permanente, pido intensificar la ayuda humanitaria, pero esto es a corto plazo, como bien dijo el comisario. Necesitamos medidas a mediano y a largo plazo que enfoquen el triple nexo entre ayuda humanitaria, desarrollo y paz. Señor comisario, le pedimos cuanto antes la comunicación... *(el presidente retira la palabra a la oradora)*.

Stéphane Bijoux (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, ici à Strasbourg, c'est l'heure de dîner. Mais aujourd'hui même sur la même planète, dans l'hémisphère Sud, à Madagascar, des millions d'enfants n'auront mangé qu'un petit bout de galette de manioc et un petit verre de jus de cactus: c'est cela, la réalité de l'insécurité alimentaire.

Alors, notre responsabilité collective exige que l'Europe s'engage – et elle s'engage déjà avec beaucoup de solidarité –, mais il faut aussi s'attaquer aux causes de cette insécurité alimentaire. Avec nos partenaires, nous devons coconstruire des solutions adaptées à l'agriculture, à l'accès à l'eau, à la santé. Mais nous devons aussi accélérer ce combat mondial contre le dérèglement climatique qui provoque la sécheresse, des famines et des conflits.

L'urgence, c'est de travailler ensemble parce que la cohérence, l'efficacité, la convergence sont les clés de notre défi collectif.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, I think we are all agreed in this House that we are approaching a food catastrophe in developing countries. And I believe that the European Union should take a 'whatever-it-takes' approach to the impending crisis. And this could be a turning point in our relations with Africa.

We started out with President von der Leyen at the beginning of her mandate defining the partnership with Africa. So it's important that we take stock right now and imagine where that partnership is. We changed from DEVCO to INTPA; that was good, but we have migration conditionality in the Global Europe Instrument. We have automatic safeguards and mirror clauses in GSP. We have lost the battle on the issue of vaccine equity. We have a diversion in specific Member States, and a lot of African states are not convinced about Global Gateway.

So we can't afford to get this wrong, because I believe that the partnership that we have with Africa is at a very low point. The European Union must lead on this issue.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, le rapport sur l'insécurité alimentaire dans les pays en développement que nous allons voter est un rapport complet qui propose de créer les conditions d'une vraie souveraineté alimentaire pour les pays en développement. Je soutiens ce qu'a dit tout à l'heure mon collègue, Benoît Biteau, à ce sujet.

Un sujet qui mériterait d'être creusé davantage, c'est celui de la pêche. Dans de très nombreux pays, les communautés côtières dépendent fortement de la pêche pour leur alimentation, mais la concurrence est de plus en plus dure avec les flottes étrangères. Il faut protéger l'accès des pêcheurs artisans aux ressources halieutiques. Dans l'ouest de l'Afrique, par exemple, les communautés côtières pêchent et consomment des espèces comme la sardinelle, or ces espèces-là sont de plus en plus pêchées par les flottes étrangères pour produire des farines de poisson qui servent à l'aquaculture, y compris en Europe. À Madagascar, alors que le pays fait face à une situation d'insécurité alimentaire majeure, la quasi-totalité des thons pêchés sont exportés hors du pays.

Ne laissons pas les clés du système alimentaire à l'agro-industrie. La semaine dernière, à la Conférence mondiale sur les océans, des organisations d'artisans pêcheurs ont lancé un appel à l'action de la pêche artisanale pour demander à la communauté internationale de garantir l'accès aux ressources marines et aux marchés pour la pêche...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, la sécurité alimentaire dans les pays en développement s'est détériorée avant la crise de la pandémie de COVID-19, mais elle a pris une ampleur considérable suite au conflit entre la Russie et l'Ukraine.

Actuellement, 800 millions de personnes sont menacées de famine, ce qui reflète la distribution inégale des aliments. Le conflit actuel en Ukraine braque les projecteurs sur les vulnérabilités du système alimentaire mondial et met en lumière la dépendance des pays en développement, qui importent une grande partie de leurs céréales depuis la Russie et l'Ukraine.

Afin d'atteindre les objectifs de développement durable, en particulier celui de l'ODD 2 – Faim «zéro», nous devons garantir que nos politiques commerciales n'interfèrent pas avec les objectifs de développement et mettre davantage l'accent sur la souveraineté alimentaire.

La souveraineté alimentaire, c'est-à-dire le droit des peuples et des pays à définir leur propre politique agricole et alimentaire, rendra les pays moins dépendants des marchés nationaux et, partant, des importations alimentaires. Le grand défi consiste à assurer à tous l'accès à une alimentation suffisante, car le droit à l'alimentation est un droit...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

President. – Ms Herzberger, I want to tell you that your group did not request speaking time for you – not one minute, not two minutes – and now you have the catch-the-eye. We have one minute for catch-the-eye, and you spoke for far more than one minute, so you cannot complain that I cut off your microphone. Sorry for that.

The official request from your group does not contain your name, so you have to blame your group or complain to your group, but we did not receive any request. I explained it to you. You got the floor on the catch-the-eye and you spoke for one minute thirty, which is not in line with the rules.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for this extremely important debate.

This crisis requires strong coordination. Coordination will be needed between the Commission services, the Member States, the EU institutions and, obviously, including the European Parliament, with the involvement of a number of committees, including AGRI, DEVE, INTA, AFET, among others.

We will strive to provide you with periodic updates about the crisis and about our response. But I would like to assure you that we are committed to continue to work in unison with our Member States in a team Europe spirit across all the various dimensions of this food crisis. And we are committed to coordinate our work with our global partners in the context of the United Nations, the G7, the G20 and, of course, with our developing partners, in particular those in Africa.

In short, we shall spare no effort to prevent the world sliding into a food crisis not seen in many decades.

Beata Kempa, Sprawozdawczyni. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Szanowni Państwo! Przede wszystkim chcę bardzo serdecznie podziękować za wkład do debaty wszystkim mówcom, wszystkim sprawozdawcom, wszystkim, którzy dzisiaj zabrali głos, a przede wszystkim wnieśli cenne uwagi i wnioski do naszej debaty.

Panie Komisarzy, dziękuję za informacje dotyczące danych statystycznych, ale przede wszystkim o tym, że trwają prace na temat tras alternatywnych dla zboża i odblokowania portów – to ważna informacja. Ponad podziałami zwracają Państwo uwagę na to, co jest ważne w tym sprawozdaniu, a więc na wielostronne działanie. Padła tu również dobra uwaga dotycząca organizacji szczytu do spraw bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego, wsparcia dla suwerenności żywnościowej, wzmocnienia odporności, prawa do żywności jako prawa człowieka. To jest rzeczywiście fundament, na który powinniśmy zwrócić uwagę. Wreszcie kwestia ukrócenia spekulacji i dostępu do wody.

Chciałabym bardzo, żeby jutro nasze głosowanie było jasnym sygnałem dla Putina, że nie będzie eksportował głodu na cały świat, żebyśmy dali temu wyraz w głosowaniu w Parlamencie Europejskim. Jeszcze raz dziękuję wszystkim za ciężką pracę, a przede wszystkim bardzo serdecznie dziękuję komisji DEVE, komisji AGRI, wszystkim współpracownikom, wszystkim doradcom, a dzisiaj mówcom za to, że ponad podziałami dostrzegamy bardzo poważny problem, z którym pewnie przyjdzie nam się jeszcze tutaj w sposób bardzo profesjonalny zajmować. Problem ten bowiem będzie musiał być omawiany jeszcze długo.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 6. Juli 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Janina Ochojska (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Cieszę się, że sprawozdanie w sprawie bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego w krajach rozwijających się postrzega bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe, zaraz obok dostępu do wody, jako jeden z podstawowych aspektów rozwoju. Nie ma dostępu do żywności, jeśli nie zapewnimy dostępu do wody. Aby wyeliminować ubóstwo, powinniśmy zacząć od spełnienia hierarchii potrzeb takich właśnie jak dostęp do wody, żywności, które mają wpływ na zdrowie, edukację, tworzenie miejsc pracy. Wszystkie te aspekty są ze sobą powiązane.

Trudno skupić się na edukacji, gdy dzieci cierpią głód w szkołach. Z drugiej strony wiele dzieci w krajach rozwijających się w wyniku zamknięcia szkół i wprowadzenia restrykcyjnych środków w czasie pandemii COVID-19 straciło jedyny ciepły posiłek w ciągu dnia. Dzięki naszej pomocy powinniśmy przywrócić programy dożywiania dzieci w szkołach. W wyniku pandemii podwoiła się liczba osób cierpiących na dotkliwy głód. Ten aspekt jest dobrze podkreślony w sprawozdaniu.

Dodatkowo wojna na Ukrainie zaburzyła łańcuch dostaw zboża nie tylko do Europy, ale także do krajów afrykańskich. Rosnące ceny energii, perturbacje na rynku gazowym też mają odzwierciedlenie w stale rosnących cenach podstawowych produktów. W najbliższych miesiącach spodziewamy się, że liczba niedożywionych i głodnych ludzi na świecie wzrośnie. Pokonanie głodu wymaga czegoś więcej niż tylko zapewnienia wystarczającej ilości pożywienia, aby przeżyć. Pożywienie musi być zdrowe.

20. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

Der Präsident. – Als letzter heutiger Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

20.1. Akt o usługach cyfrowych (A9-0356/2021 - Christel Schaldemose)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Jessica Stegrud (ECR). – Herr talman! Syftet har varit gott och visst låter det bra att EU nu skapar ordning i den digitala världens *wild west*. Man kan kalla det ordning, men i praktiken är det snarare en gigantisk och komplex digital byråkrati som snart kommer att kräva nya regleringar. När i historien har massiv byråkrati lett till mer dynamik, innovation och tillväxt? Mig veterligen aldrig, tvärtom gynnar massiv administration i slutänden myndigheter och storföretag som har råd att anpassa sig.

Men det största problemet här är så klart att yttrandefriheten kommer att inskränkas ytterligare med den här lagstiftningen. Vår grundlagsfästa frihet kommer nu att ligga i händerna, inte bara på Big Tech, utan också på utsedda nätpoliser, så kallade *trusted flaggers*, när vår yttrandefrihet istället endast borde vila på demokratiskt stiftade lagar – både offline och online. Lagarna finns. Det är framför allt en anpassning av våra domstolar till den digitala världens hastighet vi behöver, inte mer byråkrati och godtycklighet.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, serviciile digitale sunt indispensabile economiei noastre.

Avem nevoie de o legislație europeană adaptată zilelor noastre, care să stabilească responsabilități clare și să protejeze drepturile consumatorilor și întreprinderilor.

În primul rând, trebuie să luptăm pentru combaterea conținutului legal din mediul online și pentru apărarea cetățenilor care ajung victime ale infracționalității digitale, punând un mare accent pe protejarea categoriilor vulnerabile, cum ar fi copiii. În acest sens, trebuie să ne asigurăm că ce este ilegal în offline trebuie să fie ilegal și online.

În al doilea rând, avem nevoie de condiții de concurență echitabile pe piața unică digitală. Avem prea multe companii furnizoare de servicii digitale care au un capital mult mai mare decât PIB-ul multor țări europene și care au dobândit puteri de autoreglementare prea mari pentru statutul de entități private. Trebuie să ne asigurăm că regulile sunt respectate chiar și de cei mai puternici.

20.2. Przyjęcie przez Chorwację euro w dniu 1 stycznia 2023 r. (A9-0187/2022 - Siegfried Mureşan)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Jessica Stegrud (ECR). – Herr talman! Hela 3,2 miljoner svenskar röstade nej till EMU och euron. Det är ett valresultat som EU i dag struntar i då vi blir mer och mer indragna i unionens ekonomiska politik. Coronafonden är ett exempel på det, dvs. ett bidragspaket till euroländer som redan före pandemin var dysfunktionella ekonomier. Medan de får ta del av bidragen, lider svenska medborgare och företagare av skenande priser på bland annat mat, energi och bränsle.

Nästa år antar Kroatien euron. Jag värnar länders rätt att fatta beslut om vilken valuta man vill ha, men då ska man också klara av att sköta sin ekonomi och inte förvänta sig bidrag från andra länder, särskilt inte från oss utanför eurozonen. Kroatien får gärna vara med i valutaunionen, men det är dags att respektera svenska folkets nej och ställa oss utanför den på riktigt.

20.3. Ubóstwo kobiet w Europie (A9-0194/2022 - Lina Gálvez Muñoz)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Virginie Joron (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, dans le rapport sur la pauvreté des femmes en Europe, que nous soutenons, il est souligné que l'aggravation de la situation sociale et économique causée par la pandémie de COVID-19 a accru toutes les formes d'abus et de violence à l'égard des femmes. C'est pourquoi je vais vous parler de plus de 15 000 soignants suspendus en France, dont la majorité sont des femmes, sans salaire depuis presque un an.

Je les ai rencontrées et j'ai vu de près cette détresse. Adulées pendant la première vague de COVID, elles sont devenues invisibles, voire à éliminer depuis un décret infâme de Macron. Ces infirmières, aides-soignantes, pompiers, médecins ont donc été suspendues parce qu'elles ne voulaient pas se faire injecter un produit en phase expérimentale. C'est curieux, non? Personne ne veut se pencher sur cette question. Elles ont été au front, connaissent mieux que personne les vaccins, mais leur consentement, qui devait être libre et éclairé, est dénigré, voire méprisé.

Puisque la Commission de Bruxelles veut diriger cette crise COVID, qu'elle ouvre les yeux et condamne l'infâme régime de Macron à réintégrer de suite toutes ces personnes suspendues. Pour nos valeurs humanistes, pour notre honneur.

20.4. Wspólne europejskie działania w dziedzinie opieki (A9-0189/2022 - Milan Brglez, Sirpa Pietikäinen)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule preşedinte, dragi colegi, Europa se confruntă cu o criză, o criză ascunsă, despre care nu multă lume vorbeşte, dar care afectează milioane de cetăţeni.

Este vorba de sănătatea mintală, care în ultimii ani a fost pe deplin neglijată.

Organizaţia Mondială a Sănătăţii a arătat că peste 300 de milioane de persoane din întreaga lume suferă de tulburări psihice legate de locul de muncă, cum ar fi epuizarea, anxietatea, depresia sau stresul. Mai ales pentru cei care de mai bine de doi ani de zile au lucrat numai la domiciliu şi au cunoscut colegii de muncă doar în mediul virtual şi au pierdut contactul social atât de necesar unui om sănătos.

Uniunea Europeană are obligaţia de a crea cadrul necesar pentru ca lucrătorii europeni ai lumii digitale să fie protejaţi şi să lucreze în condiţii care să le garanteze sănătatea, atât fizică, cât şi cea psihică. De aceea am ales să susţin acest raport.

20.5. Zdrowie psychiczne w cyfrowym świecie pracy (A9-0184/2022 - Maria Walsh)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, în momentul de față, peste 30 de milioane de persoane din Uniunea Europeană au nevoie de îngrijire pe termen lung, iar acest număr va crește considerabil în următorii ani, în contextul declinului demografic din Europa.

Totuși, o mare parte dintre aceste persoane nu au acces la servicii de îngrijire de calitate, din cauza costurilor ridicate și a lipsei acute de lucrători în domeniu. Mai mult decât atât, deseori condițiile de muncă ale îngrijitorilor sunt inechitabile, cu abuzuri, cu salarii mici, cu munca la negru, cu ore suplimentare neplătite și fără protecție socială.

Mii de femei din România au plecat în diferite state ale Europei pentru a lucra în domeniul îngrijirii, iar mărturiile multora dintre ele cu privire la condițiile în care își desfășoară activitatea sunt terifiante.

Tocmai de aceea susțin acest raport și consider că Uniunea Europeană trebuie să facă tot ce este posibil pentru a îmbunătăți atât accesul la servicii de îngrijire, cât și calitatea condițiilor de muncă ale îngrijitorilor.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

21. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół

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

23. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

24. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia

25. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia

Der Präsident. – Die Sitzung ist damit geschlossen und wird morgen, Mittwoch, den 6. Juli, um 9.00 Uhr mit der Aussprache zu einem Schwerpunktthema – den Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Vorstellung des Tätigkeitsprogramms des tschechischen Ratsvorsitzes – wieder aufgenommen.

Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

26. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 21.59 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

Skróty i symbole

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

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni