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LACK OF TRANSPARENCY BY THE COMMISSION DURING NEGOTIATIONS WITH PFIZER

MARCO ZANNI, President ID Group

The European Ombudsman, who in this plenary session will be presenting its report for the year 2020, does not spare criticism of the meaning that the Commission gives to the concept of “transparency”.

By evading the request for access to the files on the correspondence between President Ursula Von der Leyen and the CEO of Pfizer, the Berlaymont has not only denied answers to the institution responsible for this matter but has first and foremost failed to be fair to European citizens.

It took a journalistic investigation by the New York Times to lift the veil on an affair that exposed the rather questionable way in which the EU handled the negotiations for the purchase of vaccines.

The Ombudsman, in the 2020 report, the Ombudsman recalls how the Court of Justice has established that the principles of publicity and transparency must be a beacon for the Union and how, in their absence, the confidence of citizens is weakened.

At risk is the very legitimacy of decisions taken at the European level.

Even today, too many questions remain unanswered: together with other colleagues, we felt it was our duty to table a written question asking for an assessment of the episode in relation to the code of conduct for members of the European Commission and to follow up on the Ombudsman’s requests.

With the same decision, we will ask to address the issue in a debate in the European Parliament.
During the upcoming Strasbourg plenary, we are going to vote on a report on how to strengthen Europe’s fight against cancer. The report advocates for a stronger EU commitment to implement policies that effectively tackle the sources and determinants of cancer.

There is no discussion around the importance of such a topic where we share the same ambitions and concerns - regardless of political backgrounds. Despite the great progress already achieved, increased efforts are essential to pursue a strengthened public health system.

However, as a Member of this Parliament elected from Italy, I believe that a fair health policy should not penalise certain products. There is a concrete risk of erroneously targeting as ‘unhealthy’ world-famous products of excellence, such as wine and traditional foods with geographical indications, because of the Commission’s stance against a diet based on a balanced supply of all nutrients.

Individuals’ health and food choices should not be ‘governed’ but rather accompanied by an effective communication and education system indicating complete information regarding nutritional values and recommending the intake of foods as part of a balanced diet.

The objective is to avoid imposing unfair rules on essential production chains of the agri-food sector: the EU should intervene with a system that could help everyone embrace a balanced and healthy diet that could prevent developing cancer or other serious illnesses.
THE DANGERS FACING THE ECB

Hélène LAPORTE, French Delegation

The ECB is currently facing two major risks: rising inflation and the issue of spreads at which eurozone Member States are borrowing.

Although the institution considers that inflation in the EU is much less demand-driven than in the US, and therefore less sustainable, it nevertheless accelerated in January to a record level since the creation of the euro: 5.1%.

The consequences can be manifold: reduced growth potential (through higher credit rates), reduced purchasing power, erosion of the value of savings, correction of real estate and financial markets.

In addition, the issue of the fragmentation of the euro zone is becoming more acute with the increase in spreads, now over 200bp.

They reflect the sub-optimality of the zone and the very variable confidence of investors in the various sovereign debts.

This new economic environment raises questions about the relevance of the ECB’s interest rate choices, but also about its ability to find new tools to intervene in the event of new tensions.

Hélène Laporte, Head of French delegation - Rassemblement National
THE BREXIT PARADOX

Gerolf ANNEMANS, Flemish Delegation

This week a report will be presented on the so-called assessment of the implementation of Article 50 TEU.

“Article 50 of the TEU creates a process for leaving the European Union by giving Member States a sovereign right to withdraw,” says the introduction. That is the theory. In practice the EU and its cenacles showed itself as a sore loser in the process.

The withdrawal process was indeed characterised by a climate of uncertainty from the outset, but not ‘on the part of the UK’ as described in the report. The EU institutions, in complete and utter shock, reacted badly to Brexit and to the fact that British politicians respected a legitimate and democratic referendum.

Of course there are lessons to be taken from this particular case and for the future.

For instance there is a need for stricter parallelism between the negotiation of a withdrawal agreement and the negotiation on the future trade relations with the withdrawing State.

But above all, the most important lesson is that the EU should be prompted to introspection and reflection, with a view to fully understanding all the critical and negative aspects of the federalist EU project that led to the withdrawal of the UK.

That seems to be - what I call - the ‘Brexit Paradox’.

Where one could have expected the EU to slow down or even to come back on certain domains, the EU federalists speeded up the process of further integration and pushing their Union through in the direction of a centralised federal state.

The EU institutions reacted badly to Brexit and to the fact that British politicians respected a referendum.
UNANIMITY MUST STAY!

Harald VILIMSKY, Austrian Delegation

Once again, the EU’s foreign policy is not living up to its billing. While it was announced that it wanted to take on a "global leadership role", the last few weeks have once again taught us otherwise.

While a threatening conflict is developing in the anteroom of the EU, the EU is showing itself to be a tame kitten instead of a ferociously determined foreign policy tiger.

While the US and the Russians seem to be pursuing realpolitik agendas with Ukraine, the annual report on the Common Foreign and Security Policy dreams of warm weather.

Of course, one always needs more of everything. More budgetary resources for the European External Action Service or more manpower for various areas of foreign policy activity.

Of course, one has to be politically correct and talk not about manpower but about quotas and gender-equitable foreign policy.

In view of such demands, one wonders whether one can trust such leaders with such responsibilities as a common foreign and security policy?

However, it seems that the ladies and gentlemen in the foreign policy service of the EU are only interested in abolishing the unanimity principle as quickly as possible in order to facilitate their foreign policy actions accordingly.

And although all Austrian parties are calling for the abolition of unanimity in the Council on foreign policy issues, the FPÖ remains consistent: unanimity is important for small Member States like Austria, especially on foreign policy issues, and must remain!
ENERGY GONE WITH THE WIND?

Laura HUHTASAARI, Finnish Delegation

A lot has been said about climate change and energy.

Germany has completely abandoned nuclear power and now they pay the price for that.

It is a fact that wind energy is not a sustainable solution. Wind energy can be a part of the energy-mix but not the main energy source.

There are many reasons for that: Wind energy depends on winds, the wind turbines can ruin landscapes and the material of the turbines cannot be recycled.

Each and every country has the right to choose how it produces energy, there should not be any EU guidelines.

European countries are very different when it comes to their geopolitical situation, natural resources, climate and industry.

For countries like Finland nuclear power is essential to make sure that we have a reliable source of energy without being dependent on others.

Our climate requires indoor heating and our heavy industry needs energy.

Let the Member States decide how they secure their interests in the best way.

We don't need the EU bureaucrats to tell us what to do.
During this plenary session, the European Parliament will vote on four reports relating to foreign policy: the Common Foreign and Security Policy Annual Report, the Common Security and Defence Policy Annual Report, the Annual Report on Human Rights in the World, as well as a Recommendation on Corruption and Human Rights. These reports will be adopted at a time where the EU’s foreign policy response is once again under a magnifying glass because of the crisis at the Ukrainian border.

The EU’s failure to “speak with one voice” during crises is not surprising. The reality is that a common EU foreign and security policy is impossible, because of divergent national and geopolitical interests, but also because of diverse historical ties and experiences. Despite this, EU federalists are now calling for the Council (the foreign-affairs decision-making body where every Member State is represented) to move from unanimity voting to a system of weighted majority voting (so-called qualified majority voting). However, this will completely undermine the national interests of Member States and will further erode their sovereignty.

Apart from this utopia of a common foreign policy, the EU has also taken it upon itself to comment on how the rest of the world conducts its business.

Not a single country outside of the EU has given the EU the mandate to monitor and police their human rights compliance - although this has not deterred the EU in the least. This session for instance, the European Parliament will comment on the human rights situation Iran, the Philippines and Burkina Faso.

The EU’s obsession with spreading EU values and democracy around the world amounts to nothing less than neo-colonialism - preaching to “uncivilised nations” about how they should run their countries, measured against European ideals. For example, the EU supports many controversial and undemocratic NGOs, whose involvement in third countries may be damaging and whose true interests are questionable. These attempts to bring about regime change have only resulted in disasters (like in Afghanistan and Libya, for example).
STOP THE UNFAIR RISE IN ENERGY PRICES DUE TO EU POLICIES!

CLICK HERE TO SIGN OUR PETITION

With its Green Deal, the EU will make energy prices even higher. Due to rising demand, prices are soaring and our external suppliers are taking advantage of it.

Our energy sovereignty is under threat.

We are waiting for the European Commission, who is so quick to give lessons to all Europeans, to explain to us how ordinary people will be able to heat their homes in the winter, or use their cars.

The EU Commission needs to drop its unrealistic and expensive plans!

Support us by signing this petition here and sharing it with your friends!
FOLLOW US ON SOCIAL MEDIA

Visit our website www.idgroup.eu and sign up to our Newsletter!

Follow us!
Defending the identity of peoples and the sovereignty of nations!
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