

Original text

The Riksdag's quick minutes 2022/23:128

Tuesday, June 20

At 09.00–16.48

18.00–21.58

The adjusted minutes will be published within three weeks or at the time determined by the Speaker. Speakers who wish to make objections to the rapid protocol must report this no later than 12.00 on the third weekday after the meeting.

§ 1 Adjustment of protocol

The minutes for May 30 were adjusted.

§ 2 Notification of delayed response to interpellation

The following letter had arrived:

Interpellation 2022/23:391

To the Riksdag

Interpellation 2022/23:391 The government's vision for people with disabilities

by Eva Lindh (S)

The interpellation will be answered on Thursday, August 31, 2023.

The reason for the delay is previously booked engagements.

Stockholm on 16 June 2023

Ministry of Social Affairs

Camilla Waltersson Grönvall (M)

According to mission

Andreas Krantz

Expedition manager

§ 3 Matters for referral to committee

The following documents were referred to committee:

Exercises

2022/23:2399–2401 to the social committee

EU document

COM(2023) 232 to the Committee on Nutrition

The eight-week deadline for issuing a reasoned opinion was set to expire on 11 September.

§ 4 Matters for table setting

The following documents were reported and tabled:

The Constitution Committee's reports

2022/23:KU32 Review of the JO office

2022/23:KU40 Investigation into the support for the political decision-making process and the membership in the Riksdag

2022/23:KU41 A Temporary Public Flag Day to Commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the King's Accession to the Throne

The Finance Committee's reports

2022/23:FiU24 Follow-up and evaluation of monetary policy 2022

2022/23: FiU35 Disbursement Authority

§ 5 Guidelines for economic policy

The Finance Committee's report 2022/23: FiU20

Guidelines for economic policy (prop. 2022/23:100 in part)

was preferred.

Ref. 1 EDWARD RIEDL (M):

Madam Speaker! We are approaching summer. I say "closer to us" even though I know that people in southern Sweden have had summer somewhat longer than those of us who live in northern Sweden.

There are probably many of us in this chamber who are looking forward to tomorrow's end of the parliamentary year. You may be looking forward to going home and having a few days of midsummer celebrations before Almedalen and some meetings take place while waiting for the real summer vacation to begin. But here in the House it will be summer anyway. I myself will celebrate with my daughter at home in Umeå, and being able to go home to Norrland feels welcome after a lot of work during the spring.

What you can feel as both a politician and a parent is that it is hard to see how other parents do not have the opportunity to celebrate midsummer, summer and summer holidays with their children. We have a situation where children are murdering other children in our country. Just a few days ago, a 15-year-old boy was shot dead in yet another in a series of shooting deaths in our country.

This is about kids murdering other kids in criminal deals. These are young boys who should be looking forward to graduation - who should be learning how to tie their first tie but instead are given guns and sent to kill other children.

We cannot accept this development any longer. Now we have to do everything in our power to actually break this for real. This is domestic terrorism and must be dealt with accordingly. Everything must be done to break the trend. The new government continues to invest more money in both law enforcement and prevention efforts, while increasing the penalties for serious crimes.

Another important part of the budget, Madam Speaker, is about strengthening the Swedish defence. We are adding hundreds of millions during the current year to strengthen defense and Swedish preparedness. It is about both NATO preparations and strengthening food and drinking water preparedness - many things that may not be what you think of in the first place, but there is a lot that needs to be done to increase Sweden's defense capabilities.

Democracy must be defended, which has been made clear by what has happened in our immediate area. We do it together with others, and therefore we need to equip the Swedish defense and adapt it to the possibility of joining NATO as soon as possible. Through the additions we are making this year, we will be able to speed up the process, and as soon as all NATO countries have ratified Sweden's accession protocol, we will have the opportunity to become a member.

Madam Speaker! Sweden has many problems. There are the gangs and serious crime, as well as Russia's infamous war against neighboring Ukraine. Swedish households are plagued by

higher interest rates that make mortgages an increasingly heavy burden, and we see high food prices and increasingly expensive living expenses. High inflation is making us all poorer, Madam Speaker, and it must continue to be fought. Electricity and fuel have also become much more expensive, which has also contributed to driving Swedish inflation.

It's not all the previous government's fault, Madam Speaker – let me be clear about that. But very much is the previous government's fault. More should have been done to crack down on gangs and serious crime. The dismantling of nuclear power has caused Sweden serious damage and very high electricity prices for both households and businesses. The previous government's experiment with the reduction obligation gave Sweden the world's highest diesel price, to very dubious benefit. Several of the problems caused by the previous government have also contributed to Swedish inflation.

Now it is the new government's responsibility to solve the problems Sweden has. We have started that work and will continue it in the coming years. We can already see that many concerted efforts to bring down inflation are beginning to produce results, although much remains to be done. The government will face the difficult economic situation with a plan that contains three parts.

Firstly, we must fight inflation and support vulnerable households.

Second, we will restore the line of work. It must always pay more to work than to live on benefits. That's how you build your own welfare, and that's how we build welfare in this country together with each other.

Third, we need to implement structural reforms to increase Swedish growth in global competition.

Given the difficult economic situation that Sweden finds itself in, fighting inflation needs to be a central priority. The government takes responsibility by pursuing a continued restrained fiscal policy while providing support to the vulnerable households.

Regulations that drive the price increases are revised; for example, the reduction obligation, which has given us the world's most expensive diesel, is being lowered. We will lower it from January 1, 2024. We are doing a lot to build back new electricity production. All electricity production is needed – including new nuclear power.

During the current year, households are supported with SEK 27 billion in electricity subsidies. An average home owner receives somewhere between 4,500 and 19,000 kroner in electricity subsidies, and it makes a big difference in the wallet for many. We also propose an extension and increase of the housing allowance for those who have the greatest need. A single parent with two children receives an average of SEK 1,100 more to live on per month. It is important to protect the most vulnerable households from the price increases we have now seen.

It is important to remember that the state cannot or should not compensate for everything. We can, however, support those who have it the hardest, because that's how Sweden stays together during difficult times. But in the long term, we must create the opportunity to reverse the trend, and it is only when more people have a job to go to and can contribute to the common good that Sweden becomes a richer and better country for all of us.

Therefore, we must restore the line of work. The tax on work must be reduced when the economic situation makes it possible. It is especially important for people with low and medium wages. Measures that break passivity must be put in place, and we must strengthen the drive to move from grants to work. Recently, the government has also presented plans for a benefit cap, which will ensure that it never pays more to live on benefits compared to taking a job. It is one of several steps along the way. Everyone who can go to work should also be given the opportunity to do so. This is how we build Sweden strong.

Madam Speaker! In conclusion, I would like to return to the fact that this is a problem-solving budget, with an emphasis on "solution". It may feel dark right now. There are constant headlines about shootings, violence, rampant inflation and generally tough times. But it is possible to reverse the trend - Sweden can do better. The government has already started that work, and this budget is another step towards achieving it.

As students now sing around our beautiful, long country as they walk out of schools surrounded by bright green birches and blue-yellow balloons: The bright future is ours. It is hopeful, and together we can turn the tide. Not everything is bad, and what is bad can also be good.

Madam Speaker! I request approval of the finance committee's proposed decision. During one of the last debates with the finance committee before the summer, I also want to take the opportunity to wish the members of the finance committee and the chancellery a really nice summer vacation when it arrives. I know we have extra meetings and a lot of other things left, but I want to take this opportunity to wish you a nice summer vacation.

I know I speak for the entire Finance Committee when I say that we want to extend a special thank you to the Finance Committee's office for a fantastically good job both for the governing parties and for the opposition parties. We place great value on the work you in the office do. You have had it tough during the pandemic. We thought it would be quieter after that, but there has continued to be a lot of work for the Finance Committee's office. You have coped brilliantly. Many thanks for that from all of us!

(Applause)

Ref. 2 ALI ESBATI (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! Edward Riedl is a moderate. There are certain things that moderates tend to emphasize that they like a lot, such as the king, tax cuts for high earners and welfare cuts. Even markets and the competition on them are things that moderates like to highlight.

If you examine this a little more closely, however, it turns out that there are strong indications that the Moderates are above all interested in this as theory, or as fantasy, and that in many important and real contexts they are more cold-hearted or downright hostile.

Now that we have an inflationary crisis, we see how the concrete competitive situation in certain markets causes inflation to be higher there. Through the market power that certain strong actors possess, the entire inflationary pressure and more is passed on to consumers. This is true in the food industry, where we have a few giants who control a large part of the chain. They do great, while ordinary consumers do less well. We see it not least in the banking sector, where the banks have large margins between deposits and lending. This gives them a ring in the coffers but poses a huge problem for millions of households in Sweden.

In these areas, concrete proposals have been presented, including by the Left Party but also by others, on how the actual markets – that is, not the idea of them but the actual markets – could be reregulated and how competition could be improved. However, the moderates have loudly rejected all these proposals and instead defended the importance of doing nothing.

In light of this, I would like to ask Edward Riedl: Wouldn't it be better to be more honest that it is not the competition that the Moderates cherish but the opportunity for the better-off to always and in all situations enrich themselves more?

Ref. 3 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! I would first like to correct Ali Esbati in something he said. He stated that I am a moderate, and that is perfectly true.

The government that has now taken office made this year a historic investment in strengthening welfare during tough times. That it would be about savings is not true - on the contrary, this government has actually invested in welfare.

During the previous term, the Moderates and the Left Party made common cause several times to strengthen care for the elderly and healthcare. If there is something that the Moderates and the new government care about, it is of course that welfare works and has sufficient resources for its mission.

What Ali Esbati is talking about, Madam Speaker, is about what he calls concrete proposals. This is something that cannot be implemented. I am surprised - and I know there are more people who are - that the Social Democrats have been taken on board with several of these strange proposals, which would clearly be against both EU law and many other things. It is about unfeasible proposals to use SBAB to lower interest rates and other things. Unfortunately, this is neither feasible nor desirable.

However, we share the view that competition needs to work better. Competition will drive down food prices. Ensuring competition will also ensure that the banks keep reasonable interest

margins. That is why it is important, Madam Speaker, that this government now invests money in strengthening the Swedish Competition Authority in order for competition to work.

In this context, I should also say that the Left Party wants to borrow hundreds of billions in the coming years. Then, of course, you can bet on a lot of things. However, this is pretend money, or monopoly money – it is money that does not exist. This makes it a bit difficult to have a debate in the chamber about this.

Ref. 4 ALI ESBATI (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! Yes, it is a bit difficult to have a debate when Edward Riedl claims things that are not true and that also have nothing to do with the question I asked.

I want to give Edward Riedl the right that the Moderates were involved and contributed to contributing more money to welfare before the election. However, it is not true that the things that Edward Riedl calls bets are bets in reality. Approximately 12 billion is needed to even get up to the level that had been needed to maintain the staff density in welfare. What we are now seeing in reality are very significant cuts and more.

It is interesting to hear what Edward Riedl thinks is doable and not. When it comes to food prices, it is apparently not feasible to do things that are already being done in a number of other EU countries. According to Edward Riedl, it would not be feasible to, for example, give SBAB the same directive that SBAB had before 2012. As far as I know, Sweden really existed then and was even a member of the EU, so it is a bit odd to say that this is not feasible with reference to EU law or other metaphysical ideas that Edward Riedl possibly has.

This would contrast with the fact that it would be feasible to obtain nuclear power in a matter of weeks; it sounds like Edward Riedl wants to do it. I can imagine that it might not be feasible in reality, but we have slightly different ideas about this.

I can direct anyone interested to take part in the Left Party's budget - it is available on the internet.

Ref. 5 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Like Ali Esbati, I would like to urge everyone listening to this debate to read the Left Party's budget proposal. If you borrow hundreds of billions, you can invest completely unfunded in a variety of things, but this would put Sweden in a position that it would be completely irresponsible to put the country in. Therefore, it is gratifying to see that there are also serious parts of the opposition that do not work that way. After all, both the Social Democrats and the Center Party have put reasonable budgets where they have been based on reality. The Green Party and the Left Party have now in opposition completely let go of reality, and I think that is regrettable.

I'm talking about borrowing endless amounts of money, putting the country in debt and pushing inflation. If you took the loans that the Left Party and the Green Party want to take, it would affect the interest rates for ordinary households by probably several percentage points.

Having said this: Before the election, the Moderates and the Left Party collaborated to invest in care for the elderly, healthcare and much more. After the election, the Moderates, together with the government parties, have continued to invest in welfare. We are making historically large investments this year specifically in welfare, because more resources are needed in schools and in healthcare. One can always argue that even more resources are needed, and that is certainly true. However, to claim that it is not in the way that I have described is flatly incorrect, Madam Speaker.

These investments are being made right now. On the other hand, the governing parties - and not even the entire opposition - have agreed to all of the Left Party's proposals on everything from price regulations to price ceilings. These are reforms that we recognize from other types of countries. These are reforms that, according to leading national economists, have never worked anywhere. Sweden should not experiment with this.

However, we must ensure that competition works and ensure resources for welfare. That's how we'll get through this crisis, Madam Speaker.

Ref. 6 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S):

Madam Speaker! Sweden is a fantastic country, and this debate is held when our country is at its most beautiful. Summer is at the door, the lilacs are blooming and life has returned to the streets and squares. Summer is usually something to look forward to. There is more time for loved ones and time to see new places, get out into nature or just relax.

But this summer looks set to be the toughest in a long time for many. Inflation has plagued our country for more than a year. We have had the fastest increase in food prices since the 1950s. Housing costs have hit the roof when electricity prices skyrocketed and mortgage rates doubled in a very short time. Swedish wage earners have lost ten years of real wage increases. The proportion of households that live in economic vulnerability and cannot afford the most basic things has increased for the first time in many years. Single mothers are particularly vulnerable.

Although inflation appears to have peaked both in Sweden and internationally, the development in the real economy looks bleak. Sweden's GDP is falling, and we are getting poorer. The fact is that Sweden is also heading for a full-scale healthcare crisis if nothing is done, as the regions must be able to parry the largest deficits throughout the 21st century. The meteorologists warn of extreme weather this summer with drought and forest fires.

Madam Speaker! Gang crime with its ruthless violence plagues our country. Recently, we have seen how gang violence has escalated, how the shootings are becoming more and more reckless and how the gangs are recruiting younger and younger guys. At the same time, our children and young people are facing a summer holiday that will be marked by the cost crisis,

where the municipality may have been forced to cut back on leisure activities and cannot afford to hire enough field assistants and safe adults who are on the streets and squares. Overall, this risks becoming a recruiting party for the gangs.

The cost crisis is hitting healthcare with full force. Out of 21 healthcare regions, 17 budgeted for a deficit this year, and several more have said that there will be a deficit this year. Before 2024, the deficits are expected to grow further, and we are already seeing how healthcare regions are taking measures to face the crisis. They do everything they can to protect healthcare. They cut or increase public transport fares. First and foremost, administrative staff are laid off, but we know who's turn it is. It's the assistant nurses and then the nurses, because when the regions have to collect billions in deficits, it will be felt in the healthcare system. In the end, it will be the patients and the employees who have to pay the price through longer care queues and a tougher work environment.

Madam Speaker! Overall, Sweden is in a historically difficult economic situation. So what is the government doing to meet the crisis? Almost nothing. In tough times, leadership is required that can prioritize and make tough decisions. Instead, we have a government that has sat on the podium. We have demanded that the government come back with an announcement before midsummer about the state contributions to welfare for 2024. Now there are three days left, and I want to give the finance minister one last chance to give a clear announcement. How much will the government invest in welfare in the autumn budget? The Sweden Democrats and the government must be able to prioritize the welfare issue. Otherwise, we risk seeing student assistants, assistant nurses and nurses being dismissed completely unnecessarily. The responsibility for the welfare crisis is home-cooked and falls heavily on the government.

Madam Speaker! In this economic situation, we social democrats have done our best to contribute with constructive proposals that would make a real difference but also show that there is an alternative to the passive policy of the Sweden Democrats and the government. When the government in the autumn budget, in addition to all the broken promises, chose to protect high income earners from inflation and proceed with a tax cut of SEK 13 billion, we showed how we could have prioritized instead. We wanted to invest twice as much in supporting welfare, provide a temporary increase in child allowance and invest in education and labor market policy.

In our proposal for the spring amendment budget, we went forward with additional support for families with children and single parents, as well as an investment in summer activities with lunch for children and young people, especially aimed at municipalities with socio-economic challenges. We also showed how it could be financed.

The difference in politics is fundamentally about how we think society should handle crises. In the Sweden of the Social Democrats, we face difficult times together, we stick together and we make sure that the gaps do not increase. But the government's political agenda and crisis management, on the contrary, risk increasing the division. In the Sweden of the Sweden Democrats and the Moderates, millionaires receive electricity subsidies at the same time as single mothers find it difficult to put nutritious food on the table for their children. In the Sweden

of the Sweden Democrats and the Moderates, twice as much money is spent on protecting inflation and lowering taxes for high income earners as they spend on supporting welfare through the cost crisis. It won't do.

Madam Speaker! The prospects for the Swedish economy are also gloomy, to say the least. Last week, the OECD presented its new forecast and once again Sweden is at the bottom in terms of growth prospects. We are one of the few countries where the economy is shrinking this year. In the entire OECD, only Estonia looks set to have worse growth than Sweden. We are also the country in Western Europe that has seen the biggest drops in real wages, and inflation is still significantly higher than in our Nordic neighbours.

This is something the government should take very seriously, but instead they are pursuing a backwards crisis policy with cuts to labor market policy and education places. The government chose to cut the queue for investment support for rental housing

while we are facing the worst crisis in the construction industry for a long time. The fact is that there have probably not been this few homes built in Sweden since Ulf Kristersson was last in government.

Madam Speaker! Today we are debating the guidelines for economic policy, so I intend to take the opportunity to look ahead. Sweden's development potential is really enormous, but the government seems to lack a direction for Sweden. When it comes to growth policy, the finance minister puts all his faith in a legitimate productivity commission that should be ready in October 2025, but does not take responsibility for decisions that need to be made here and now.

In Sweden, a green industrial revolution is underway with the establishment of new industries in places that in some cases have been characterized by relocation. Being at the forefront of the green transition is absolutely crucial for Sweden's competitiveness, but the new right-wing government has chosen to tear off Sweden's leadership shirt, sit in the back seat and let the Sweden Democrats steer climate policy. The government states that business has become the new environmental movement and seems satisfied with that. Rather, I see how business runs away from the state in terms of both responsibility and ambition.

The largest party in the government base wants to go as far as demolishing wind turbines, and for the first time in 20 years, Sweden has a government that actively contributes to increasing emissions.

The government's inaction risks having consequences for a long time to come. We are currently at a crucial time for the new industrialization where companies are faced with investment decisions regarding establishments and new factories. Either the investments and the jobs end up in Sweden - or they end up somewhere else.

Madam Speaker! Sweden must be equipped for the great social transformations of our time. The green transition, AI and new treatment methods and revolutionary medicines in healthcare

mean enormous opportunities for prosperity in our country. But it also places demands on society's ability to adjust and ensure that people have the opportunity to further their education and take jobs in an industry that is developing and needs to hire.

Last year, a completely historic restructuring agreement was concluded in the Swedish labor market. With the new transition study support, Sweden is perhaps receiving the world's most modern transition support. When fully developed, 40,000 people a year will have the opportunity to further their education in the middle of working life with 80 percent of their salary. But the government is not honoring its end of the bargain. It has been chosen not to allocate the funds required for CSN to fulfill its mission, which means that the applications received are not processed. In the same way, the parties' establishment jobs are at risk, which could contribute to thousands of newly arrived and long-term unemployed people getting into work.

I mean that it is ultimately the Minister of Finance who bears the responsibility for if the agreements are not fulfilled and for the consequences this has for the supply of skills and productivity. I therefore expect the Minister of Finance and the Moderates to step forward and take full responsibility for securing the transition study support and establishment jobs. They are important pieces of the puzzle for building Sweden stronger.

With this, I would like to request approval of reservation 1.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the chancellery and the entire Riksdag administration, who make our work easier, and of course all the members of the finance committee for their good cooperation during the year. I wish you a nice summer.

(Applause)

Ref. 7 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! I thought it might be appropriate to say a few things after Mikael Damberg's opening speech. When you listen to the rhetoric, the obvious question is whether the, certainly much lower, electricity subsidy that the previous government brought forward when Mikael Damberg was finance minister also went to millionaires. Or was it only aimed at those who weren't millionaires?

From the speech that Mikael Damberg gives when we are now discussing the spring budget and the spring bill, one can almost believe that the Social Democrats are adding a lot of new money this spring. It's not like that. There is not a single kroner more for municipalities and regions in the spring budget that the Social Democrats are presenting here. It sounds like it would be a lot of new money, but there is not a single penny more for municipalities and regions to handle this.

When last autumn the Social Democrats actually invested somewhat more than the government did – marginally more, but still – on municipalities and regions, they wanted to finance it by raising taxes for nurses and midwives and a million wage earners. Mikael Damberg forgot to tell

them that the investments they wanted to make would be financed by, among other things, those who work in healthcare.

Then I just want to say that the worst economic prospects for Sweden were achieved during Mikael Damberg's time as finance minister. Hopefully we will be able to change that now.

Ref. 8 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! Regarding growth, it can be stated that Sweden had a faster regrowth after the pandemic than many other countries. We also dipped less than many other countries. From this it can be calculated that, a few years later, we will not have as great a recovery as some countries that had a much worse economic development. So you have to see it over time.

Regardless, I'm a little surprised that Edward Riedl is responding to the electricity subsidy because it is the government's biggest betrayal of promise, but also a shambles in government. First, they succeed in deceiving the Swedish people that the electricity subsidy would come into place on November 1; they stood and said that they were in complete agreement about it. They promised a very generous system in the election campaign, which they then did not implement in government. It was very late. No ceiling was set on the payments to the millionaires, which meant that among those who received the most payments there was a single person who received 700,000 in electricity subsidies, while others had a very difficult time managing their finances. It was only after we and other parties had pressured the government to include all of Sweden that northern Sweden also received any electricity support at all.

There are so many mistakes and so much sloppiness in the handling of the electricity subsidy that the government deserves criticism for. My point is that there was no ambition from the government to put a cap on electricity subsidy payments, but you can't afford to improve for the single mother, who we know has the absolute hardest time in society. You can afford to set aside 13 billion in tax cuts for those who are members of the Riksdag with 1,000 kroner a month, but you can't afford to guarantee welfare with sufficient resources so that we wouldn't have had to have the healthcare crisis we have right now or the savings in schools. It is the wrong priority from the Moderates.

(Applause)

Ref. 9 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Let me start with the total lack of humility in the face of the problems the Social Democrats created during the last term. When you listen to Mikael Damberg, you can believe that he had nothing to do with the problems we have today. The fact is that nuclear power was phased out by the previous government, which Mikael Damberg was in, and that created the problems and the need for electricity subsidies.

This government has paid out electricity subsidies that are several times larger than the electricity subsidies that the Social Democrats produced last term. It is also aimed at businesses.

In this situation, when you have caused the problems by shutting down nuclear power and when, with these high electricity prices, you had a smaller electricity subsidy that took even longer to get in place, Mikael Damberg stands here with a high tone and talks about that this the government has messed up, when it itself has caused the problem that we now have to solve. It is a total lack of self-awareness and humility in the face of what one has done, Madam Speaker. It is provocative.

I hope that those of you listening to this debate actually take in what Mikael Damberg is saying here. They have created the problems by shutting down nuclear power, and they themselves paid out an electricity subsidy that was much lower, and now they are standing here criticizing the new government. It is provocative.

In terms of economic growth, it was the lowest in the entire European Union during Mikael Damberg's time as finance minister. The outlook still looks bleak, but that is because of the eight years that the previous government had. We will turn this around.

When it comes to ensuring that those who have the hardest time get support, this government has done a lot at the turn of the year and now during the spring. I must stay there, because time is running out.

(Applause)

Ref. 10 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! As if by chance, the Moderates did not have time to talk about those who are worst off in Sweden. Because you do very little. They extend a support that we introduced during the pandemic and adjust the level. They count up the guaranteed pension, which we had a fight with the Moderates and the Sweden Democrats about raising before the election. It was the last political battle before the election, and it was about us being able to improve the pensions for the pensioners who are the worst off by SEK 1,000 a month, above all many women who have worked their whole professional life for a very low salary. What if they hadn't received that guaranteed pension increase, how would they have coped with inflation now?

I responded earlier to the discussion about growth and the pandemic. Sweden was one of the countries that managed the pandemic best financially. There were problems with the pandemic management, but Sweden chose a balanced line where we both took responsibility for reducing the spread of infection and made sure that, not least, welfare had the resources required to handle a pandemic. It was incredibly important when we went through the pandemic. It was also one of the reasons why Sweden had a faster recovery after the pandemic and thus overall had a better economic development than most other countries, linked to the economic crisis in particular. You can roughly compare the crisis management during the pandemic and the crisis management that the government is trying to conduct right now.

Then what was said about nuclear power was wrong, and I don't need to go into all the parts about this. But it is social democratic governments that have built Swedish nuclear power. It is social democratic governments that have always taken responsibility for the energy supply in Sweden. We know that it is the basis of the industry we have in our country.

Last year, despite the high electricity prices, Sweden had the lowest electricity prices in Europe. We had the largest export of electricity in the entire EU. It won't do; we must do more. Therefore, we propose a new energy policy goal of 60 new terawatt hours of fossil-free electricity by 2030 - so that the industry can expand and make the investments in Sweden and not elsewhere. But with the Moderates' collaboration with the Sweden Democrats, this is jeopardized, because they are not pushing for electrification, and they will not be able to cope with the environmental transition.

(Applause)

Ref. 11 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD):

Madam Speaker! Fighting inflation is the single most important economic policy measure this year, and probably for years to come. It is inflation that causes municipalities and regions to suffer from cost increases, which affects welfare, and it is inflation that causes the average wage earner to suffer from real wage reductions for the first time in I don't know how long. With high inflation also comes high interest rates. Then you have to maintain at least a neutral approach to fiscal policy.

An expansionary approach, that is to say that one accelerates, pours on, increases expenses and runs the state with large deficits, in this situation would have worsened and increased inflation and forced Sweden's Riksbank to even bigger and more interest rate increases.

We in the government documents believe that the economic policy that we pursue and the budget proposals that we put on the Riksdag's table imply precisely a neutral and not an expansive orientation. Here, both the Riksbank and the Fiscal Policy Council are correct.

That it is then boring is a completely different matter. I also want to compensate every single individual, every municipality and every company that has been affected by inflation, kroner for kroner. But it doesn't work, because then we create a bigger problem than the one we're trying to solve, and sometimes you have to do things that are boring.

It is actually more interesting than it sounds, Madam Speaker, because all Tidö parties stand behind this basic reasoning. Can the same be said of the four opposition parties? It was a rhetorical question. The answer is no, it spreads something incredible.

The Left Party and the Green Party want to run the state with gigantic budget deficits and put us in debt with 200 or almost 300 billion kroner during this budget period. What would happen to inflation and interest then? It's a toxic cocktail they keep mixing up on that side of politics.

Madam Speaker! If you accept this reasoning, as boring as it sounds, you understand that we cannot do everything and certainly not everything at the same time. You also understand that it really reinforces the need to prioritize and preferably prioritize correctly.

What we prioritize in the government document is clearly evident from both the latest budget bill and the spring financial bill. It is about protecting the most economically vulnerable groups, who have been hit the hardest by inflation, and it is about internal and external security.

The Tidö parties have pushed through a number of reforms and proposals to strengthen economically vulnerable groups. We have strengthened unemployment insurance. We have strengthened the guaranteed pension. We have strengthened the housing allowance, and we have made it cheaper to fill up the car for an average family with children.

Madam Speaker! These are concrete examples. There are of course more, but these are concrete examples of how the Tidö parties have strengthened the purchasing power of the households that have been most affected by inflation.

We pushed to SEK 12 billion for the municipal sector in the current year's budget, but the state cannot or should not do everything. The municipalities also need to prioritize. So it is not time for any extravagances or luxury projects. It is possible to make yourself unpopular by saying this, but still: Focus on the core business! Better good food for the school students than municipal bathhouses. Better high quality in nursing homes than municipally employed communicators. It is about preschool, school and care for the elderly. Focus on the core task!

It must be said that most municipalities do an extremely strong and good job, but unfortunately there are also examples of the opposite.

Madam Speaker! In the context of extravagant projects, I would like to mention Stålverk 80. It was a while ago. I was small then, small and cute maybe. In the case of Stålverk 80, the Social Democrats pumped billion after billion of tax money into what would later turn out to be a stillborn project. And now we're there again, but now it's not called Stålverk 80 anymore but Hybrit.

It's a hallelujah moment like never before. Then I get worried and take a couple of steps back. It is billions of taxpayers' money that goes through the taxpayers' authorities, through the taxpayers' government and also through the taxpayers' limited companies, that is LKAB, SSAB and Vattenfall.

Not a single penny of private venture capital wants to approach the project, but only tax money is invested. We taxpayers have not even been asked. I very much fear that all the tax money that is now being pushed into the project will end up the same way it once did for Stålverk 80, that is, with a gigantic loss of taxpayers' money. Hybrit will not be commercially viable. And you should not play venture capitalists for the Swedish people's tax money.

Madam Speaker! I also mentioned internal and external security. It is about how the state should be able to restore the monopoly of violence within the borders of the kingdom and how the state should be able to pacify these borders. It is a long journey that has started now, and there is a huge amount that needs to be done: more police, more powers for those police, more prosecutors and longer sentences.

It is about an enormous development of the penitentiary system: 16 large and completely new institutions are the assessed need that is a result of the Tidöpartien's crime-fighting policy. From the financial horizon, we will respond to the needs for resource reinforcements that have become apparent. After eight years of social democratic rule, these needs are bordering on the infinite.

Madam Speaker! When I did the rag, which is starting to be a while now, of course we understood who the supposed enemy was, even if it wasn't said correctly, and what it was that we were learning and practicing. But the sharp practice after all this practice, that is to say, with extremely high levels of violence, to kill other people, felt very distant. Of course we were happy about that.

Back then it felt distant, but today it unfortunately feels less distant. Every day we continue with the rearmament of the Armed Forces so that we do not have to end up in that sharp situation, that is, when the exercise turns into a sharp operation.

We have seen how Russian troops have behaved in the independent and sovereign state of Ukraine. It's ethnic cleansing, it's rape, it's looting, it's war crimes, it's pure terrorism and it's torture.

Madam Speaker! I request approval of the committee's proposal.

After my rather sad words, I still want, like previous speakers, to take the opportunity to wish the finance committee's excellent office, the members of the finance committee and of course also the speaker and the speaker's bureau a pleasant summer. I want to give a special thanks to the chairman of the finance committee, who has kept us in check so that the meetings have not gone completely off the rails. I wish you and your daughter a nice summer, Edward Riedl.

(Applause)

Ref. 12 ALI ESBATI (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! Since last autumn, the Sweden Democrats have demonstrated a rather impressive ability to systematically do something other than what they envisioned the voters in the election. Then they made a big deal out of wanting to strengthen pensions, but in the budgets they have negotiated there is none of this at all. For those pensioners who need care for the elderly, the Sweden Democrats instead offer cuts when reduced taxes for income earners are prioritized over securing the municipalities' finances.

Faced with the choice between the home owner's finances and the bank directors' profit margins, the Sweden Democrats side with the bank directors. This was shown in the position regarding the directives for SBAB that were taken up the other week.

Leading Sweden Democrats fantasize about train staff paying tribute to them as saviors of the nation, but Oscar Sjöstedt has no problem with Swedish public properties tumbling around with speculators and could end up in Chinese or Saudi ownership. That school groups can meet the same fate is not only okay for the Sweden Democrats, but an important reason why Oscar Sjöstedt is where he is.

The Sweden Democrats have betrayed what they have expressed regarding the current health insurance, where they must now investigate deteriorations for the long-term sick instead of improvements, and regarding train maintenance, where they are now wavering away from earlier promises of stronger government coordination.

For those of us who have followed the Sweden Democrats for a while, this does not really come as a surprise. But I think this way of behaving and speaking with double tongues may be a surprise to many voters.

Then I want to help Oscar Sjöstedt a little and tell poor pensioners, owners of small houses and concerned parents of school children why he and his party are more interested in standing on the side of bank directors and school company profiteers when it comes down to it.

Ref. 13 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! It was a lot, and I'll see if I caught it all. Ali Esbati started with the pensions. I think we've had an exchange before about that. My answer is the same now, and that is that the Sweden Democrats are not in the Pensions Group. Hopefully that will be able to change, and hopefully it will be able to be changed in the fairly near future. If we are to push through various types of reforms in the pension system, they will have to pass the Pension Group in one way or another.

I hope we get an invitation there in the near future. In that case, we will accept such an invitation, and we will come up with constructive, realistic and feasible proposals once we are inside the Pension Group. Right now, the Sweden Democrats are therefore not in the Pension Group.

We have not cut back on care for the elderly. On the contrary, as I touched on in my speech. We pushed to SEK 12 billion in this year's budget. Those are big additions. Much of this money will trickle down, for example, to care for the elderly, but of course not all SEK 12 billion because there are also needs in preschool, school and care. But a large part of this money will trickle down to care for the elderly. And it is therefore an addition and not a reduction.

Member Esbati was inside SBAB. The Left Party has submitted a proposal that did not receive a majority in the committee. The reason for that was that it is not a feasible and realistic proposal.

Then we would perhaps have a discussion about whether the state should own a bank at all. I'm not entirely convinced of that. But that will be another discussion.

When it comes to community properties, the Fortifications Agency has been given the task of inventorying which community properties are classified as security, precisely so that they do not end up with the Chinese or elsewhere. There is also a bill on this which is on the Riksdag's table and which is handled by the justice committee.

Ref. 14 ALI ESBATI (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! It's true that I covered a lot. This is because there is much that the Sweden Democrats have been involved in and that is in conflict with or in contrast to what the voters envisioned in the election.

I see a pattern here that is very clear. In the election, the Sweden Democrats gave the appearance of being on the side of ordinary people when it comes to how the everyday economy should work together and when it comes to what the problem is in ordinary people's everyday life.

Once the Sweden Democrats sit down and decide on the budgets, there are completely different things that are prioritized, and that is to stand on the side of the powerful and possessed right through on every single point. In every issue that comes up where there are priorities and path choices to be made, the Sweden Democrats incredibly clearly choose a side, and it is not the side of ordinary people.

Now money will trickle down to care for the elderly. Oscar Sjöstedt claims that it is investments that are made. It is the same nominal amount as before. This means, as I think Oscar Sjöstedt really knows, that it does not follow the development, not even when it comes to keeping the same staff density as before, but there are cuts. These cuts are not theoretical, but they take place all the time in all municipalities and regions in Sweden. The responsibility is transferred from the state, which sits on the money, to the municipalities and regions, which have no opportunity to solve these problems, regardless of the color of the government. The municipalities and regions can set different priorities, but it is not possible to conjure.

What Oscar Sjöstedt's message is anyway is that you should wait for some money to trickle down and otherwise come up with something else. But there is money in Oscar Sjöstedt's budget to lower taxes for the richest and to stand firm that the Sweden Democrats stand on the side of the wealthy. This is the point here, and I hear that Oscar Sjöstedt does not want to comment on it.

Ref. 15 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica:

Madam Speaker! You don't have to wait, because this money has already entered the municipal financial equalization system.

Dripping down was perhaps the wrong expression. But the money ends up in the country's various municipalities and regions. Then it is the municipalities themselves who dispose of the money. It is perhaps some municipality that hypothetically does not want to invest a single krona in care for the elderly, although I don't think so, and some other municipality that feels that you need to invest a lot. This is what I mean. It is not the Minister of Finance, or myself for that matter, who sits and decides what each individual municipality should do with these additions.

But you can't reasonably call an addition of SEK 12 billion a cut, Madam Speaker. Somewhere there must still be a little rhyme and reason and balance.

We have taken several measures. Why are we pushing so hard for further tax cuts on fuel? It is so that ordinary families with children can afford to refuel the car. It has nothing to do with any directors here or there. It's about ordinary people. Electricity subsidies went out to ordinary people. We made sure that it went to ordinary people also north of the Dalälven, to electricity price area 1 and electricity price area 2, which otherwise would not have been the case.

Then we are back at this with 1 million wage earners who would have received higher taxes with the Left Party's budget policy. There we find midwives, police officers and other fairly common professional groups. Ali Esbati therefore wants to proceed with a proper tax increase for ordinary wage earners. 1 million individuals had been affected by it.

Ref. 16 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! I had intended to ask my question about welfare in particular. And I think that Ali Esbati's exchange of lines with Oscar Sjöstedt was still illuminating. It seems that Oscar Sjöstedt still believes that it is a lot of extra money that trickles down to municipalities and regions. Then basically not every healthcare region would run a deficit. Then we wouldn't be talking about savings in care for the elderly and in leisure activities at school in municipality after municipality, if it reduced a lot of resources from the state that the municipalities can sit and distribute and make investments with. That's not how reality looks like.

It is still basic to understand that we live in an inflationary economy where cost increases also hit the municipalities? By making other priorities, the government does not prioritize welfare. The government instead chose a tax cut, which Oscar Sjöstedt stands here defending. Then the healthcare and the school end up in these worries. That is the reality.

Here, reality seems not to have really haunted Oscar Sjöstedt yet. But this is the reality in the municipalities that have to manage the budget that Oscar Sjöstedt has helped push through. It is a political choice that he has made by failing the employees in the elderly care and in the health care on this point. You spoke so much in opposition that you would be on the same side as them. The working conditions for the women in care were very important. Where are they now? Now they are faced with savings because the government is unable to make the investments required to maintain the welfare quality in schools and in healthcare.

My second reply will be about if Oscar Sjöstedt understands the uncertainty he is creating in Swedish business life. He has spoken about dismantling wind farms in Sweden. That's one thing. Now he stands and is against the technological shift that the Swedish steel industry is facing. This is about whether the steel is to be refined in Sweden or whether it is to be done in other countries. Investments worth billions are at stake, and thousands of jobs in Sweden are at stake. Does Oscar Sjöstedt understand what he is saying?

(Applause)

Ref. 17 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is about SEK 12 billion in additions to the country's municipalities and regions. If we had invested SEK 20 billion, Mikael Damberg would have stood here and said that it is not enough but that we have to invest SEK 21 billion. If we had invested SEK 30 billion, Mikael Damberg would have said that it is not enough but that we must invest even more. He had never been satisfied. And everyone, including municipalities and regions – households, businesses and public activities – is of course affected by inflation. Everyone is forced into tougher priorities.

My point in the podium just now was that the state also needs to prioritize tougher, primarily on the expenditure side.

Before we start work really sharply with the autumn budget - the budget bill - there will be more forecasts. And depending on how these forecasts look like, they will control the need for which additional additions to the municipalities and regions that we need to decide on.

If it turns out that the forecasts are very good, that things look very optimistic and gratifying and that inflation falls back to normal levels, I will in any case judge that the need for further additions is lower. If it turns out that the hyperinflationary economy remains and may even worsen, it will of course affect needs in the other direction. Of course it is.

As I said, there will be further forecasts before we make a decision on the budget bill later this autumn.

I have no views on how to make steel. That wasn't the point. My view is that it is not a single penny of private venture capital. When you have a business or a business idea, you normally say: "Look! I have a business idea and want to start a business. Does anyone want to come and help me invest in the company?" After that, you are good to go.

My point is that in this case it is tax money that we are putting at risk. I have nothing against technological development, but I protect the taxpayers' money.

Ref. 18 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! SSAB is a private company that works in global competition and sees that customers will want high-quality steel. You will not be able to compete on the world market with old technology.

It is not only Hybrit that is trying to work with this technology to make a technology shift. In H2 Green Steel, only private actors make an investment. Why do they do that? Well, because they see that they will not be able to compete on the world market with the old technology where you use a lot of coal in the process to make steel.

Business has therefore made the assessment that the shift must take place. The decisive thing now is that we make the right choice of path in Sweden so that we continue to be at the forefront of the green transition. This is what drives the investments and the new jobs in Sweden.

Now, however, the announcement came that the Sweden Democrats will not only try to slow down the expansion of wind power, which is the entire prerequisite for the green transition in Sweden, but they will also stop the technological shift in the steel industry. It is a very serious statement from the largest party in the government constellation.

This endangers jobs and investments in Sweden and creates enormous uncertainty. There is a great risk that some of the investments that have been planned in Sweden will instead end up in Finland, the USA or Germany, because these countries are on their toes to drive the green transition and position their countries in it.

Should we just take iron ore out of the mines and export it to other countries? Or should we refine the products in Sweden and build the industry of the future in our country? That is what the question is about. Unfortunately, the Sweden Democrats have ended up on the wrong side of the issue, because they want to turn climate policy into a new culture war in Swedish politics. Swedish industry cannot afford that.

(Applause)

Ref. 19 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! The state is still the largest owner of SSAB, isn't it? In LKAB you own 100 percent of the shares, and in Vattenfall you also own 100 percent of the shares. This is taxpayer money, and that was my point. It is the taxpayers' limited liability company.

It is Mikael Damberg who must explain where all these terawatt hours will come from in order for the project to be possible. Do not shoot the messenger! I'm just a messenger here, Madam Speaker. I found that the terawatt hours that had been required to make the project possible do not exist. It's not my fault. Where shall we find them? Where will they come from? We need to get an explanation for that first.

Then it is not true in the case of H2 Green Steel. Time and again money has been allocated from the government agencies Vinnova, the Agency for Growth and the Energy Agency. I would have believed in the project if it had been done on a commercial basis with private venture capital, but not a single private investor wants to put money into it. Then you should take a step back and say: Oh, why is it that way? Why does no private investor want to invest a single penny here? Is it because the risks with the project are so high? Is it because it is unrealistic? Yes, it probably is.

Do not shoot the messenger! I'm just pointing out the problems. The terawatt hours don't exist, whether it's 70 or 100. They would have been needed for this to be realistic and doable, but they don't.

Ref. 20 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! This area has been raised before, but the Sweden Democrats say they are a party that prioritizes welfare. You could hear that in Oscar Sjöstedt's speech. Now, for the first time, they sit and decide together with the government. Then it's up to the evidence. What we have seen so far is not impressive.

They came forward with an autumn budget that contained tax cuts for high-income earners, while welfare was put on a starvation diet. It is classic right-wing politics and thus also that of the Sweden Democrats.

Before the upcoming autumn budget, Sweden's municipalities and regions have asked for clear information about next year's state grant, but they are not getting it. The government wants to be able to lower the tax next year, apparently with the good memory of the Sweden Democrats. Proposals have also been forwarded to specifically lower the tax for high income earners.

I would like to ask Oscar Sjöstedt how a party that claims to stand up for welfare can agree to put forward tax cuts for the rich instead of announcing more money for welfare.

Ref. 21 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is very interesting that Janine Alm Ericson knows more than I do about what we will proceed with in the autumn budget. We are not done with that. In the budget negotiations that we will have until the end of the summer, I and the Sweden Democrats will push for tax breaks on primary electricity and fuel. I think it is a wise measure that also has a dampening effect on inflation. That is what I and the Sweden Democrats will do. No one knows yet where we will land, except for Janine Alm Ericson who apparently already knows. It's absolutely fantastic. How did it happen?

Last autumn we pushed to SEK 12 billion to municipalities and regions to strengthen welfare. What need for further additions there will be this autumn will be determined by the forecasts that we first want to see before we decide on the autumn budget.

If the situation is roughly as it is now with continued high inflation and the business cycle thereafter, there is of course a greater need for further additions. In a happy scenario where inflation falls back to more normal levels, the target levels, the need for further additions to the municipalities decreases.

Ref. 22 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! No, of course I don't know how the debate is going. What I do know, however, is that you have written a tax PM about tax cuts for the rich, but you have not informed municipalities and regions about how much money they can plan for.

That's the thing. They asked several weeks ago, before the spring budget bill, to be informed. They already need to plan their business. If they don't get a supplement, they have to cut back. It will affect ordinary people throughout Sweden.

It cannot be funny for those who voted for the Sweden Democrats in the belief that they would stand up for welfare to now see how Oscar Sjöstedt and the Sweden Democrats act when for the first time they have real influence over the policies pursued.

It doesn't help to say that the municipalities should invest in the core business when you then don't allocate the necessary resources. If there is not even money for what is the core – care, care for our elderly and a good schooling for our children – you cannot invest out of thin air. The government should have made an announcement, and that a long time ago.

I notice that Oscar Sjöstedt does not answer the question. That's why I asked it, even though Ali Esbati and Mikael Damberg had already done it. I will therefore ask it again and be a little clearer: What is most important to you in the upcoming negotiations? Is it the tax cuts or welfare?

Ref. 23 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is still a bit strange that there is a debate about the fact that we have not come up with an announcement. When does the notification usually come? Is the autumn budget usually ready in mid-June? It's not like that.

I have full respect for the fact that those who sit and plan want to be informed as early as possible. This applies, among other things, to the municipalities, but the whole of society is of course affected by the budget bill. But it's not normal for the autumn budget to be ready already in mid-June, is it? It never happened, did it? We are not finished with the autumn budget, and therefore I have no information that is numerical. But there is nothing out of the ordinary or strange in any way.

The needs will show in the forecasts we will see. Then we will see how much more money we need to contribute to municipalities and regions. But I can't mention any number at the moment. It is as it usually is; we are in the middle of June.

When it comes to tax cuts, I'm pretty picky. I think that the situation we are now in with the high inflation means that we need to prioritize tax cuts as well. I don't think it's time for any big income tax cuts. I think it is time to lower the tax on inputs, such as electricity and fuel. It benefits both households and businesses. Then we reduce the costs at the producer level, so that the companies can lower their costs. Then we also reduce costs at the consumer level, and inflation falls back. I think it is wise economic policy to lower taxes on input goods, such as electricity and fuel, and not income taxes.

Ref. 24 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Mrs Speaker and Oscar Sjöstedt! Now I hope that all the voters who accidentally voted for the Sweden Democrats in Norrbotten county and Västerbotten county - where members were elected who in some cases had not even been to Västerbotten - listen to this change of reply very carefully. Oscar Sjöstedt has in some kind of general exposition - populist as usual, which the SD are experts at - attacked the biggest project that the whole of Norrland is now investing in, certainly also the SD's representatives in the municipalities in northern Sweden. Look at Edward Riedl from Västerbotten, who is sitting here in the chamber and must be screwing himself up. Look at the finance minister, who stands behind Oscar Sjöstedt and is probably screwing himself up. She has just been to a major climate conference, where the industry has been promised more wind power and a major investment in what the whole world is now focusing its eyes on:

I have a little information for Oscar Sjöstedt, who has his little Stockholm perspective. Private investments of tens of billions are being made in H2 Green Steel in Boden. It is the pride of all of Sweden. Feel free to go up there! I'll give a reference, so you understand how big it is. The area where you are going to build is as big as Kungsholmen. You must have 140 meter high towers to create the fossil-free steel. All that you are now prepared to lower.

I want to ask one more question; that was actually the original question. Does Oscar Sjöstedt know what the price of milk is? By that I don't mean the shop price, but the price that Sweden's farmers are getting for milk right now.

Ref. 25 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica:

Madam Speaker! No, I don't actually know, I want to be honest. I would very much like to be informed about that.

Now we have to keep some things apart. The technology behind fossil-free steel is awesome. That's not what we're talking about. But perhaps even the Center Party should back off when we have three joint-stock companies involved, two of which are fully state-owned and one of which has the state as the largest owner, and the government authorities are sending out money in various types of grants for this project. It's our tax money - mine, Martin's and everyone else's.

There are no private investors in Hybrit. And why doesn't it? So we are not debating that this would in any way be a bad technique. The technology is super cool. It's the fact that it's only taxpayers' money behind this that worries me. Now, if this really is the Hallelujah Moment, which

will change everything and be so good, then in a functioning market economy, shouldn't private investors pour money into the project, so that we didn't have to step in with tax money?

I want to ask Martin Ådahl the same question that I asked Mikael Damberg. It was in my second reply to him, so he had no opportunity to answer the question. It is about a "small detail": Where will all these terawatt hours come from?

Ref. 26 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I hope that everyone who invests in this, the communities and regions that make every effort to contribute, heard what Oscar Sjöstedt said. Now SD talks down Norrland. Now SD talks down Swedish green industrialization. What SD repeats in its populist ignorance is not true. Tens of billions of kroner are invested by international investors in Sweden. Be proud of Sweden, Oscar Sjöstedt! Be proud of Norrland, Oscar Sjöstedt! Don't talk it down!

You have forgotten the farmers. In the shop, the milk costs SEK 13–15. I think you know that too, Oscar Sjöstedt. But the farmers get 5.50–5.60 today with the latest settlement prices. There is an enormous crisis right now because of the drought. The summer looks set to be worse than 2018. Then the farmers need information about what we are doing for their long-term competitiveness. It is not enough to just say that the reduction for diesel that we in the Center Party pushed through is being extended. It is important to have a long-term agricultural deduction. You need to start today, so that the guarantees are there, so that Swedish farmers do not go bankrupt in this climate crisis, so that there is a group exemption and so that the money is not distributed sometime next year when it is all over.

Why are SD so interested in stopping things in Norrland and so uninterested in the farmers? I heard nothing from Oscar Sjöstedt about the Swedish countryside and the deep crisis for Swedish farmers. Now apparently the election is completely forgotten. Now all the promises and all the nice words about Sweden's farmers are gone.

Ref. 27 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica:

Madam Speaker! Now Martin Ådahl takes it so that he cracks. My concern is genuine and justified. What I said in my keynote speech and in previous exchanges of reply, Madam Speaker, is that I fear that all the tax money that goes into this project will be lost, much like what happened with the Social Democrats' Steel Plant 80. There are a lot of similarities. The state steps in and is an actor in the market when we have a market economy. One might think that the market players could solve this if it is so nice and good. I hope so. But I have a legitimate, genuine and justified concern that taxpayers will lose a great deal of money. Martin Ådahl doesn't have to take it from the balls of his feet so that he cracks. It's a legitimate concern about taxpayers' money. That concern has not been quelled by either this shift or previous shifts.

I also asked the question: Where will all the terawatt-hours that are needed to make this project even possible come from? It is a matter of enormous amounts of energy. It is a business that is extremely energy intensive, incredibly energy intensive. Where will all the terawatt hours come

from? Perhaps they can come from Finland, where a nuclear power plant has actually been started. But it is not certain that the Finns want to sell their electricity to us.

We were into the farmers. The tax on agricultural diesel has been reduced to an absolute minimum level, in practice abolished. It applies during the budget period. The reduction obligation will be lowered at the turn of the year. We will reduce diesel costs very significantly, which will benefit farmers, and hopefully we will also be able to push through further tax cuts on fuel.

Ref. 28 ALI ESBATI (V):

Madam Speaker! On 18 October last year, I, like most others in the chamber today, had the dubious pleasure of sitting in this hall and hearing Ulf Kristersson's declaration of government. Much was said in it, such as the now-familiar emphasis on reactionary meanness signaling, other things of a more flat and empty nature, this too an increasingly strong sign of today's government.

One sentence, early in the government's declaration, I sometimes return to, however, with some grudging admiration: "Cooperation lays the foundation for a long-term policy, with the goal of seriously solving Sweden's major social problems."

This is how the Prime Minister spoke and thus referred to the submission of the bourgeoisie under the Sweden Democrats.

I think of the fine expression "to possess the grace of audacity". Because it is quite a gift to build an entire government project without blushing or visible qualification on something that is so fundamental, so demonstrative, in direct opposition to what you stand and say in the Riksdag's rostrum. And rarely is the contrast between what is said and what is done so obvious, so concrete, as in connection with the budget proposals that the government, under the supervision of the Sweden Democrats, presents and, perhaps even more importantly, does not present.

If there is something that really characterizes the economic spring bill that we are now debating, it is that central economic-political problems in Sweden are out of focus and, above all, that solutions to them are conspicuous by their absence.

During the spring, we heard the finance minister speak mantra-like about inflation. But what we see is a political passivity that costs the Swedish people dearly, now and in the future. This spring budget had been poor in spirit in a situation that was not characterized by several ongoing crises. Now it is rather remarkably apathetic.

Madam Speaker! The inflationary crisis is not something this government has created. But it shows and intervenes in some structural problems in the Swedish economy. Anyone who is interested in what the economy actually looks like would, for example, have seen and cared about the oligopoly of the food giants - which has led to higher price increases in Sweden than

in many other countries. It is price increases that linger and that hit families with children and households with small margins disproportionately hard.

A responsible government would have been able to gather these actors and act for price pressure - which the Left Party raised early on and which more and more people in the international debate are pointing to in order to push back inflation. Instead, we have first received irritated rhetoric that nothing must be done, then some pre-arranged photo opportunity with no ambitions.

We could have had a government that analyzes and acts when the poor competitive conditions in the mortgage market mean that big Swedish banks have happy days, at the same time that many Swedes feel a growing anxiety every month when the interest on the mortgage must be paid. The tools are available. The state's ownership of SBAB could easily be used to improve the competitive conditions - those that the right-wing parties would otherwise be happy to talk about in theory.

We know that SBAB had differently worded directives and yield requirements just over ten years ago, and we see in the statistics that it had a dampening effect on other commercial banks' interest margins. Such a proposal was also raised by the Left Party with the support of S and MP in the finance committee, but the Sweden Democrats and the supporting parties in the government chose to side with the bank directors instead of helping Swedes who are burdened by mortgages.

Madam Speaker! Not least, we now see as a direct effect of the government's refusal to provide the necessary resources an ongoing and every day deepening welfare crisis in Sweden. The responsibility falls on SD and the government to municipalities and regions where there is no real possibility of compensating for the long-term state underfunding, for the fat straws that sluice and sluice school money and care allowances to capital owners, not infrequently with a party background or shared summer cottage with the ruling , and now absolutely urgent for the weight from inflation.

So it is not that the money is not there. These are simply the choices that the SD-M government has made. The 13 billion that was used to lower taxes for high income earners is incidentally in the same order of magnitude as what the government chose not to give to Sweden's municipalities and regions in the autumn budget so that they would at least have been able to maintain the staff density at the same level, given an aging population.

And how does it look going forward? Yes, the dynamic duo who control the state budget now – Oscar Sjöstedt and Elisabeth Svantesson – have no extra money in this spring budget. They also have no information to bring to municipalities and regions that are trying to plan. They will negotiate a little later, and then we'll see. That's the message. The only thing that we know has been forwarded, as a potential major investment in next year's budget, are tax cuts with an almost parodic old-fashioned distribution profile, where millionaires would receive thousands of kroner every month.

The government's idea of how to fight inflation is thus to do nothing about the areas where we know that inflation is particularly high and to act to keep directors and landlords harmless with tax cuts and the design of the electricity subsidy, to then arrive at the conclusion that patients who are allowed to lie in hospital corridors, students who have to squeeze into larger classes and the elderly who have to wait three more days for a shower - that's good anti-inflation.

I wish this was exaggeration and rhetorical weaving. But unfortunately it is not. It is government policy in our Sweden, and it is policy that we as a society will have to pay a high price for also much later. It is not just about snapping your fingers and taking back people who leave school, healthcare or care for the elderly. And let's not talk about the cost of deteriorating education and the slaughter of social services. It has become, to quote the deputy prime minister's unintentionally humorous election slogan, "expensive to be Swedish".

Madam Speaker! The government's apparent failure to pursue "a long-term policy, with the goal of seriously solving Sweden's major social problems" goes beyond what is about the inflation crisis, households and welfare in the shorter term.

It's about train traffic working and our schools being focused on knowledge. It's about climate change, which every day changes the conditions for welfare and prosperity for people on this planet - and even if some people here don't seem to have realized that, I'm talking about the same planet that Sweden is on as well.

These are examples of problems and challenges that most people outside the market fundamentalist thought bubble understand require societal action. It is not possible to hope that some happy entrepreneur will get feeling and, driven by consumer power, draw railway tracks for the future. It is clear that the idea of playing bass with railway maintenance has had fatal systemic effects. But the government does not see any of this. No analysis, no action.

The school is an area where the problems of marketing are even more obvious. Children's education lends itself particularly poorly to treating it as a fun consumer product. And the damage is irreparable. After all, it is not possible to submit your education for repair if you are dissatisfied or believe that it will be solved if you change the brand, as if it were a question of fast food and underwear.

Is the government doing anything about this? No, on the contrary, this entire government coalition was created to guard these lucrative profit withdrawals. Without them, there would not have been the same financial incentive to invite Sweden Democrats to cognac, into the business-generated heat.

On top of this, or under, alongside and around this, we have the climate crisis. No individual consumption choices in the world will bring us industrial transformation, large wind farms at sea and on land, powerfully expanded transmission capacity for electricity or a realistic and systematic transformation of the vehicle fleet.

All this is needed. None of this is a priority for the government. It is shameful and irresponsible, and it makes Sweden a country that is less well positioned to compete on the world market.

It is a bit tragicomic that there are people sitting in and around the Government Office and kind of fantasizing about how to replace parts of the population or in any case recolor here and there, while the nearby and laborious ones are left there. How should the train maintenance work? We keep our fingers crossed. How should new recruitment to organized crime be stopped? Through symbolic repression and stale suspicion. How can the school system be changed when the system is rigged to produce precisely increased inequality and prioritize profit before knowledge?

There will be some non-binding admonitions from the Minister of Education and yet another fresh idea about supervision. This kind of eats away at the seams in the social debate.

Recently, we have heard some representatives of the blue-brown alliance express concern about fairy-tale moments with costumed performers. There are quite a few of us who rather have good reason to be worried about the tangible, harmful effects of basing government policy on fairy tales about perfectly functioning markets and about prosperity that will trickle down when the wealthiest have had to scrape together even more of the jointly created values in the economy.

Madam Speaker! The spring budget motion that the Left Party has put on the Riksdag's table - and which I now take the opportunity to seek approval for, reservation 2 - would involve several important urgent investments for security and responsibility in the crisis.

It is about introducing a crisis child allowance, financed by pausing the grid allowances for household services. It is about school breakfast throughout the country. It is a good way to lighten the burdens in a situation when households are under a lot of pressure. It's about having the same rules for the qualifying allowance as we had during the pandemic. And it is not least about a proper rescue package for the regions, and giving the municipalities the opportunity to use the targeted state grants to salvage core operations. It is also about halving ticket costs in public transport – important both for households in the short term and for climate change in the longer term. It is about drawing attention and doing something about the strange situation that people born in 1957 have found themselves in with the policies that the government has been behind when it comes to taxes.

But above all, this is about a different approach to politics – a policy that sees the capital of trust, welfare and knowledge that has been built up painstakingly and over several decades in our country now being eroded at a rapid pace. Growing inequality, chronic underfunding and senseless marketing of welfare services, severe underinvestment in infrastructure - these are the things that make our society more fragile, colder and poorer.

But it doesn't have to be that way. Instead, the Swedish people deserve a real policy with the goal of seriously solving Sweden's major social problems. We must have a policy that takes this country's citizens and opportunities seriously. It is left-wing politics, to put it more succinctly.

I also want to say a few things about the summer and thank people, but I will do that tomorrow in a debate that I will also be participating in.

(Applause)

Ref. 29 HANS EKLIND (KD):

Mr Speaker! In Sweden, students are now applying for new studies, and newly minted students are looking for jobs. The transfer class goes where studies and work are available. But it is sad to note that relocation is also done in order to escape the insecurity that one experiences in one's area.

Now that Sweden has entered a recession with continued high inflation, high interest rates and high unemployment, demands are being placed on the ability of politicians to implement a responsible economic policy and, in parallel, bring about the reforms required to make Sweden strong and safe again.

After the past eight years, there is no shortage of problems and challenges for our government to deal with. But the government, together with the Sweden Democrats, has set off to try to get Sweden on the right course again. In government, the Christian Democrats have taken a stand for the energy policy to be changed and for the households with the least margins to be supported through targeted measures. The guarantee pension, the parental allowance and the housing allowance – they have all been increased. Electricity subsidies to private individuals and companies totaling just over SEK 55 billion have been paid out. At the same time, the government has strengthened the judiciary, defense and welfare.

Even if the inflation figures both here at home in Sweden and abroad are now finally pointing in the right direction, it is too early to call the danger over. Current forecasts indicate that we continue to demand restraint. But already here and now, we can of course, from the political side, focus on what measures and reforms are required to speed up the labor market but also on growth.

The Christian Democrats believe that a policy for business and growth is the key to continued good welfare. It is time to look up and not only talk about crisis management, but also review how we can have a business-friendly and growth-promoting policy. It is time for structural reforms. We believe that there are some particularly important foundations for dealing with this.

One of the most important is that the incentives for self-sufficiency must increase. It should always pay to work rather than go on benefits. When people move from exclusion to employment, it is absolutely a gain in economic terms. But it is also a gain for the individual and not just for society as a whole. It increases tax revenue and reduces the need for subsidies. But

the most important thing for me is the gain for the individual on a moral and social level. The knowledge that one can provide for oneself and one's family naturally gives an inner strength and security that no state and municipal grants can give in the same way

The government's work to strengthen the incentives to work includes reforms such as allowance caps and qualifications. Other important parts are that the welfare benefits must not be allowed to passivize people. Passive receipt of support is devastating for the individual, and it can lead to lifelong exclusion. It must be broken through activity requirements in order to collect subsistence allowance. Vocational education, adult education and university of applied sciences are also being strengthened.

A particularly serious consequence of high inflation is that it erodes incentives to work. At the same time that most of the benefits in the social insurance systems are now calculated, the wage earners have had to see their purchasing power greatly eroded by inflation. It will therefore be important for the government and the Riksdag to review how to make it possible for work to pay off again.

A functioning welfare system is not built with words, rhetoric or, for that matter, with symbolic politics. Prioritizing welfare is our line in government from the Christian Democrats, and we believe that we do this best by increasing self-sufficiency in this country and letting the diligence and work of individuals pay off.

It is based on a simple and stark observation: that it is tax revenues, not tax rates, that finance welfare. Tax revenues do not arise out of thin air, they arise when people work and pay taxes. More tax revenue comes when more people work more. It is facilitated if we in Sweden have a tax and subsidy system that specifically encourages work. This is how we can make sure that we meet the welfare commitments that we from various parties would like to see and argue for.

Here and now, however, it is important that fiscal policy join hands with monetary policy in order to crack inflation as quickly as possible and bring it down to the benchmark. It will be crucial for both households and businesses. It is based on the knowledge that low and stable inflation is a prerequisite for Sweden to achieve good economic development.

Inflation also always hits the hardest against households that already had small margins before inflation. Uncertainty then affects the willingness to invest and consumption, which in turn affects growth.

Everyone has understood that it is a priority measure for the government to fight inflation and likewise to support vulnerable households. But it is also important to make sure that the line of work is now equipped and that we make sure to speed up growth in Sweden.

Politicians, as you know, do not create work, but politics and politicians can, through laws, regulations and taxes, encourage or put a damper on new jobs and for our entrepreneurs.

Sweden now has a government that sees the value of us not only getting new but also growing companies so that more jobs can be created and more people can become self-sufficient.

We believe that running a business should be easy. It is in the small and medium-sized companies that the jobs are created. The Productivity Commission has already been up in the debate, and that is good. It is the first time in 30 years that we have had one. It analyzes the obstacles to productivity growth and the opportunities to increase it. In addition, the government must work to reduce companies' regulatory burdens and administrative costs.

The government also invests in research and development and in increased knowledge in schools. It is all such things that give and promote growth.

But, Madam Speaker, it's not all about cracking down on inflation, supporting households, restoring the workforce and making sure we get higher growth. We have a government that also prioritizes the work of removing the long queues for care and that wants to work to create equal care across the country so that the quality of care is not determined by where you live.

We have a government that understands how to build on society's most important building block: families. Earlier this spring, the government decided to double the number of double days, i.e. the days when mother and father can be at home at the same time. Very recently, the government also decided that parental days can be handed over to relatives. Parents must be able to hand over 45 days each, those who are single 90 days. These are the first steps towards a more modern and flexible parental insurance, something that creates increased opportunities for both men and women to make family life and working life go together.

Sweden now also has a government that prioritizes the work of ensuring that safety returns to Sweden and that we crack down on the grossly criminal gangs that can plague entire residential areas.

The government's work since it took office and this spring bill and spring amendment budget show a way forward that makes what the students sing about "the brighter future is ours" not just a song but something that both they and all of us can look forward to.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you for your cooperation in the finance committee. I would like to express my warm thanks to our chairman Edward Riedl and vice chairman Mikael Damberg. There has been a good and constructive climate in the committee, I think. I would also like to express my warm thanks to the speakers of the Riksdag and the office staff, but of course also to our fantastic office staff in the finance committee.

(Applause)

In this speech, Mathias Bengtsson and Camilla Rinaldo Miller (both KD) agreed.

Ref. 30 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I could actually sign many paragraphs of the speech that Hans just gave. I think that was a good description of what Sweden needs.

My first simple question, however, is: If you really believe in the line of work, to go from benefits to work, why don't you stand up for it in practical politics? Why has the tax on work instead been raised, without lowering any other tax on work to compensate, very sharply since taking office and raising the social security fund by the same amount? It is the opposite of the line of work. I cannot understand it in any other way than that this government is dominated by a different party that pursues a completely different policy.

My second question concerns Sweden's farmers. KD has historically prioritized them and also said before the election that it would do so. Why then, in this extremely tough situation, can't you give a clear message so that they can know that they will get through this crisis, which is the worst since the drought of 2018?

Then I have a very specific question that also concerns the countryside, where you have the responsible department: Why has Gotland to this day not been able to receive any information about its traffic, where the costs have increased by 50 percent? The entire island is dependent on a single lifeline to the mainland. They have asked for 150 million because of the soaring fuel prices for the ferries, which in turn lead to soaring ticket prices. They have asked the government and the region for help to cope with this but received zero and no response. Gotland is now in a serious cost crisis.

Ref. 31 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Regarding the line of work, I think Martin Ådahl was there and saw our initiative to introduce something we called state daily allowance. We see that there are many people who are able to work but who are unemployed and end up on welfare. An able-bodied but unemployed person should not be there. Those people must of course be equipped so that they become employable. Then we had an idea to introduce a state daily allowance that would mean that you would not only get the education part, but also the opportunity to, for example, take a job for a few hours and actually get to keep part of the money for the work you do. This is not the case with subsistence allowance today, but it is counted off entirely.

If you are now going to talk about incentives – and you absolutely should; I am a friend of that - I think it is extremely important to create a line of work that those who are currently unemployed but not employable become so. I think there are a lot of people who would love to go to a job if only someone would hire them. Then it is important to ensure that they are equipped so that the companies can do this.

It is true that unemployment compensation remains at a higher level. I think it might be wise to have it at a higher level now that we are entering a recession. I am convinced that there are many who appreciate that announcement from the government. But the line of work comes from a number of different things. As I mentioned in my speech, we now have an inquiry that the

government has appointed to look at and come up with a grant ceiling. The line of work is central, but then it must also always be more worthwhile to work than to go on benefits.

Ref. 32 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I understand that Hans Eklind has a lot to answer, so I will repeat some questions.

I really didn't get an answer as to why you spend the big money on increasing the unemployment fund, what you used to call social policy, while you raise taxes to finance it. Sweden's business owners know that at the time we negotiated with the Social Democrats we made sure to get substantial tax reductions on employer contributions and other things so that there was actually a delivery of what at that time would be called bourgeois or liberal politics. But there I did not understand the answer at all, although it is good that you have something completely different.

We have also put something concretely similar to this on the Riksdag's table: When you go from grants and livelihood support and into work, you should get a 50 percent incentive so that you can keep much more of the money. You have said no to this. It is great that KD has its own proposal, but it is good to start with something that is similar to this and is already in the Riksdag.

Then there were the other two questions. The farmers need a lot right now so that we can maintain a Swedish food supply where we do not import more than half of everything we eat and have a much better preparedness. They must not be knocked out again. In the climate crisis that is unfortunately ongoing, they need help with irrigation and better competitive conditions, where we convert the deductions that exist today on, for example, diesel into a permanent agricultural deduction.

The dairy farmers in particular are having a very tough time right now, as I mentioned earlier. They now need to be told that there is the same kind of support as there was during the last drought - this time it might be even worse - and that they can also get this block exemption in the EU.

Finally, it concerned Gotland, which is cut off and has huge problems right now. Answer that question!

Ref. 33 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! I think that Martin Ådahl and I had this debate in connection with leaving the budget bill. Martin Ådahl then gave the impression that the government does not see agriculture and the countryside, but that is not true. This government is really investing in rural areas. We look at agriculture and have said very clearly that the tax on agricultural and forestry diesel must be at the EU's minimum level. This government has announced this. We have also ensured that the travel deduction has been strengthened. We have ensured that even the diesel used in the aquaculture operations is at that level in terms of taxation.

We invest in the expansion and maintenance of socially important infrastructure. Anyone who has lived in the country – I have; I don't know if Martin Ådahl has ever done that – knows how important it is that the maintenance of roads and so on works in those parts. This, combined with the fact that the travel deduction is designed in such a way that you can commute to your job at a reasonable cost, naturally develops the countryside.

Again – perhaps the single most important thing is that the reduction obligation will be lowered to the EU's minimum level on 1 January. It will mean an incredible amount for everyone who wants to live in Sweden's beautiful countryside. The Center Party still needs to deliver a sustainable answer to why it must be ensured that the reduction obligation is not reduced. They want to continue on the funding path that makes diesel and petrol more expensive. It will not benefit those who want to live in the countryside.

Ref. 34 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! With Hans Eklind, I want to address the unreasonable tax situation that pensioners born in 1957 have found themselves in since the target age for pension was raised without the transitional rules being followed. This means that those born in 1957 pay more in tax than others.

Hans Eklind has said that he thinks that injustice should be remedied. I welcome that. It is good. Therefore, I would like to ask when there will be a proposal to compensate those born in 1957 for the tax injustice they have suffered.

Ref. 35 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! The background is that the 57s have to pay a completely different tax than, for example, the 58s will have to do. The 59s can end up in the same situation, if care is not taken to adjust the target age, the transition rules and the regulatory framework in parallel. They may also suffer from having to pay higher taxes in the first year. Then those who were born in 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965 will have to pay the tax that you should have when you become a pensioner. While the 66ers, my generation, will have to pay higher taxes in the first year, if nothing is done about this.

There is a reason why I have been clear that this needs to be fixed. In the Pensions Group, during the time Annika Strandhäll was minister and led the Pensions Group, we put our foot down in regard to this thing about the retirement age. It was extremely clear that everything related to the age of majority, from LAS rules and so on, would be adjusted in parallel.

But last year the government put forward a bill that did not include an increased basic deduction. This means that these pensioners are pensioners in the employment law sense, but in the tax law sense they are suddenly working. It is not reasonable. Therefore, I believe that it is a priority task for all political parties. We cannot have it so that a cohort of just over 100,000 pays more in taxes than other cohorts have to.

I hope that we will be able to give notice that such action will be taken. I do not think it will be possible to do it in the current year. However, as I understand it, there is the possibility of doing it retroactively. I am pushing for this, because right is right and wrong is wrong.

Ref. 36 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! We fully agree that it is an injustice that should not continue.

I thank Hans Eklind for the detailed explanation of why it arose. But what I asked about was actually if there will be any proposal soon or if it is something that Hans Eklind and the Christian Democrats intend to pursue in the budget negotiations.

Ref. 37 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! I have been clear that I intend to push this all the way into the tile. For me, it is first and foremost a moral issue. It is morally reprehensible to, as was done last year, put forward proposals which mean that one cohort must pay more in taxes than other cohorts.

All parties in the Pensions Group nevertheless agreed that all systems should be adjusted in parallel, precisely so that this would not occur. I therefore believe that it is reasonable that at least all the parties that are or were part of the Pensions Group - as the Green Party was in government, you were also part of the Pensions Group at the time - join hands with each other and say: There was a crunch, and that must be remedied.

I hope we will be able to give notice of that. It will be done as soon as possible. But when I can't answer here and now.

Ref. 38 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C):

Madam Speaker! I'll start by thanking you for a great parliamentary term. Now that we are closing in on what looks to be a very hot summer, I would like to thank the committee for good discussions and the chairman and the speaker for fine debates.

I also want to take the opportunity to ask for approval of our reservation. Since the Center Party now stands as the last liberal, green and common-sense alternative to the Tidö government and the Social Democrats in Swedish politics, it is important to stand up for this.

It is a very tough economic situation. One can cite any amount of data about how inflation has eroded the purchasing power of households. Many people are under pressure when shopping. I note when I talk to friends and acquaintances how expensive people feel it is to shop just for the midsummer meal.

Interest costs have doubled for many households. Sweden's GDP is now at the bottom, among the worst countries, of the EU's growth league. And our unemployment is at the top. It is a very serious situation.

I think the most worried, however, is that one should be concerned that trust has collapsed so much. It is not just that there is no trust in the government, which we read about. It is also about consumer confidence. The fact that households have believed in the future has been an asset in our country. It doesn't exist at all anymore.

We know that a large part of it has to do with the reprehensible gun violence, which affects us all. We fully support the investment in the police. We have done so for a long time, and we will continue to do so. We also want to invest in capturing the young people in the classes who are the recruitment base. In our alternative, we make a big investment in sociologists – it sounds boring, but it is important – who can meet all those young people. The police say that nine out of ten young people that the gangs want to recruit are missed today because that type of effort does not exist.

Of course, the pessimism is also due to the war in Ukraine. It is now in full force. The people of Ukraine are fighting for the freedom of all of Europe. They sacrifice a lot. Of course, it's on everyone's mind right now.

But it is more than that. It is also about the fact that we cannot get any information from the new government. They promised an awful lot: gold and green forests, cheap gasoline and everything at once. There would be order in Sweden. But we don't get any news. We do not receive any information about how the country's municipalities will manage to run the schools. We do not get any information about how the countryside will cope with the crisis with closed schools as well as higher prices and agriculture that is hit hard. We receive no information about the climate, where Sweden lags behind in the EU.

There is no ability in this government to prioritize after all the populist promises. As Reinfeldt said: Either you are prepared, or you are not. And then it shows.

An alternative is needed here. Everyone thinks we should fight inflation. It is obvious. We in the Center Party are known to be hawks when it comes to pursuing strict policies. But moderation is a virtue; Action paralysis is not. The answer to what will bring economic growth is not to bury your head in the sand and pretend it will go away.

I must have thought differently than Anders Borg when he was finance minister, even though our parties were in the same government. But please, dear someone - all is forgiven, Anders Borg. Come back to the Ministry of Finance!

Then you did something! It was a crisis, and they made employment tax deductions and strengthened the work line. And yes, they dared to put an end to contributions. Now they do nothing - or rather a few things: They raise the tax on work, and they raise the unemployment fund. With all due respect, Mikael Damberg - at the time you did it, it didn't work. It worked better when you worked with us. Sossepolitik even in new form will not work now either.

Why don't you take the chance to do as the experts say and lower the cost of hiring? Should it be that difficult? Do you have to raise taxes instead? Reduce costs!

Why can't you, as was mentioned earlier in the debate, now that there is such a huge need for skills which in turn can provide more jobs and more growth, invest in polytechnics, further education and the fantastic transition study support that unions and employers agreed on when LAS was made more flexible while giving people the world's chance to educate themselves in mid-life?

The green industry and digitization mean that the municipalities have enormous skills needs. Why don't you do this? Why this total paralysis of action? Why not just ordinary, bourgeois politics – liberal politics? Why is it always the SD with the plastic bag tax or the unemployment insurance fund and so on that must come first?

Several have been aware of the situation in the municipalities. It is about to go from an economic crisis to a welfare crisis. The municipalities' situation is such that it is as if their results - minus 28 billion - plunge into some kind of grand canyon. They have very high inflationary costs while the tax revenue is decreasing, and in addition you raise the tax on hiring young people by 2 billion, so they also lose that money.

We are already seeing that the number of qualified teachers being dismissed in the municipalities is in the thousands. It is therefore teachers at hundreds of small schools in the Swedish countryside who are at risk of being dismissed. This has long-lasting effects – and why? It is not because you want to be moderate in inflation, as is said here, but because you cannot give notice to the municipalities as you usually do in the spring! They have nothing to go on. They are forced to take panic measures just so SD will rule over the government and you can't come to an agreement.

Notice must be given. We have said it. At least give them the billions they need to keep qualified teachers and the hundreds of millions needed to keep the small schools! Make sure they get general funds. Take the playoff money for targeted funds that you have had and lump it together so that it can be used in this crisis and meet the needs of tens of billions. It is about real needs in everyday life in many small municipalities.

Finally, I also have to say something about how the government's policy for the climate crisis is almost starting to resemble a crisis for climate policy. What you hear from the lectern is absolutely incredible. It is not enough that wind power must be stopped - now it is also about green industrialization. All that you talked about at that conference, SD apparently has to stop in practice now.

We see for the first time that because so many important climate measures have been put in place in a short time, all the assessors say that emissions will increase. Listen to it! The whole world is going to slow down quickly because of the ongoing climate crisis. It is wonderful when the children can swim at 30 degrees and it is 21 degrees in Siljan, but it is a symptom of

something that we all worry about. And what do you do then? Yes, Sweden must increase emissions, even though we have every chance thanks to the fantastic industrialization in the north. These are fantastic opportunities.

Regarding the electric cars, which were supposed to save the situation, word came today that the percentage sold is falling because you removed the only instrument that affected it. There are 16,000 fewer electric cars in the new forecast from Mobility Sweden.

Everything is just collapsing in climate policy! The Center Party says: Give people a chance now, before next winter when the new electricity bills arrive, to save electricity. I have met many people who have large houses in the countryside, and they have not been able to afford to make energy savings. They are now getting the highest electricity bills ever due to the great energy crisis. Give them a hand! We have proposed a green deduction so that they can buy a heat pump or even geothermal heating. Also give them a green credit that can be used by those who cannot go to the bank so that they can make these profitable savings for Sweden, the climate and their own economy and then pay it back over a longer period of time.

As for the reduction obligation, the reduction will mean that in this situation Sweden will become completely dependent – friends in the Sweden Democrats – on Saudi and indeed, indirectly, Russian oil. You increase that percentage and that dependence. The Center Party just says: Think Swedish! What we wanted with the reduction obligation was to invest fully in Swedish production of Swedish fuel.

Okay - we'll have to redo this. We can't just scrap it, but we have to remake it so that we have as low a tax as possible on the Swedish biofuel and that we procure it as cheaply as possible and not as expensive as we do today. There must be a requirement that the cleanest fuel be the cheapest. Think Swedish!

The Energy Agency says that we can get Swedish biofuel from the remains of Swedish forest for 15 kroner a litre. Dare to do what is good for Sweden! Dare to fill the tank with Swedish fuel that strengthens the Swedish countryside and strengthens our independence!

I'll stop there, because time is up, but there is so much to be said for the green, liberal, common sense alternative that we have put forward. I will possibly come back to the farmers' crisis in the future if the opportunity arises, but I have already done so in many rejoinders. I just want to say to all those who have given up hope a little bit, all those who the confidence indicators show have given up hope: Don't give up hope! Sweden will lead the green new industrialization.

We will turn this crisis around. The government may do nothing, but in the end it will be better if we dare to take up the debate and put forward alternatives.

(SECOND DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the members to switch chairs with each other.)

Ref. 39 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is not easy to know which side to stand on in Swedish politics, but the Center Party ends up wrong time and time again - so here too.

Let me address a few things first. As for the Center Party being hawks on economic policy, the Center Party has time and again proposed major, unfunded reforms straight into the finance committee, and they would spew inflation. Anyone who has listened to Martin Ådahl in the lectern has heard him line up proposal after proposal that would drive the cost trend.

Madam Speaker! It is interesting to hear a representative of the Center Party, which I actually believe was the only party in Sweden's Riksdag last fall that wanted to save on welfare, reduce money for municipalities and regions and implement savings requirements on municipalities and regions. There would then be less money for what Martin Ådahl is now talking about. There is a small investment in the spring budget, which I believe is about a third of what they wanted to save last fall. So you want to remove more than you want to add. It is symptomatic of much of what Martin Ådahl talks about in the rostrum.

When the farmers do not receive any information, as Martin Ådahl says, he can read in the newspaper how the finance minister, who also sits here in the chamber, still says that municipalities and regions will not be left in the lurch, that they will not rule out support if the drought strikes and so on – of course taking into account the high inflation.

Let's be clear about the duty to reduce: Soon it will only be Martin Ådahl and the Center Party who stand for the completely unreasonable policy. I think that even the Social Democrats will try to sneak out of the old positions. Today, the National Audit Office also ruled on the reduction obligation. Nevertheless, Martin Ådahl stands still and defends that Sweden should have the world's highest fuel prices. How would that help the countryside, Martin Ådahl?

(Applause)

Ref. 40 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I really have to thank Edward Riedl for giving me the opportunity to talk about things that are close to our hearts, but unfortunately there were not many correct answers to the three questions.

First of all, in our budget we do many things for the school. Above all, we appeal to the government to save the qualified teachers and put money into it. We prioritize it over social security. We prioritize that over filling city commuters' SUVs with even cheaper petrol and diesel, as you do. It is those in the countryside who depend on the car who should have the money. We prioritize it, and we stand for it.

You have also increased the taxes on the municipalities and regions by 2 billion by increasing the fees for the young people they employ. They will get that back. In addition, we put 5 billion straight, that is, 7 billion compared to you. Just read our budget. I can return to the calculation

for the autumn budget, but it also does not seem to add up when you read the opposition budget. I hope that things are in order at the Ministry of Finance.

Then there are the farmers. Yes! It is good that general statements are made, but everyone who was with the drought last time knows – and so does Edward Riedl – that they need a statement now. We have to get the groups started now or the money will come too late. This has been an ongoing problem, and much broader efforts are needed than now.

Then there was the question of the reduction obligation. It is probably good not to write the questions before I have given my speech or read on our website about what we are proposing if you are not aware of it.

We are not saying that the reduction obligation should continue as it is today. We say that we will switch to what everyone really wants, that is, the cheapest possible Swedish biofuel from Swedish residual raw materials from the forest, where there is great potential, into the tank to replace the oil from Saudi Arabia. The tax must be reduced as much as possible so that the fuel becomes cheap. Think Swedish is our policy now. It's time to update yourself.

Ref. 41 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! I would like to remind those listening to the debate that the Center Party saves more on municipalities and regions in the autumn budget than it wants to add to the spring budget. It just doesn't add up.

As far as the farmers are concerned, this government has announced the diesel reduction for the entire year. What Martin Ådahl requested in other parts when the Center Party has been involved, the farmers have been informed about a long time ago. They know they get the discount. If the drought strikes, the government will have reason to return.

There have been early announcements. The diesel reduction came early. And that is important because you can plan based on those conditions.

Regarding the reduction obligation, I can once again state that the reality does not quite match the rhetoric. As far as I understand, almost everyone except the Center Party has left the unreasonable position that Sweden should have the world's most expensive fuel prices. It is a direct consequence of what the Center Party has helped push through and which the Center Party remains committed to, i.e. filling the tank with a lot of biofuel, despite the fact that even the environmental movement condemns this - you simply cannot add up the climate calculations.

In that situation, they say that it should be cheap Swedish production in the tank, but the fact is that the policy of the Center Party in terms of fuel led to us having to vacuum a large part of Southeast Asia on slaughterhouse waste at very high costs, which in turn led to the world's most expensive diesel prices in Sweden - before the war in Ukraine.

Martin Ådahl is welcome to elaborate on how this is to be done. What Martin Ådahl talks about does not exist in reality, but reality became the world's most expensive fuels. It is bad for the countryside. We who come from there can talk about that, unlike Martin Ådahl.

Ref. 42 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is striking how many times it is referred to who comes from the countryside. Seriously; talk to people in rural areas about how worried they are about services being cut, aged care being cut and the small schools being closed. Talk to your friends in the small municipalities around the country, and you'll get a bit of a reality check on that.

(EDWARD RIEDL (M): We live there!)

Just! But then maybe you should care a little more about them. Then we can also stick to the order of the speakers, Madam Speaker.

I had actually wanted to ask Edward Riedl questions. Now you have privileged access in the pulpit to what the Center Party actually thinks. It's also on our website, and that's what we operate throughout the country. There will soon be small caps that say: Tanka Swedish!

We must become more independent of oil from dictatorship states. We have to use our Swedish forest. Instead, take as income now that we hoped that the reduction obligation would result in production in Sweden. We were all behind it. Then it wasn't good enough, and above all there was uncertainty because you didn't make the big investments.

Now we go straight to the point: Lower the tax on the good fuel, the Swedish fuel, procure it not as expensively as possible but as cheaply as possible. Then require that highly mixed from that type of raw materials go into the tank. Get straight to the point. That's what we all want. What is so bad about refueling Swedish, not Saudi or Russian? Let's build a cheap Swedish production base. It is not me who says so, but there are investors already today. But they are waiting because of your anti-climate policies. Give them the chance. Invest in large-scale production of Swedish fuel instead of the way it is now. Then we will meet our climate goals, and we will avoid that kind of climate crisis. Sweden can lead instead of lagging behind.

Ref. 43 CARL B HAMILTON (L):

Madam Speaker! The uncertainty that has existed about the economic development is now diminishing. The previous forecast that appears in the material that there will be a recession well into 2025 appears to be excessively gloomy. Let us rejoice in it.

This is important because everyone demands more money for something or everything. After all, it has to be paid, and it can only be paid with growth in the gross domestic product either today or tomorrow. Tomorrow there are many who think it should be paid; we can always use the National Debt Office to borrow the money. It is quite obvious. Billions after billions are promised here, and they will not be in the Swedish budget unless they are borrowed.

Let me move on to my main question. It applies to Sweden and the European currency cooperation, the euro. When the issue is discussed, it is almost always about exchange rates. Why is the crown so weak and so unstable?

But let's not get stuck on the question of Sweden's future currency policy on this simple and extremely short-term question. It is of course popular in business, but is not particularly useful when dealing with economic policy, even if the question of the exchange rate becomes important for companies and consumers in certain situations.

What we have to think about instead is the political and economic situation in Europe. Why doesn't Sweden join the euro cooperation without further ado? The sooner, the safer; and better conditions for a stable Swedish policy for the economy and economic growth.

First of all, it does not work because there must be changes in laws, perhaps even constitutional changes. But the Liberals believe that Sweden should become a full-fledged and more participating team player in the EU's macro and financial policy, which so often over the years has only had the simple goal of minimizing Sweden's contribution to joint tasks in economic policy.

Thankfully, that stance as a side effect of the war in Ukraine has given way to greater political broad-mindedness and realism. The austerity drive regarding the EU budget has subsided.

We must be clear that Sweden should belong and benefits from belonging to the core of Europe and that Sweden wants to contribute to the stability and economic growth of the whole of Europe with its policies and its analyzes and positions. It doesn't come for free. It is at the core of the political and economic European cooperation that Sweden should exist, gains by existing, and where Sweden should contribute to knowledge, analysis and commitment.

I think that when you look back on the Ukraine war in five or fifty years, you will note that that war practically made impossible Swedish hesitancy and attempts to, in slightly lame German, alone enter European politics and economics.

I think we should absorb the realization that we are in a completely new situation when it comes to economic policy in a European context. Sweden has also become much more of a team player in just over a year thanks to the Ukraine war - no evil that has no good in it. Today, to a greater degree, we weigh the fate of the whole of Europe into what we do, and what we have done in the 50s and later is really far away and alien today.

The alternative is that we entangle it for ourselves, and if Swedish entanglement would benefit anyone, it is Vladimir Putin. The stronger and more united the EU is, the more difficult it will be for Putin and Russia to sow division and start wars and conflicts with their neighbors.

If we instead want to contribute to a stronger and more democratic EU, which of course can be a very genuine political goal, the natural role of a rich, well-run and stable country like Sweden

is that we take part, to the extent of our ability the responsibility for democracy, prosperity and economic policy in Europe and not continue to bite us outside, for example, the euro, outside the ECB and outside a banking union that would strengthen the stability of the entire Nordic region.

We should therefore now follow Finland in the euro issue in much the same way as we try to follow Finland in the NATO issue. We should follow Finland into euro cooperation.

Finland chose to join the euro in 1999, i.e. 24 years ago, mainly for political reasons. Finland's motive 24 years ago was not least to secure support and backing from its European outside world against the eternal Russian danger in the east. But in that debate, strangely enough, it was the economic issues – wage formation, buffer funds and similar issues – that were the focus of the discussion 24 years ago in Finland. But they had foreseen and prepared a broader perspective on the decision than just the exchange rate and the budget, which were what was discussed, and the decision was made that Finland would join the euro without further ado. While we in Sweden - including myself - at that time focused on interest rate differences and exchange rate forecasts which today are all completely overplayed and forgotten, Finland kept its thoughts on the main question,

In the European issue, we should govern in accordance with the larger and broader perspective and then follow and do as Finland does. As a country, we must take to heart that we gain from the conclusion of a full-fledged euro cooperation in terms of the treaty. It then happens with countries that are largely similar to us: Germany, France, the Benelux countries, Finland, the Baltics and like-minded euro members. In this way, we take responsibility, not least for the entire Baltic Sea area.

Therefore, it becomes very important for the entire EU which political direction Sweden chooses. Confirming that you see yourself as a full-fledged and responsible actor in European cooperation is what we hope Sweden will do. Sweden should not be some tricky stepchild in the European family. We must both benefit from the cooperation and contribute with full force ourselves so that the cooperation is deepened and secured far into the future. We should not act as temporary EU visitors, but as full-fledged, integrated team players in the cooperation of the European democracies.

I also want to join those who thank the competent employees of the office and the committee for an extraordinary collaboration. Thanks!

(Applause)

Ref. 44 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP):

Madam Speaker! Now summer is at the door. While many families are longing for long days off with sun and swimming, others are dreading the weeks ahead. Because what happens to the children without a fixed point in their lives when school activities stop and they may lose contact

with the adult role models who make sure they stay on track? Well, they are left alone, often completely without the conditions to get the summer vacation we wish every child would get.

The open violence has been escalating for a very long time, and after last weekend's reprehensible shootings, it is even more obvious that we as a society must take action to reverse the trend. Then we have to work with both police methods and preventive measures.

Now, unfortunately, all the focus and the entire debate is on the police and the judiciary. But it is prevention that tackles the problem in the longer term, and that work is to a very large extent the responsibility of the municipalities. Then it is remarkable that this is exactly where the government cuts, because that is exactly what happens when municipalities and regions raise the alarm that more money is needed but the government turns a deaf ear. It is not only upsetting but also very sad. In this situation, the municipalities must be given the conditions to invest in social services and schools in the vulnerable areas.

I am extremely concerned about the effect the cuts to our common welfare will have on new gang recruitment. I really hope that in the very near future the government informs municipalities and regions of increased financial resources for next year. Otherwise, there is the risk that you will already start to cut back on municipal activities that are absolutely crucial for society to hold together and keep young boys from the clutches of gangs.

Increased penalties and tougher measures will never make up for broken welfare. It is a realization that by now should have reached the government as well.

But it is not only the school and the social services that will be affected by the government's inability to prioritize what is common to us. The care that everyone in this House claims to protect is also facing major cuts if we do not act. It strikes against all those who take care of us when we need it most and against each of those who are in need of care and support.

It doesn't have to be that way. Already for this year, we in the Green Party proposed that, in addition to the government's budget, 14 billion be given to Sweden's municipalities and regions. It is money that was needed here and now. But the government chose to do what right-wing politicians always do – to give more to those who already have.

We know that another path is possible. By giving Sweden's municipalities and regions the money required to be able to maintain and develop welfare throughout the country, we are building a better Sweden. A country where healthcare staff have more colleagues and higher wages. Where extra support for every child in need is available in the school from day one. Where social services have the time, money and opportunities to put in the right efforts, not just for the children but for the whole family.

Madam Speaker! While some families are packing their bags for the family's annual trip to the Mediterranean, other parents are panicking about not having enough money to pack food for a picnic basket. High food prices and rampant costs have made families who previously lived in

economic vulnerability even poorer. During the spring term, there have been reports that more and more food is being consumed in the schools. Now during the summer, the school lunch will no longer be an option for many children around Sweden. The summer vacation, which should be a time for relaxation and fun activities together, will for many families instead be about keeping costs down.

But this cost crisis should not have to be paid for by families with children. When everything becomes more expensive, society's allowances must also follow. We have proposals such as inflation-proofing child support so that it is not eroded when it is most needed. And with food prices skyrocketing, we have proposed to completely scrap VAT on key staples such as milk, bread and butter over the coming summer months. This would make a big difference for those who are having the hardest time now during the summer holidays, when more food has to be prepared at home.

But the right says no. And it is as unsurprising as it is incredibly serious for the children who have to suffer the consequences here and now. Unfortunately, it is the same children who always have to pay the price when society is not enough and abdicates.

Madam Speaker! The heat records and alarm reports about various kinds of extreme weather have been raining heavily in recent weeks. And so, unfortunately, it will continue. In Sweden, we are now only at the beginning of summer, but when we look around in nature, it looks as it usually does after many, long summer months. Many say that the situation is already worse than it was during the very dry summer of 2018. Several experts already warned this spring that it could be a very dry and hot summer.

We in the Green Party therefore proposed to increase support for agricultural climate adaptation, with a particular focus on measures to prevent drought in particular. The government did not act then, and we now see how crops are at risk of drying up and how the queues at the slaughterhouses are growing. This means bad times for Sweden's farmers, but it also means bad times for our self-sufficiency - which we in this chamber usually say that we agree needs to increase.

But it is not only agriculture that is affected by extreme weather. The extremely hot summer of 2018 also led to approximately 700 more deaths, completely unnecessarily. We see that we must also strengthen the work on climate adaptation, because it is literally a matter of life and death. Today we do far too little.

The Green Party wants to see investments in heat care, information on where to cool off and measures to reduce the risk of heat islands and areas that can flood when heavy rains come. I really hope that more parties in this chamber can realize that it is now starting to be really urgent to strengthen the work with climate adaptation in Sweden when the heat records are being broken on an assembly line.

But of course we must not only deal with the effects of the climate crisis. Emissions must be reduced, and they must be reduced quickly. All warning lights light up red. Climate scientists have exhausted their vocabulary in their attempts to emphasize the gravity of the situation. We hear that 2023 is on track to be the hottest year ever recorded.

It should be quite obvious that we have to increase the pace of climate work - but no, not for the Tidö parties. Instead, they choose to pursue a policy that increases emissions. This government's climate policy is nothing but a disaster. They make it cheaper to emit and proceed with a policy that causes us to miss the climate goals for 2030 - which we were on our way to reaching. They want to increase the proportion of fossil fuels in petrol and diesel. When people then ask how we should reduce climate emissions, the government answers that we should electrify the vehicle fleet. And yes, that sounds like a good plan; it needs to be done. But with one day's notice, the government instead scraps the electric car bonus and crashes electric car sales to private individuals. It is the exact opposite of what you say you want to do and therefore completely absurd.

This is unworthy of Sweden, which can actually be at the forefront of the transition, if we want. But this government has shown time and time again and with all desirable clarity that it does not actually want to. It's embarrassing, and it's dangerous.

We in the Green Party have a policy to accelerate the transition. We want us to invest 100 billion a year in the green transition. We see that the US and the EU are doing it. They are increasing the pace of climate investments, and Sweden risks falling behind.

We cannot afford to have a neglected railway that threatens Swedish competitiveness. We cannot afford wind power to be expanded far too slowly. And we also cannot afford to lose large green industrial investments to other countries.

But we can actually afford to invest in the climate. The Green Party has long emphasized that the fiscal policy framework should be climate-proofed. Now we also hear how everyone from LO to Swedish Business and the Agenda 2030 coordinator are raising the need to change the rules for fiscal policy. Sweden can do better. We have all the conditions to be a country where new green technologies are developed and scaled up. We should be a leading country for green social construction, not a country that puts its heels in the ground and struggles.

Madam Speaker! After every summer comes an autumn. Even though it now feels like a long time until then, it is with a starting point in what we have dealt with here today that we enter it. For us in the Green Party, it is obvious: It is only with investments in the climate, households and welfare that we can face autumn with confidence. I hope that the government will come to the same conclusion during the summer.

With this, I would like to request approval for reservation number 4. I would also like to thank the committee and its chairman and vice-chairman for very good cooperation during the year. But above all, I want to send a very big thank you to the office, which always stands up, is very

knowledgeable and with a lot of patience helps us right through the twists and turns of the administration.

Ref. 45 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M):

Madam Speaker! We hear about eleven-year-olds who are lured by drug dealers to perform jobs for criminals, fourteen-year-olds who carry out bombings for the same criminal network, fifteen-year-olds who are picked up after soccer practice and then go and shoot someone, and children with automatic carbines that they can barely even carry.

Madam Speaker! It was 21 shots with automatic weapons that not long ago took the lives of a man and a boy, right in the center of Farsta. This has left many very concerned, rightly so. This is not how Sweden should be, or needs to be. Reversing this brutal development is linked to political priorities. It is about political will and action.

To break the trend of violence and the wave of insecurity that sweeps over our country, to build and expand an energy system that has been seriously damaged and does not at all benefit the climate transition and to get through a rare difficult economic situation are some of the big and difficult tasks that we four cooperation parties have decided to take on. We know it won't be easy, but it can be done. We now have the responsibility, and we take responsibility.

Madam Speaker! Many hard working people are now heading for vacation. Some have already taken vacations and may be enjoying the warm weather that has been in recent weeks. It is gratifying with heat and sun, but we also know that it is very worrying for many of Sweden's farmers. They are worried about their harvest, rightly so, and in addition, many forest owners are now also worried about forest fires. The government follows this development closely and is in constant contact with both the industry and the authorities. But we are also prepared to handle a difficult situation this summer. Much may need to be done to help both forest owners and farmers.

Madam Speaker! It has been high summer heat here outside Sweden's Riksdag, but it doesn't look like that in the Swedish economy. It is still economic winter there. We have inflation that is at record levels, and the fact that core inflation is not going down is very worrying. At the same time, we are now expected to be heading into a recession. All this means that we are in a rarely seen trial.

In addition, the uncertainty factors are greater than in a very long time with, among other things, the war, Russia's brutal war in Ukraine, where we do not know how developments will continue.

Madam Speaker! The government and the partner parties have a plan to get us through this economic situation. I have told you about it before, but I want to repeat it here in the chamber of the Swedish Parliament. It is a plan in three parts.

The first and most important thing right now is to fight inflation. It may sound obvious to some, but obviously not to everyone. Inflation must be fought because it is a prerequisite for us to be

able to have good economic development, and it is a prerequisite for future real wage increases for ordinary wage earners. Inflation must simply return to a low and stable level. It is also a prerequisite for households to be able to cope with everyday financial life. For those who are most vulnerable right now, the fight against inflation is absolutely central.

It is also a prerequisite for all of Sweden's municipalities and regions to be able to push back their costs and that costs should not continue to increase. If they are to be able to maintain good welfare, fighting inflation is of course an important part.

But having said that, Madam Speaker, I would like to say that for this year the partner parties put 12 billion in various types of support to both municipalities and regions. I know that many of the municipalities want more. I talk to them very often. But I also know it makes a difference. And just so we've said it: The fight against inflation is also one of the most important things we do for Sweden's municipalities and regions. Otherwise, costs in care for the elderly, in schools and in healthcare will continue to increase.

Madam Speaker! There are no shortcuts. It requires restraint. After reading the opposition's four different spring motions, I can state that that view may not be shared by everyone. Some parties here in the Riksdag think that it is completely in order to proceed with a strongly expansionary policy in this situation. It would therefore be like throwing money on the inflation fire. It would burn even more. The fire is getting bigger, inflation is increasing, interest rates are increasing, prices for goods and services are increasing and households are getting poorer.

My message is that our four cooperating parties will not lift the blanket until the inflation fire is more or less extinguished. This is why the budget for this year was restrained, and the spring budget that you will decide on today is also restrained.

But this does not mean that it is a passive budget, on the contrary. The 2023 budget and this spring budget are of great use. They are of great use in defense and in the judiciary. They make great use of the 12 billion for municipalities and regions. That was a third of the reform space we had.

We have also been active in supporting households and businesses. Enormously large electricity subsidies have expired in recent months and make a big difference for both individuals and companies. The list could be made very long, and I will not use all my time for it. But we have done all this by prioritizing. We have done it by taking responsibility. Overall, our policy is restrained and responsible, and it does not hedge inflation.

Madam Speaker! Let me say something briefly about the spring amendment budget. Here, we make a targeted effort to those who have the hardest time. Several people have mentioned it before, but I still want to bring it up. It is about the housing allowance for families with children, which will be increased by 40 percent and also extended. It is incredibly important and accurate so that precisely those who have the smallest margins will also receive a reinforcement.

In addition, we contribute to civil society, which also supports people in particularly vulnerable situations. Not everyone wants to turn to the municipality or the authorities.

Madam Speaker! I just want to mention one more thing. There has been talk of prices here in the rostrum today. I agree that you can sometimes wonder how certain prices have increased. As a government, we think it is hugely important to also ensure that there is good competition in various markets. Therefore, in this budget, the Competition Authority also gets extra resources to follow this development and, above all, also come back and see if legislative changes are required, for example with regard to the Consumer Act and other things. There should not be a single company that takes the opportunity to raise prices just because it is, as they say, possible.

Madam Speaker! Although inflation is the most important thing to fight here and now, we also know that Sweden is in need of major structural reforms. One such is to strengthen the line of work. Let me say something brief about this. I received the OECD's report on the Swedish economy last week. One of the important conclusions there was that we must increase the motivation to work. There is too little difference between working and not working. That is why we are currently working on subsidy reforms in different stages. It's about 100 percent activity and making sure you can't stack contributions. We will also return to what we call qualifying for welfare.

At the same time, our parties during this mandate – this year or next year, I will return – will reduce income tax. It comes down to what I have said many times: Inflation is the wage earner's worst enemy.

The third part of our plan is about permanently strengthening growth and productivity. One can absolutely have many opinions about a productivity commission. Otherwise, it is very popular to demand a commission here in the Riksdag, but I am happy that we have got it in place. Finally, several experts will immerse themselves in the Swedish economy - the private sector and the public sector - to see how we can become more productive, so that growth can increase in five, ten or fifteen years.

But that does not mean that the government does not do things here and now. The rule simplification work has gained new momentum. The 3:12 rules must be improved. And, for example, we have now also ensured that the Swedish Migration Agency will have a maximum of 30 days to notify whether a company can hire people from other countries. Labor immigration is an important part for many companies.

Another part, Madam Speaker, that concerns growth is energy. A lot of people have talked about this one today. Today is a historic day for future increased growth and improved transition, and it is about the energy policy goal, which members of the Riksdag will vote on in just a few hours. Here, each party has an opportunity to decide whether it should be a 100 percent fossil-free goal or a renewable one.

This makes a real difference - that we get a breadth of energy types, so that we can handle all the growth, production and conversion that this country so badly needs. It is a big day, and I am glad that there is now a majority in the Riksdag for this.

Finally, Madam Speaker – time flies! - I want to say something briefly about the autumn budget. Many people want to know, and I can understand that.

We will return to the budget this autumn. But as I underlined earlier, we are still in a very difficult situation. Inflation needs to come down. At the same time, our four parties must obviously focus on important reforms that Sweden, Swedish households and Swedish companies need. But we will come back to this.

It will also be an occasion when all of us here in the Riksdag must have the ability to prioritize. A situation like the one we are in now, with an incipient recession, a recession and high inflation, most of us in this room have not been in before. It requires something from us. It requires priorities, it requires focus and it requires us to be able to take responsibility.

(Applause)

Ref. 46 ALI ESBATI (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! It has been interesting, perhaps mostly in the sense of a bit strange, to hear the finance minister talk about inflation and the importance of fighting it today as well. Because it is difficult, if not impossible, to find anything that the finance minister is doing to fight inflation.

I cannot see that the Minister of Finance has taken any impression from discussions that are being held internationally about how best to understand the nature of this particular inflationary episode and what it can mean for the design of fiscal policy. That inflation is not wage-driven but rather profit-driven is obvious, but it doesn't seem to matter to the finance minister. Likewise, the competitive situation in different markets has no prominent place in what the government says and no place at all in what the government does. The Minister of Finance is not impressed by the regulations that have met with some success in, for example, Switzerland and Spain specifically to combat inflation, nor by the investment plans being rolled out in the United States with reference to combating inflation in the future.

But even if you have landed on the narrow idea that inflation should be fought only by holding back demand, it will be extremely strange to see what is pacified and how it is presented to the Swedish people. It is therefore a good fight against inflation if nurses have to be laid off and if patients are allowed to lie in the corridors of the emergency department. But it is not conceivable to reduce tax cuts for members of parliament and ministers. It apparently helps against inflation to squeeze more students into a classroom. But you can't limit the grants to those who buy cleaning or silver polishing for the parade floor.

The electricity subsidy is great, but when it comes to panic in care for the elderly, they mean: Yes, unfortunately, we have to fight inflation.

Perhaps the Minister of Finance would like to explain a little more precisely why exactly extended surgery queues, dismissed teachers and desperate staff in elderly care are the methods that the government prefers and has chosen to experiment with as an inflation dampener?

Ref. 47 Finance Minister ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thanks, Ali Esbati, for the question! For me it is both easy and difficult. It is simple to the extent that we now need to prioritize what is most important. In the budget that we presented for this year, there was a large investment in defense and the judiciary. But the single biggest thing is precisely about welfare. We made sure that a third of our entire reform space went to just this. Will it be enough? No, many municipalities and regions are having a tough time. Above all, many of the staff are having a tough time. But it looks different in different places. I talk, as I said, with many colleagues around the country.

What is inflation about here? I think Ali Esbati heard me say this, but I'm happy to say it now too in case there are any TV viewers watching this. What would it lead to if you do like Ali Esbati? In this spring budget alone, Ali Esbati puts 20 billion in unfunded investments. What would that lead to? That would lead to higher inflation.

Then you can always have a discussion about exactly what kind of investments lead to more inflation or not. It is about money coming out of the system, but it is also important that fiscal policy as a whole is responsible and that inflation is not inflated.

Questions have come to me, or there have not been questions, but there have been statements in the House in the debate on welfare. For me, it is obvious that the cooperation parties will continue to support welfare. I have passed three budgets here in the Riksdag. In all of them, welfare – both regions and municipalities – have received money. Then it will probably always be the case that the Left Party and the partner parties will not always share the view of how much it should be. But it should be clear and obvious and make it easier for those who have it very, very hard. This applies to both municipalities and regions, but of course it also concerns households.

Ref. 48 ALI ESBATI (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is about doing what is most important and prioritizing what is most important, said the finance minister. That's what I'm pointing to. What has obviously been most important for this government has been to appease those who earn very well, so that they get their tax cuts, and to appease those who live in estates and mansions, so that they get extra electricity subsidies. That is the priority that has actually been made by the government.

What Elisabeth Svantesson mentions about the defence, for example, we agree on. We talk about what you do in addition to this and otherwise. It became clear. It is good.

With regard to fiscal policy in general, we can well state that last autumn the Left Party presented a budget that was neutral, which meant that it did not run a deficit during the current year. With regard to unfunded investments, it is not about that, but it is about the fact that we know that things went well for the Swedish economy last year in terms of state finances, but that it did not go so well for everyone in the Swedish economy. Therefore, it would be reasonable to take measures that in several cases solve acute problems and in other cases contribute to pushing back inflation. Reduced fares in public transport, for example, is something that can help push back inflation here and now.

Both in my speech and now, I touched on several other things that are discussed much more outside Sweden's borders. It is about ways to push back the inflation that we have right now and about doing something about the poor competitive situation within certain markets. The finance minister and her colleagues flatly rejected that. It is also about ensuring in other ways that what the government does pushes back inflation rather than contributing to it.

I still don't have an answer to the question: Why wouldn't more money in the pockets of high earners lead to inflation? On the other hand, inflation must be suppressed through extended operating queues. It's interesting.

Ref. 49 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Ali Esbati knows very well that the government has not actively reduced a tax for those with the highest incomes. On the contrary, it is the case that Ali Esbati, Mikael Damberg and others here in the chamber would like this tax to be higher for midwives, police officers and others who have state tax. If your budget or the Social Democrats' budget were to apply, many people would pay higher taxes this year. So it's not just members of parliament and ministers. There are a lot of hard working people. These are people who take an extra shift in healthcare or an extra shift as a police officer. I just want it said. It is very clear. These people are affected by your policies. You are actually raising taxes for ordinary people by somewhere between 20 and 30 billion. It affects people in this situation.

What is important to me and to the government is that we now fight inflation while supporting those who have it hardest and while ensuring that the welfare sectors also have resources. But I've said it before, and I'll say it now: It's going to be tough for a while longer, until inflation is properly curbed.

Finally: The best thing that we can do right now is to also have structurally correct reforms for those who do not work. It is about those who have been left to their own devices, who during the last eight years have barely had contact with the Employment Service but are stuck in long-term unemployment. It is also about the families where we know that it does not pay at all for one of the parents to go to work. So it's not nonsense, Ali Esbati, but it's true. It is real.

With grant systems and incentives but also support and help in terms of vocational training and other types of education - Swedish is incredibly important, for example - we want to ensure that people are full-time active. It's about not getting a grant but a performance in return. This is how

people enter the Swedish labor market. That's how you can build Sweden strong, and that's how you help those who have the least margins right now.

(Applause)

Ref. 50 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Finance, but first I will ask a question that has to do with what has taken place here in the House when the Minister of Finance has been there.

It is about the fact that the Sweden Democrats, the largest party in the Tidö coalition or among the Tidö parties, have announced that they are against the big green fossil-free steel project in northern Sweden, Hybrit. They cast a shadow over this and actually want to stop support, to the extent that it exists, also for other green industrial projects, unlike all other countries in the world, even though we are a world leader.

I just want a clear message. Is it what SD says that applies, or is it what the government says that applies? Is what SD says nonsense that we should ignore, or is it they who will in practice decide in the future?

It is very important for Norrland, very important for the Swedish business community and very important for the industrial investments.

Secondly, I wonder about the following. It is about all the municipal councilors who think that the school should be a priority, that there should be competent teachers and that the students should be given a chance in life. They are very worried because you are now unable to give notice.

They are ready to close schools because you have not given notice. Are they wrong? Is it somehow that they should just wait nicely? The qualified teachers must disappear, and then they can be rehired again when you have agreed on it. That is my second question.

The third is that there has been a lot of talk about keeping inflation down. But why don't you lower the costs of hiring so that more vulnerable and young people can get a job? Companies ask for it, business asks for it, and job seekers ask for it. The experts say it also lowers inflation. I do not understand this from a so-called bourgeois, liberal government.

Ref. 51 Finance Minister ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! I used to listen to Martin Ådahl's post for eleven minutes. Then it struck me that Martin Ådahl should start a new parliamentary choir with himself, Mikael Damberg, Ali Esbati and Janine Alm Ericson. There was a lot of lamentation.

It is completely voluntary. You can spend eleven minutes showing your frustration. But I am somewhat surprised by the tone. I think it would be better if you also used your time to tell us about what you want to do yourself.

I have used my time for that. I intend to continue doing that. Number one is about the employer's contribution for young people. I don't know how many times I have discussed that particular question with Martin Ådahl.

It was a temporary reduction. It may very well be that further down the line it will be put down again. But if I had to choose here and now, I would make sure that the wage earners who were hit very hard by inflation would get a tax cut.

We will also do so during the term of office. I think it is very important and central. I also think that Martin Ådahl knows that it is not the young people who are the most expensive to employ. That being said, it may absolutely need to be redone. But right now it's not a priority.

Then I realized that Martin Ådahl has suddenly become very fond of Norrlands. It makes me very happy. I have lived both in Lycksele and in Östersund.

I can only remember back to the time when the Center Party and the Social Democrats collaborated on various things, the so-called January Agreement. Many of us have tried to suppress it, but it was still there.

It wasn't like you always agreed on everything. Let me say one thing that I really agree with Oscar Sjöstedt about in this matter. That's the elephant in the room.

We need to get more electricity. More electricity production is needed. Therefore, the Center Party should today vote yes to a 100 percent fossil-free goal so that we can seriously start even more with electricity production throughout Sweden.

This applies especially in Norrbotten. In five, eight or ten years, there is a risk that there will be a shortage of electricity for Hybrit and for others.

(Applause)

Ref. 52 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! It is a bit daring to say that you should talk about your own proposals and then give no answer at all about what you yourself want to do.

If the Minister of Finance listened carefully to my speech, she could hear that it was really about the visions of what we want to do. We can take the questions a little quickly again.

Is it SD, who says that Hybrit and the big green investments in Norrland - which we, believe me, have been involved in for a long time - are stupid, who are the ones who decide, or is it you in

the government? What really matters? Now there is really great uncertainty here during the debate.

The second thing is again: The experts say that if you lower the costs for companies so that they can hire, it also lowers inflation. Why this huge opposition to it?

If you don't like the reduction for young people but want it more for the vulnerable, which the Center Party wants in the future, why don't you do that instead?

It is great if you lower taxes on income. But now you have so far raised them. Why raise them and then lower them?

Then again: I heard absolutely nothing from us who protect the school about what might happen during the year. Are the municipal councilors and school managers wrong who say: We are now forced to dismiss our qualified teachers to the long-term detriment of our students because the government cannot give any proper notice?

Ref. 53 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! I have been clear all along that the government follows developments very closely when it comes to welfare. I think that Martin Ådahl should start thinking back to the years before.

It was not the case that the previous government announced in June what the state subsidies would look like the following year. You usually don't do that. This is especially true now in a difficult economic time when we do not know. We don't know how the economy will develop. We don't know what the budget space will look like.

Then I don't want to go out and say exactly how it will be. We have not negotiated a budget either. If there is anyone who knows this, it is Martin Ådahl.

You can be sure that the cooperation parties will not leave municipalities and regions in the lurch. But they also have work to do themselves. It looks different in different municipalities and in different regions. Many are under pressure. We don't leave them in the lurch. But it will also be tough.

Mr Speaker! Having said that, I think I have answered Martin Ådahl's questions. I am not going to enter yet again into a discussion about reduced employer contributions for young people. We have had it here so many times together, Martin Ådahl and I. I partially share the image but not fully.

For us and for the government, it is important to continue to fight inflation. We will use the money in the reform space in the very best way. We have been given a mandate by the voters to reverse a development that has gone in the wrong direction. We are convinced that it can be turned around.

Having said that, I want to wish everyone a happy summer. I'm saying it now, Mr. Speaker, so I don't miss it. I would like to thank the Speaker's office and the entire finance committee for their good cooperation this year.

Ref. 54 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! I begin by stating that the finance minister was unable or unwilling to distance himself from the Sweden Democrats' attack on the green transformation of the Swedish steel industry.

I think that it still deserves some kind of comment from the government when the largest party in the government constellation cooperation still makes such a big attack on Sweden's growth conditions going forward.

It is not just that it has threatened the expansion of the energy system in various debates in the past. Now they are going for a frontal attack against the flagship project that the government has also talked about in the European context and internationally as something that can reduce emissions and also contribute to Swedish competitiveness over time.

Otherwise, I have listened very carefully to the Minister of Finance. She usually repeats that we live in a very difficult economic situation and that you have to pursue a responsible financial policy. I agree with that, although it shouldn't be an excuse.

What we social democrats have criticized the government and SD for is that they make the wrong priorities within the framework of the available budget space. They made the mistake of prioritizing a tax cut of SEK 13 billion for the highly paid instead of securing the financing of welfare and also being able to make efforts for the families with children who are hit very hard by the economic crisis.

Now we are not alone in the criticism. I've seen that SKR is pushing for it, and that's one thing. But this is what Lars Calmfors writes: "However, I am critical of the balance in the government's overall financial policy. Support for households should not have been so broad, but aimed more at low-income groups. The tax reductions for high income earners through the indexation of the cut-off point for state income tax could have been paused. It had created room for higher state subsidies to municipalities and regions with the aim of reducing the risk of cuts in school, care and care. This is what Lars Calmfors wrote on May 15 this year.

Against the background of the reality of school cuts and the health care crisis, is the finance minister prepared to admit that a wrong priority was made in the autumn budget which is now creating major problems in welfare?

Ref. 55 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! Mikael Damberg and I have also had this discussion a few times now. The budget that we put on the Riksdag's table in November was well balanced. It was slightly tightening and, together with the electric support, neutral. It was absolutely right and true.

Many have also agreed with that. This applies to the Riksbank and the Fiscal Policy Council. We didn't make the judgment that we're going to go in and change tax rates in specific strata limits, just like we didn't do in anything else that's added up because of inflation. We have had this discussion several times.

I also talk to a lot of people around municipalities and regions. As I said, it looks very different. Many are now working on using this tough time to try to do things in a better way. Of course, no parties here want us to see big cuts in welfare. That is why we have said that we will come back in the budget with new information for next year.

Mr Speaker! I don't think that a third of the room for reform was small. SEK 12 billion was SEK 12 billion to the sectors that now need it so badly.

I can only state that Mikael Damberg probably partly wants to talk about this because the money he would use would here and now have meant a difference in taxes of quite a lot of money for 1 million wage earners. And it's not just about directors - Ali Esbati usually talks about bank directors. There are slightly more bank directors now because we have better competition. But it is not much more than 150 pers. But there are many, many hard-working people who would have had a higher tax with Mikael Damberg than with this government, which I think is worth pointing out, even those who work on welfare.

Ref. 56 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! Now my point was not that the Social Democrats criticized the government, but that Lars Calmfors criticized the government for choosing a tax cut for high income earners instead of securing the funding of schools, healthcare and elderly care in a situation where they may be hit by savings.

The finance minister can't get the logic together. She says that we are in an exceptional situation and that it is a very difficult situation. And now Sweden's municipalities and regions say that they need to be informed now in order not to make even unnecessary savings in healthcare and in the municipalities.

If in an exceptional situation and in a different situation you cannot act on the part of the government and give notice, when should you give notice? Now is the crisis. This is now what the exceptional situation is.

I cannot interpret the finance minister in any other way during this debate than that there will be no announcements to municipalities and regions before the summer about how the economy will be. Then the finance minister must understand that she also bears responsibility for the savings that may be implemented unnecessarily in healthcare and in schools.

I will continue to quote Lars Calmfors: "The government should at least give a statement about how large real state grants - grants in fixed monetary value - the municipal sector will receive in 2024 to provide better planning conditions." All this in order to avoid savings.

This is what reality looks like. You cannot escape reality when you are finance minister. You have a responsibility to take in reality, act, govern and prioritize. And so far this government has chosen to prioritize errors in this crisis situation.

(Applause)

Ref. 57 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! This is very interesting. The main responsibility for the finances of the regions and municipalities is, of course, theirs. They are the ones who naturally collect taxes.

But I have said for many years that the state also has an important responsibility. That is why, for example, I settled with Ulla Andersson, who is not here now, in the finance committee during the last term and stopped the year off and made sure that the money went to welfare. A few years later, the Christian Democrats, the Left Party and the Moderates reconciled and made sure to strengthen care for the elderly. The Sweden Democrats also voted for it. It was two or three years ago. I have done this several times, and I will support welfare again.

But now in June, when we don't know exactly what it will look like in the next few months and how big the scope for reform is, then it would be purely irresponsible to do it because the defense needs a lot of money and the police and the judiciary will need a lot of money. Households may continue to need support. There are a multitude of needs. Municipalities and regions are one of all parts that we will need to support in some way. But they have to wait until the fall. And I have said that. Households and companies can also do that. But that is because the economy is uncertain, the development is uncertain and the forecasts are uncertain. I take responsibility in a difficult situation and do one thing at a time and make sure to prioritize in the way we think is the best way.

Then I have great respect for the fact that Mikael Damberg thinks it is a bad way to prioritize. But I feel calm and confident that we have done the right thing.

(Applause)

Ref. 58 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply:

Mr Speaker! The climate crisis is here and now. Droughts, floods and extreme weather overturn people's everyday lives and living conditions both in Sweden and around the world. Species are dying out, ecosystems are being disrupted and both oceans and forests are under enormous strain.

Basically, there is only one single action that is superior to all others, and that is reducing emissions. But it is unfortunately a measure that the government seems to be uninterested in.

The Green Party has for several years highlighted the need to climate-proof the fiscal policy framework. This has now also been highlighted by both the Climate Policy Council and the Fiscal Policy Council. Most recently, it was actors from the Nature Conservation Association, Volvo Cars and Swedbank who, together with the Agenda 2030 coordinator, highlighted the need to initiate a review of the framework to ensure that it better contributes to sustainable development. Even Svenskt Näringsliv has suggested that the surplus target should be scrapped.

In its report, the Fiscal Policy Council pointed to the need for investments in the green transition and that it was an important reason to review the rules and create space for such investments.

It is clear that there is a broad consensus that a review should be launched urgently.

I would like to ask the Finance Minister if she is prepared to do that.

Ref. 59 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:
Mr Speaker! The answer to Janine Alm Ericson's question is yes.

Ref. 60 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply:
Mr Speaker! It was very pleasing news and we look forward to it as there is no time to lose on this.

I would also like to take the opportunity to bring up a theme that I have brought up with others, and that is the tough situation for municipalities and regions. Several speakers have asked the Minister of Finance about this in the past. But I would still just like to ask one more time: Can the Minister of Finance give an indication of how the money for municipalities and regions will be next year? Or when else will we know? They need information now to be able to plan and not cut back.

Ref. 61 Finance Minister ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply:
Mr Speaker! I thank you for the question. I have answered it on a few occasions, and I have no other answer to give. It is incredibly important that the welfare sectors, welfare activities – schools, care for the elderly, healthcare and psychiatry – work. All of us four partners are very much in agreement about that.

I'll still connect it a bit to the framework. It must be reviewed. All eight parties here in the Riksdag agree on that. This work is now in progress, and we will return. In order for the framework to be launched as planned on 1 January 2027, we must start this work now.

It is important that we have order and order in the economy. During the spring, we pushed hard in the EU work for a new framework and brought together 27 countries to get exactly one direction where we all have order and order in our finances. It is important in the EU, and it is important here. It is definitely time to review the framework to see if we need to make

adjustments. Exactly how it will be will be up to you – as I think it will be a parliamentary committee – to discuss. So we can come back to these questions later.

But I share the view that you have to prioritize correctly and make the right investments, adjust and of course ensure that emissions are reduced.

Once again, I am very happy that you who are sitting here and a few others are going to vote on a new energy policy goal. I believe that it is a very important piece of the puzzle so that it can become a greener, safer and freer Sweden.

(Applause)

Ref. 62 BORIANA ÅBERG (M):

Mr Speaker! In the party leaders' debate on Wednesday, the prime minister said: Nothing is more important than supporting Ukraine.

Russia's brutal war has cost many lives and created a huge disaster – humanitarian, environmental and economic. The price is ultimately paid by the Ukrainian people who pay with their blood for their freedom and for ours. When we repeatedly talk about how the war affects us in Sweden, we must never forget who makes the real sacrifices.

Mr Speaker! Sweden is undeniably in a strained situation with an ongoing war in the immediate area, an extremely difficult situation on the energy markets in Europe and the highest inflation in 30 years. In addition, we have inflation at the same time as we have a recession.

Since the moderate-led government took office last autumn, the main priority has been to prevent inflation from getting stuck at a high level by pursuing a continued restrained fiscal policy. Unlike the Left Party and the Green Party, the government takes this task very seriously. At the same time, support is given to especially vulnerable households through targeted investments in the budget and through the continuation of the enumerations that take place with established automaticity.

In an earlier exchange of words, Mikael Damberg insinuated that the Moderates do not want to tell what the government is doing to support those who have the hardest time - this after Edward Riedl's speaking time ended before he had time to address the issue. That's why I do it instead.

An example of a measure to support those who are struggling is an extension and increase of the temporary supplementary allowance for families with children on housing benefit. This is done to give these families better conditions to cope with their housing costs in these times when the cost of living is increasing.

This effort is considerably more accurate than a general increase in child support, which is proposed in motions by the Social Democrats, the Left Party and the Green Party - separately, I would like to add. The housing allowance is means-tested and goes to a greater extent to

families with children who are dependent on social insurance and other transfers from the welfare systems.

The Green Party and the Left Party believe that the extended and increased supplementary allowance should not be deducted from the subsistence allowance, which in my opinion is completely wrong. Let me explain why. For groups with a weak anchorage in the labor market, increased contributions reduce the driving forces for self-sufficiency. There must always be a difference between having a job and supporting yourself and living on benefits.

To support the most vulnerable, the government has increased funding by SEK 50 million in 2023 to the civil society organizations that work with humanitarian efforts for people who are having a hard time.

Another measure to combat inflation is the tax cut on agricultural diesel to the EU's minimum level until the end of the year. The government intends to maintain this tax reduction in 2024 and 2025 to support Swedish food production. The government also prioritizes the implementation of structural reforms for increased growth.

This is much needed to say the least. During the eight years after 2014, under the Löfven and Andersson governments, Sweden was the country in the entire European Union where unemployment increased the most. Sweden is also one of the countries in the European Union that has had the lowest economic growth during the two previous S and MP and S governments respectively.

A little humility would therefore be in order instead of, like the Social Democrats, writing in their motion about segregation and poverty without mentioning their own guilt at all. Anyone can calculate that Sweden's problems have not arisen in the months that have passed since the Kristersson government took office. For the opposition to constantly claim this is not serious.

The devastating and system-threatening crime involving criminal clans has not arisen during the Kristersson government's nine months in power. The parallel societies with people who lack the right to stay in Sweden have also not arisen in the past nine months. Neither does the energy crisis, the waiting times to receive care or the subpar school results.

What we now have, however, is a government that has won its way to fix these system-threatening problems of a different nature. When we debated tax policy a year ago, we moderates thought that tax policy should be used to meet the problems that Sweden has. Since then, Sweden has had a new government - a government that does exactly this.

Tax policy is now used to reduce unemployment, to provide increased opportunities for economic growth and to clamp down on those who cheat and commit crimes and thus destroy our security and everyday life. Cheaters and criminals annually steal several billions from welfare. What serious crime costs society cannot even be seen.

Mr Speaker! I am the first to regret that there are currently no financial conditions to implement any significant tax cuts. As I have already mentioned, the fight against inflation has the highest priority. But in addition to combating inflation, the government prioritizes restoring the work line. As soon as the situation permits, a strengthened job tax deduction with a focus on low and medium incomes will therefore be introduced. It is an important measure to stimulate job creation and growth.

The government is also working on reforming the allowance system with allowance caps, gradual qualification into welfare and requirements for full-time work for those who still need allowances. It must always be worthwhile to work so that people who are marginalized can transition to supporting themselves and also contribute to our common welfare. It is the way to positive social change: working, more independent and freer citizens.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee office, the Riksdag administration and not least all the members of the tax committee, including chairman Niklas Karlsson and vice chairman Per Söderlund, and wish you a nice summer.

(Applause)

Ref. 63 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! We have already experienced how the extensive and far-reaching election promises that the bourgeois parties, not least the Moderates, exhibited in the election campaign have not succeeded in meeting reality. This was brought up earlier in the debate when Martin Ådahl from the Center Party expressed it as promising gold, green forests and lower petrol prices. It was something like that. But what do we see from this? Nothing. It was 14 öre at the pump. What happens to the rest remains to be seen.

Despite this, we can discern the bourgeois social structure. The ambition is evident in the government's proposal, even if it has not succeeded in putting forward any sharp proposals yet.

Mr Speaker! Boriana Åberg said in her speech that tax policy should be used to meet the problems. We have many problems. The municipal sector and the regions are crying out for support from the state in order to meet their commitments, not to have to cut welfare and to be able to manage schools, care and welfare. The government is proposing tax cuts of 24 billion, but no support for the municipal sector can be promised. You can only say in the Riksdag debate that you will not leave the businesses in the lurch. But a message is needed now.

Mr Speaker! What is the message from the bourgeois parties? What is the message from Boriana Åberg? How do you solve the problems in welfare by lowering taxes with a distribution policy profile that means that those who already have get the most?

Ref. 64 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! Let me start by telling you how we support municipalities and regions. As early as this autumn, municipalities and regions will be awarded NOK 12 billion in various supports.

Municipalities and regions can also take part in the electricity subsidy of approximately NOK 5 billion. Then there are other ways to get a little more money – the additional supplement to the housing benefit, for example, means that the costs of social benefits fall. In total, it will be approximately 20 billion to the municipalities.

If Niklas Karlsson had listened earlier during the debate, he could have heard that the finance minister said that she does not rule out help if it is needed. However, it is not clear that all municipalities or all regions have these needs. For example, moderate-led municipalities such as Kävlinge and Staffanstorp are doing really well, because they pursue a responsible policy. In addition, they usually end up at the top when it comes to various classifications that SKR usually applies, for example elderly care. Even in various rankings of security, moderate-led municipalities end up at the top. This is something for Niklas Karlsson to think about.

(Applause)

Ref. 65 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! I listened to Boriانا Åberg, and I listened to the Minister of Finance. I honestly try to understand how they think and what the consequences will be of the policies they put on the table of the Riksdag and which they want to implement.

I heard exactly what Boriانا Åberg said now. The Minister of Finance said verbatim that they do not intend to leave municipalities and regions in the lurch. The only problem is that they need the message now. The 20 billion in deficit that municipalities and regions have flagged for is no longer 20 billion. Just a moment ago, the weekly email came from SKR, where they said that there is now another 12 billion missing compared to the budget that has been set.

The crisis is serious, and it is here now. Then you have to give notice. Then it is not enough to say in June that you do not intend to leave municipalities and regions in the lurch, but you also have to say how you will support them. Otherwise, the work of cutting welfare in the municipalities and regions will begin already now. If you don't want it, you have to be honest, make suggestions and talk about what you want.

What I also note in today's debate is that the cooperation party - that is, the Sweden Democrats, the party that actually runs the government - in the debate through Oscar Sjöstedt says that it is now important for our municipal councils and regional councils and for municipalities and regions to focus on the core business. They need to prioritize tougher. It is clear: When the Minister of Finance vaguely says that they do not intend to leave the businesses in the lurch and the Sweden Democrats say that it is a matter of prioritization, it is easy to conclude that there will be no money and that tax cuts for those who already have will come before care, school and care.

(Applause)

Ref. 66 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! I can do nothing but repeat what the Finance Minister said: We will not leave those who need help in the lurch.

It is not customary to make statements in June about what you will do this autumn in the budget. We don't know how the economy is changing. We also don't know how the situation around the world is changing. I have mentioned that there is a war going on in the immediate area. We all hope this war ends. There are many variables beyond our control, and we must respect this.

Regarding cuts in core activities, I wonder: Which municipalities started to cut back on teachers and social workers? Which municipalities did this?

Niklas Karlsson apostrophized the Sweden Democrats' Oscar Sjöstedt. He asked who has started to cut back on, for example, communicators. There are many tasks in a municipality that are not core activities and which can certainly be needed in good times. In bad times, however, one must have the courage to prioritize.

(Applause)

Ref. 67 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S):

Mr Speaker! In *Åldrandets poesi* by Anki Sehlstedt, we meet Elin, who watches ski competitions in the day room and remembers her Folke. We get to meet dementia sufferer Markus, who can barely formulate words but still manages to come up with a beautiful declaration of love. We also get to meet Josefina, who all her life longed for a woman in her arms, and many more.

What Anki Sehlstedt succeeds in illustrating in her debut novel is, among other things, the experience that my years as an elected representative have given me about how welfare concretely and directly affects people's everyday lives - how it creates security in old age, gives life chances in youth and increases people's freedom and improves their conditions for a good and meaningful life.

As a social democrat, I believe in a very simple and generally beneficial principle: We must finance common matters together and take responsibility for them together. This is what the social contract for the Swedish and Scandinavian welfare model looks like. Namely, it gives people the tools to free themselves from the shackles of economic subordination. It frees people, and it means that we do not become dependent on our own financial resources to take part in school, care and welfare. We also don't have to give up large parts of our lives to take care of relatives who need such services and cannot buy them on a market. In this way, through the Scandinavian and Swedish welfare model, we have created perhaps the world's most equal, libertarian and generous society.

Mr Speaker! How welfare should take shape and what the common concerns are is also expressed in tax policy. Our way of defining the common and how we choose to finance welfare determines how we should pay taxes, who should do it and how much we should pay in taxes.

With this also follows the inverse relationship: Any proposed tax cut must be paid for with reduced spending and less or alternatively worse welfare.

Mr Speaker! If we are to meet the welfare commitment, we will need stable and long-term welfare funding. We therefore need to increase the legitimacy of the tax system, among other things by ensuring that welfare and security are financed according to carrying capacity, while at the same time making it more difficult for tax fraud, tax evasion and tax evasion. The need for a political tax reform exists, and the reform must be based on the principles of uniformity, neutrality and uniformity, with few exceptions and special rules. But such must also be based on the principle that the burdens are borne according to ability, where we consider how those with the highest incomes and assets can contribute more to the general welfare.

Mr Speaker! Against this Swedish welfare model stands a different way of looking at the world – a bourgeois, conservative view of society where market logic governs how welfare resources are distributed and where the common project and common concerns are significantly fewer and where whoever has the most also gets the most. It also shows itself in practical politics, because even with the government's handling errors in hand and despite the extensive and far-reaching election promises not being able to meet reality, we can still discern the contours of the bourgeois system shift. The right is the same. They want to protect high-income earners' incomes against inflation rather than increasing child support. Tax reductions of well over 20 billion are prioritized over pushing resources for care, school and social care.

Of all the government's tax referrals, perhaps the proposal for reduced marginal tax takes the prize. Behind the headline itself hides a proposal to remove the phasing-out of the employment tax deduction and the increased basic deduction. This means a tax reduction for those with incomes of SEK 780,000 a year, corresponding to a monthly salary of SEK 65,000, of just over SEK 9,000. If you have a really large income of SEK 2 million, you can look forward to a tax reduction of just over SEK 36,000.

Mr Speaker! The government's ambition is clear, even if reality is currently perhaps its biggest opponent. Tax cuts for high income earners come before families with children, and the principle that those who already have the most should also get the most applies. They pursue a policy that divides and backs into the future.

Mr Speaker! This is how Anki Sehlstedt writes in her book *Åldrandets poesi*: She stood in the doorway to the ward with a lost, sad face and looked like she wanted to turn around, go home again and back to the time when her father was healthy, strong and cheerful. Then her little hand had found safety and comfort in his big, rough worker's fist. Now the roles were reversed. Now he was the one convulsively holding a hand that he sensed was familiar but only vaguely. However, their firm grip generated heat, and that gave him peace for the moment. To him it did not matter where his physical body resided. He had long ago forgotten where home was. The disease had robbed him of everything that was previously familiar and secure.

In a new Sweden with a different system where welfare is not general and where everyone is the forge of their own success, these are not the stories we will hear told. They look different and are not as warm and happy.

(Applause)

Ref. 68 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! I thank Niklas Karlsson for a lively speech. While I don't agree with the conclusions, it was really enjoyable to listen to.

Someone who did not express himself as enthusiastically was Magdalena Andersson in Wednesday's party leader debate. She said then that cutting taxes for high-income earners won't stop a single young guy from picking up a gun.

Sweden does not stand out with exceptionally low taxes, quite the opposite. On the other hand, Sweden stands out in terms of the number of fatal shootings. We actually have the highest number in all of Europe.

The connection that Magdalena Andersson tried to show was not really clear to me. Can Niklas Karlsson answer whether higher taxes will prevent a young guy from picking up a weapon? What is going to stop this young guy from picking up a gun?

Ref. 69 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! There is of course a connection between what we are prepared to give up for common affairs and the quality we have of the welfare we define as common. Now if the member's children are also my children and my children are also the member's children and every bit of chatter is our joint children, they are our responsibility, and then we must be prepared to allocate resources.

What we are now seeing happening in our society with young people taking up arms and saying they will not stop until everyone dies must be taken seriously. Then we cannot say that the tax means nothing and that the resources we allocate to welfare are insignificant, because they are not. We will need to make investments to catch these young people, get them to stop shooting and give them a future to look forward to with successful schooling and a job so they can be employed and support themselves.

This will require resources, and the answer is definitely not to go ahead with tax cuts and say those with incomes of SEK 780,000 or more should get tax cuts. It is not to say that we should have low taxes on assets and capital. If Sweden excels in any respect, it is here. After all, it is the wealthy in our country who pay a little tax, not the working people. So there is certainly room to raise taxes in Sweden, to distribute the burdens more fairly and to contribute according to ability. Let's make sure we have the resources necessary to catch every single rant so they don't have to look forward to a life of violence, crime or exclusion.

(Applause)

Ref. 70 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! Most recently, the Social Democrats were in power for eight years - and for many years before that. They levied high taxes on everyone's wages, but still crime developed catastrophically. Despite this, Niklas Karlsson tries to make it a question of money. They will tax people who work hard and have long educations behind them as they have had no income.

But is it really non-existent tax increases on people who pay government taxes that have given criminals free rein in the country and caused children and young people to use guns and shoot each other? Is there nothing the Social Democrats can admit is their fault and which they did not deal with during their time in government, for example uncontrolled immigration, lack of integration and general lack of demands?

(Applause)

Ref. 71 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! I will be honest and say that I think that the debate about the violence and the shootings and what is happening among many young people today does not deserve to be trivialized and sharpened in a debate in the Riksdag. If we are serious about getting this right, it is a joint concern. It is a task we must take seriously – all parties in Sweden's Riksdag. It is not about the opposition against the government or vice versa.

I can of course say that there are also errors and shortcomings in what has happened during the eight years with the S-led government, and we are prepared to take responsibility for that. But that's not the whole truth. And if we are to be humble, the government must also show this and say just as I say, that if we are to succeed in this, we also need your help.

This is an issue that is so important that we must solve it together. To solve it, it is not only a matter of pointing the finger at what has happened or should happen, but also of honestly daring to admit that if we are to deal with this, investments and resources will be required. And if you are to finance it, you must either take it from something else or be prepared to pay for it. Then it is not possible to come to Sweden's Riksdag and lower taxes in the billions range for those who earn the most. It doesn't hold.

(Applause)

Ref. 72 CECILIA RÖNN (L) reply:

Mr Speaker! I thank the member Niklas Karlsson for the speech.

I have a question about the tax system and what you think it can lead to. As a small country on the edge of Europe, Sweden must guard its competitiveness. The tax system must not inhibit effort and economic growth while at the same time funding our common welfare, as the member has talked about.

About a week ago, we had a research day in the tax committee, and we had invited Åsa Hansson to a very interesting speech. I assume that the member Niklas Karlsson was involved in that invitation. Åsa Hansson believes that if the tax system were reformed based on today's conditions, Sweden could get higher growth and employment - that is, more tax money for welfare. The proposals were definitely not tax increases on income, but rather the opposite.

I wonder how Niklas Karlsson thinks about this and if he can see that lower tax on income can actually lead to higher employment, i.e. more tax money for welfare.

Ref. 73 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! This is a fundamentally very intellectual question, and I thank you for that. Politics also deserves to be intellectual a little more often than it perhaps is.

There is reason to think about the tax system we have in Sweden, and I think there are few today who would say that it is perfect. I stated in my speech that we need a substantial tax reform, which I believe the Liberals are also proposing given that in the January agreement we had a point where we wrote that this needs to be done. However, we will come up with different input values, and we will probably have long and difficult discussions, but the starting point is that we will review the tax system.

For me, a principle is that we should both create growth and have resources to distribute. They should go hand in hand; you can't just do one. You cannot have a tax system that only creates growth when you are disinterested in distribution policy, and you cannot just say that we should distribute resources but at the same time have a system that does not create growth.

We must jointly try to find that balance, or that entrance. If we succeed in that and can get a broad settlement, I think it will be beneficial for the whole of Sweden, both when it comes to creating wealth and distributing wealth. I look forward to having that discussion, among other things with the Liberals and the other parties in the Riksdag's tax committee.

Ref. 74 CECILIA RÖNN (L) reply:

Mr Speaker! I thank the member Niklas Karlsson for the answer.

I completely agree with the member that we need a tax reform and overhaul the tax system. Last time we did it, we actually did it together. At the time, there were two principles that we agreed on: that you should keep half in your wallet and that 10 percent should pay state tax. It is not at all how it looks now, and the Social Democrats were very quick to abandon these principles. I would also like to add that we also had uniform VAT for almost a whole year, which was quite a nice thing, I think, for many of the country's entrepreneurs.

During the last 90 years, the Social Democrats have ruled for 63 years, and you protest every May Day against the terrible injustices that exist in Sweden. I really want to agree with member Niklas Karlsson that we have things that need to be corrected and that the system is not perfect.

But that's exactly what I think is the big difference here: Having a tax system that creates growth is the basis of it all, I think. It provides more money for our common welfare.

So I do not agree with Niklas Karlsson when he says that the tax system must not only be there to create growth - that is exactly what it should be there for. If we create growth, we have money for our common welfare so that we can have a strong school and healthcare and a strong safety net that is there if you fall. If we have a strong school and a tax system that favors education, diligence and effort, we have the opportunity to bring in additional money for our welfare. Therefore, I had hoped that the Social Democrats could move away from the principle that higher taxes are always better. How does Niklas Karlsson think about it?

Ref. 75 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply:

Mr Speaker! My answer to the member is: Not at all, because what the member says is of course not true. It is a way of fabulating.

If the first post was intellectual, the second was just a rant. Of course, we deviated from the agreement when we made a tax system in the early 90s. In fact, the People's Party - the Liberals - have also done that, so we are probably both responsible there. We will probably have to put this aside if we are to agree and find an agreement that lasts over time and that creates a stable majority in Sweden's Riksdag.

What I particularly want to emphasize is that we differ here in one respect. For me, it's not just about a tax system that will create growth. For me, the distribution policy is important. I think it is unreasonable that we have a tax system today where those with the really large assets pay significantly less in tax than the person who is an ordinary wage earner who has to scrape by for his income and pay 30 to 32 kroner for every hundred bucks earned. For me, it is distributional politics. And should it turn out that this system is good for creating growth, then I am prepared to reconsider that system, because the distribution is also important.

The principle of contributing according to ability and that everyone should participate is extremely important to me as a social democrat. I hear this is not as important to the Liberals. I guess we'll see when we get to the negotiating table what comes out of it in the end.

(Applause)

Ref. 76 PER SÖDERLUND (SD):

Mr Speaker! Our country is in a very difficult economic situation, and the forecast for the future remains worrying. Many households have felt the effects of inflation when the price of food, travel and accommodation has increased at a very rapid rate. The governing parties and the Sweden Democrats intend to reform several of the taxes and regulations that have driven up cost levels in our country, not least in terms of transport costs.

Mr Speaker! Sales of electric and hybrid cars have increased, and today many have just such a car, naturally mainly in larger cities. Electric cars are not completely cheap to buy, and for them

to pay off in the long run, you need to be able to calculate the purchase cost against reduced operating costs. Then it can be advantageous to charge your electric car at work when you have driven it there anyway. From July 1 this year, a temporary exemption from taxation of the benefit of laddel at the workplace will therefore be introduced. Such an exception is also expected to reduce the administrative burden for both employers and employees when reporting this type of benefit.

Mr Speaker! Russia's invasion of Ukraine, combined with the weak Swedish krona, has had major effects on fuel prices. Now, the entire price increase should not be blamed on Russia's illegal attack on Ukraine, even if it is a strong contributing factor. The increase already started in the spring of 2021, when both petrol and diesel prices were below SEK 16 per litre. Before the turn of the year 2021/22, the price of petrol had risen by approximately SEK 2 per liter and diesel by around SEK 4 per liter.

In order to mitigate the costs of necessary travel to and from work, the mileage allowance was increased sharply from SEK 1.85 per kilometer to SEK 2.50 per kilometer on 1 January this year. No such increase has been made since 2008, when fuel prices were between SEK 10 and 14.

Madam Speaker! It is not only those who depend on the car as a means of transport who are affected by the high fuel prices. On the contrary, these strike broadly against our entire society. Every link in the production chains, from the producer to the end customer, is affected by the increased fuel prices. It may be fuel costs for our farmers when they produce the food we eat. It can also be costs for transport of various goods that cause prices in the trade to increase.

The next step for us is a reduction in the reduction obligation from 1 January 2024. This will have an effect and bring further reductions in fuel prices.

Madam Speaker! Negotiations and investigations are currently underway in several areas between the Tidö parties. One such is the abolition of the tax on plastic bags. The goal of the tax is to reduce the use of plastic bags, something that the EU requires us to do. Unfortunately, the treasure is designed in such a way that it also hits degradable, plastic-like bags.

It has been a hard blow to many of the manufacturers who developed environmentally friendly alternatives to plastic in order to be able to produce bags that have the same properties as plastic bags but are better for the environment. These companies lost their entire market when the tax was introduced. Today, the environmentally friendly bags are not manufactured, and development has stopped. This is nothing more than a prime example of how the wrong taxes can backfire if implemented in the wrong way.

Madam Speaker! The aviation tax has also been heavily criticized for not achieving its intended effect: reducing emissions by reducing travel. The tax has three levels and is based on the destination, not the flight distance. Then it gets a little tricky.

Flying to Spain means an air tax of SEK 69, but flying to Morocco, i.e. a little further, means a tax of SEK 288. If, instead of going to Morocco, you fly directly to the Canary Islands, which are still a bit longer, the tax will be SEK 69 because the Canary Islands belong to Spain. The same tax as for a flight to Morocco is also incurred if you fly to New York, which is considerably longer.

Instead of taxing the harmful emissions, it is the journey itself that is taxed. In the long term, this tax should therefore be abolished.

Madam Speaker! Perhaps the most worrying thing in the area of taxation right now is that the EU is reviewing the possibility of changing the decision-making procedure for taxes. Today, unanimity is required for the EU to be able to decide on taxes in the member states. However, the Commission has presented a communication with a roadmap for moving to qualified majority voting under the ordinary legislative procedure in the field of taxation.

The transition will take place in four stages, and the fourth stage will introduce qualified majority decision-making for tax initiatives, which are necessary for the single market and for fair and competitive taxation in Europe, according to the Commission. This is a very worrying development that we need to counteract together.

Madam Speaker! Let me also finish by thanking the committee for a good job during the past year. I would like to extend a special thank you to Niklas Karlsson for good cooperation in the Bureau. At times it has been happy tax, and at times we have rubbed our genius balls to try to solve situations that have arisen in the committee.

I want to take this opportunity to wish everyone a nice summer. I would also like to thank our very knowledgeable committee office for the work they do and the support they provide to us. They have helped us through some difficult situations in the past year. I also want to thank the Riksdag administration and those who work here for the support they provide to us members. Of course, I also want to thank the Speaker's Bureau for a very good job during the past year. Pleasant summer!

(SECOND DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much, I wish the same!)

(Applause)

Ref. 77 ILONA SZATMÁRI WALDAU (V):

Madam Speaker! In the 2023 budget, the government chose to raise the limit for when you have to pay state tax. People with monthly incomes of SEK 70,000 or more will receive around SEK 17,000 less tax this year thanks to that decision. We in the Left Party believe that it is an unreasonable priority to spend SEK 13 billion on tax cuts for high income earners in a situation where welfare lacks resources.

The parties in the right-wing conservative government and its partner the Sweden Democrats usually say that they did not make any choice or make any decision. It was not only the tax limit

that was changed, but also pensions and other insurance systems that were added up, they claim.

This is nothing more than excuses. Doing nothing is also a decision. The majority could have chosen to pause the strata limit and thus not lower the tax and at the same time keep the calculations in the security systems. Previous governments have managed to do this.

Another such non-decision is not to introduce transitional rules for pensioners born in 1957. We have done nothing - it was the previous government, the governing parties explained, and chose not to include transitional rules in the 2023 budget, despite both PRO and SPF wooing the government before the budget work.

We haven't done anything – that was the previous government, the parties repeated in the income tax debate with me earlier this year. When the governing parties and the Sweden Democrats choose not to introduce transitional rules or provide compensation, it is a decision – a decision to do nothing.

When the tax committee decided a few weeks ago not to proceed with my initiative that the Riksdag should decide on transitional rules and compensation, the governing parties and the Sweden Democrats referred to negotiations on the autumn budget. So they let pensioners born in 1957 live in the same uncertainty as municipalities and regions.

Regions and municipalities are saving and cutting back, not only to make it through 2023, but also to prepare for 2024. Pensioners born in 1957 are saving and cutting back to get by until they turn 67, and for those who now have to change to a cheaper home, canceling the newspaper subscription, giving up the trips to the grandchildren or selling the summer cottage would be a welcome message.

How should one be able to plan when the governing parties and the Sweden Democrats refer to negotiations? These are negotiations that they could have had before what we are debating today, namely the spring amendment budget and the economic policy guidelines. But they choose, as usual, to do nothing and let municipalities and private individuals live in uncertainty about the future economy.

Madam Speaker! I've had several debates about transition rules for the 57s, and I've made all the arguments over and over and won't repeat them. It is pleasing that several of the parties that previously only blamed each other now still see the problem, even if so far it has not led to any announcement or action.

The Left Party would prefer to see the retirement age for everyone be 65. No age groups would then suffer from transition problems. But now the higher retirement age has been hammered out, and then transitional rules are required.

Pensioners born in 1957 pay up to SEK 2,995 more in taxes per month than a pensioner born in 1956. For those with the lowest pensions, this is over SEK 1,000 more in taxes each month. Those with the lowest pensions also belong to those who often could not choose when to retire. There, the government has previously referred to the fact that the 57-year-olds should work and receive a share of the employment tax deduction.

However, those who have unemployment insurance, sickness benefit or similar from our security systems cannot choose when to retire. Compensation ceases. They may or may not work, because then they would not have sickness benefit or unemployment insurance. Incidentally, we should not forget here that the 57-year-olds who work also pay higher taxes than older pensioners because the basic deduction also applies to those who work.

Calculations show that upwards of 3 billion would be needed to correct the tax injustice for the 57s. The tax cuts for those of us with higher incomes subtract 13 billion from the state's income. I am happy to give up my tax reduction of 1,400 a month so that all pensioners can receive the increased basic deduction. We can put the rest on municipalities and regions that are bleeding today.

Madam Speaker! In the Left Party's budget motion for 2023, we presented a policy that would lead to a more equal distribution of the financial burdens. This policy is based on a more redistributive tax policy and extensive investments in the worst-off households through strengthened security systems as well as reduced fees and rates on necessary expenses for households. The Left Party's policy had meant that households were significantly better equipped to face the crisis that we see today.

In our spring budget motion, we have made several proposals that benefit the households and families who are having the hardest time. The most obvious thing in the government's economic spring bill is the absence of a real crisis policy. Since the government took office with the support of the Sweden Democrats, they have consistently ducked the responsibility to face the crisis Sweden is in.

With references to the high inflation and the limited scope for reform, they have chosen to pursue a passive policy. The government comes up with evasions at the same time as putting aside the legs for the municipalities' and regions' opportunities to run a functioning business. Enormous tax cuts for high income earners are prioritized instead of something for the households that have it the hardest.

That has not always been the case. In the past, there was a strong belief in the tax system and the opportunity to make a difference together. It was a matter of course that community investments would be jointly financed.

The discussion about taxes was then how they should be levied fairly, economically efficiently and with a maintained legitimacy for the tax system. Today, the discussion about legitimate taxes lives a waning existence. Rather, the starting point for the debate is that taxes are harmful

and need to be abolished or minimized. The tax ratio, i.e. taxes' share of the economy, has been lowered and corresponds to approximately SEK 440 billion in lower tax income each year.

The motives for the tax reductions have varied, but are predominantly characterized by the fact that the reductions should solve one social problem or another. However, there is no support that taxes do more harm than good. A strong thesis is that taxes on work inhibit the will to work. Nevertheless, we can see that Sweden has relatively high marginal and participation taxes on work while we have the EU's second highest employment rate.

The only thing that is absolutely certain is that tax cuts lead to reduced tax revenues and that they have clearly contributed to greatly increased income differences.

Tax must be paid according to capacity and welfare given according to need. It is the core of the redistribution that should be the starting point for tax collection. It cannot be as the government envisions, i.e. large tax cuts. Sweden needs a new tax policy that prioritizes redistribution, the environment and welfare.

Ref. 78 CECILIA ENGSTRÖM (KD):

Madam Speaker! Tax revenue is absolutely fundamental to our welfare. They are a prerequisite for being able to face the problems in healthcare, the increasing insecurity and many other social problems. It is our authorities the Tax Agency, the Customs Agency and the Kronofogden that ensure that the tax comes in.

Tax revenues do not arise out of thin air. They occur when people work. In order to increase tax revenues, the most important thing is that more people work. A tax system that encourages work is needed, and it should always pay to go from benefits to jobs. By going to work, you also get into society and become part of the community. It contributes to the integration.

Madam Speaker! In today's situation, economic policy needs to be focused on fighting inflation and supporting vulnerable households. The recession must be met by structural reforms. The work line must be re-established so that it will always pay to work, and a benefit reform must increase the incentives to come to work. Structural reforms must be implemented in order to have a competitive and innovative business life.

With the new government, politics prioritizes welfare with reforms to fight organized crime, get better skills in elderly care, increase the number of qualified teachers and get a crisis preparedness that improves energy supply and reduces emissions.

Madam Speaker! The best way to get more people into work and increase growth is to make broad tax cuts that benefit everyone who works. But there are also groups on which politics needs to make special investments. Of particular concern right now is the large group of long-term unemployed. The previous Social Democratic government did not manage to access it.

We already had high unemployment before the pandemic, but in the economic situation that followed the pandemic, unemployment increased even more. Therefore, special measures are required to counteract precisely long-term unemployment. Of course, many different types of measures will be required, but one of these must be to design the tax system so that it contributes to counteracting long-term unemployment.

We Christian Democrats believe that the tax system needs to be designed so that the incentives to extend working life are strengthened. That is why we have pushed for people over 65 to get further tax cuts when they continue to work.

Madam Speaker! As we have probably all learned during the last term of office, it is extremely difficult to predict what problems are around the corner. The only thing we can be sure of is that, over time, new challenges will arise that need to be dealt with. But we now have a government that pursues a policy that means that more people come to work, and thus we have a strong starting point when dealing with new problems. The Christian Democrats have therefore worked and will continue to work for a tax policy that leads to more people working more.

Sweden now has a government that prioritizes removing the long queues for care and that works to create equal care across the country so that the quality of care is not determined by where you live.

Sweden has a government that prioritizes the work of increasing safety and once and for all cracking down on the serious crime that plagues entire residential areas.

Sweden already has a high tax burden, and in order to maintain trust in the tax system, the tax levels must be reasonable and defensible and stimulate work and entrepreneurship.

Madam Speaker! During the Social Democrats' eight years in power, insecurity has spread throughout society with serious crime taking control of many of the socially vulnerable areas.

Today, more than 1 million people cannot support themselves while employers are desperately crying out for workers. The Swedish labor market is not adapted to today's needs. There are those who have a demanding job to go to every day and those who do not have a job and go on benefits year after year.

It is a total failure. After eight years with the Social Democrats, they have not succeeded in reversing the trend, but instead have allowed long-term unemployment to take hold. More and more people have ended up further away from the labor market. Instead of making it possible for more people to get a job and support themselves, exclusion has been allowed to grow. The distance for everyone who is far from work has only gotten bigger. The Christian Democrats want it to be profitable to take a job.

Madam Speaker! Sweden has 1.1 million companies. Of these, 99 percent are small businesses. Four out of five jobs are created there. Small businesses are important for more jobs to be created. They are the backbone of our common welfare.

We want to see more people realizing their dream of starting a business, especially among women. That is why our minister of economic affairs, Ebba Busch, has particularly highlighted their needs. With strong entrepreneurship and a good business climate, we reduce bureaucracy and stop increased capital taxes. Then we will be attractive for business establishments and investments in Sweden.

The policy must continue to focus on reforms to combat organized crime, increase the number of qualified teachers, shorten care queues, increase the number of care places, equip defense and crisis preparedness as well as improve energy supply and reduce emissions. For that we need a responsible fiscal policy, and we get that with this government.

Madam Speaker! I request approval of the finance committee's proposal. As this is my last debate this parliamentary year, I would like to express my thanks to the chancellery staff, who are always professional and guide us well. Thanks also to the members of the tax committee for good cooperation! I wish everyone a nice summer.

Ref. 79 HELENA LINDAHL (C):

Madam Speaker and others watching and listening! I thought it was a great shame that the Finance Minister had to go, but I understand that she has other things on her agenda. I would like to comment on something she said, even though she is not there. The Minister of Finance said something about the Swedish Competition Authority being tasked with ensuring that food prices do not rise because traders charge unreasonably high prices.

Madam Speaker! I actually think most traders are hard workers. Most traders are not big entrepreneurs who drive the newest Mercedes cars, which unfortunately some like to portray in the media and debates. The general profit is about 4-6 percent for a trader. Then you should also consider carefully that the state collects 12 percent in VAT on food. The state thus generally receives a larger share of each hundred lank than the trader.

Then we have not gone through the entire food chain from farm to table. There are many taxes, fees and rules that could be simplified for the primary producer, that is, the farmer, for the person who transports the food, for the sausage manufacturer and for the store. But it is clear that it is more complicated to discuss that issue than to point to the traders as the big culprits.

I will personally, together with the Center Party, return to this discussion this autumn in the tax committee, because I think it is time to do a review if you seriously want us to have more farmers producing food in this country. Possibly, it would also be possible to lower the costs for ordinary people.

Madam Speaker! A few days ago, 32 farmers wrote an open letter in Aftonbladet. I do not know if my colleagues have read that debate article. A call was made regarding biogas, which we have discussed quite a lot in the tax committee. An EU ruling led to the tax exemption disappearing overnight. The farmers pointed out that the situation is very bad right now and that people live in uncertainty. You don't know if this will come back or not, and you ask the government to try to work on the issue as quickly as possible.

As I said here in the rostrum before, I have personally visited the farmers Mattias and Thomas Nilsson, a pair of brothers who live in Kulbäcksliden outside Vindeln in my own home county. Both they and the 32 farmers who signed the Aftonbladet article have invested large sums of money in biogas plants on their farms. You have now received a very large tax hit. It was thought that, since the EU promised tax exemption between 2020 and 2030, that they would dare to invest, which many did. It is during the last two or three years that they have dared to take the step and make these large investments. The brothers from Västerbotten that I talked about invested in their facility quite a few years ago, but then I think it was 10 million. It's not exactly something you sneak up on as a small business owner.

And not only that. This ruling also means that the Tax Agency has the opportunity to claim back tax that has been refunded for 2021 and 2022. The brothers would risk paying 2 million, many other farmers the same amount if not much more - not to mention larger producers.

It is clear that this is problematic in many ways, Madam Speaker, not least because the gas is already being sold at prices that were based on the notion that tax would not come. But it gets worse than that. Since the tax exemption no longer applies, the biogas becomes radically more expensive, and the conditions for selling the product and earning the money are very poor.

Madam Speaker! Unfortunately, it doesn't stop there. The consequences are even more extensive and affect many levels. It's a disaster for the producers, and it's really bad for the hauliers, who have made large investments to be able to drive fossil-free and at the same time make a decent business. Now you are locked in with expensive vehicles and more expensive fuels that there is presumably a rapidly declining interest in producing. In the next stage, it also affects farmers who have acquired machines and vehicles when they calculated with tax-free biofuel. In the end, it is all of us who have to bear the cost, either at the checkout in the grocery store or through all the consequences that arise when it becomes too expensive to produce.

Madam Speaker! The ambition to tax-exempt biogas has been very good and would, in the best of worlds, have been able to create more income streams for, for example, Swedish farmers. But if private companies, small and somewhat larger, are to invest millions in facilities, they must be able to trust that politics will keep its promises. Now it has obviously gone wrong, and then the problem must be dealt with quickly and clearly. I think everyone here agrees that it is completely unreasonable to demand money from the companies after the fact as a result of mistakes that they themselves have no control over. The producers have followed the rules. The fact that the EU Commission and the government have failed to keep what they promised should not be blamed on those who have invested.

Madam Speaker! In order to move forward on the issue, the Center Party presented a proposal for a committee initiative in the Riksdag's tax committee. We demanded that the government would ensure that there were no refunds for Swedish biogas producers regarding the tax exemption for biogas that had already been granted by the Swedish Tax Agency and that the government would immediately restore full tax exemption with the support of the EU's block exemption regulation, also called GBER, which according to the industry is a significant faster route to a possible solution than a new state aid approval.

Unfortunately, I have to say from the heart – but there is still the possibility of changing one's mind; now I look at my colleagues here in the chamber - the governing parties and SD did not want to go ahead with this initiative. It was pointed out that the work is already being done by the government. In practice, this means that biogas producers, haulage companies, farmers and others will have to wait 15–18 months for a yes or no from the EU Commission. I would probably say that is a disaster in itself, and unfortunately it risks killing the biogas market in Sweden if it gets really bad.

Madam Speaker! In conclusion, I would like to say a few words about wind power. Eight out of ten municipalities today say no to wind power. It is not because the municipalities are malicious or unwilling to contribute to fossil-free electricity production, but they do so because it is completely rational. Yes, you heard right. It is actually the national politics that have created this problem. Therefore, it was sad that no clear answers were delivered about the municipalities' way forward in the recently presented investigation on incentives to the municipalities for the construction of wind power.

Because there are answers. In practice, there are currently two very obvious measures that would significantly improve the situation for the municipalities and for nearby residents who worry about establishments. I fully understand that the public may not always appreciate a new establishment if it ends up in the knot, regardless of whether it is an industry or wind power, because it affects housing prices, for example. It goes without saying that the local residents must get a share of the financial pie. When the local environment is affected, more of the local values must stay local.

That is why it was such a shame that the investigation's additional directive, which came during the count's time last spring, said that one would not be allowed to influence the state tax. It's a shame, because the property tax could have gone back to the municipalities - as it does in Finland. I can say that many small Finnish municipalities in the countryside fight for wind power installations because they get something in return at the same time. Why allow wind power exploitation if there are no carrots at all? The government and SD can think about that over the summer. It's a small pass on my part.

When it comes to the establishment of wind power, the same thing has happened in the past with hydropower, not least in Norrland. We - I say "we" - send in hundreds of millions in property and energy taxes every year, and when the state then distributes the money, it is based on

population size. In a practical sense, Ragunda, Jokkmokk and other municipalities have become production colonies that are not given any conditions to develop, despite the enormous values they contribute.

With this as a background, it is also logical, Madam Speaker, that locally there is no intention of letting history repeat itself. The state must refund the property tax that today goes straight to Rosenbad to the municipalities where it belongs. It can contribute to business development and vitality, while at the same time creating a compensation for the natural resources that are used.

Ref. 80 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! I did not intend to request a response from Helena Lindahl. However, I would like to clarify the statement about the biogas, because I think that people listening to the debate risk misunderstanding what has happened.

First, I want to say that biogas is very important for Sweden's green transition, and the tax exemption has been an important tool. We all parties stand behind it. Then it was very unfortunate that a German company appealed the Swedish tax exemption. This led to the EU stopping it.

I want to clarify that the committee initiative that the Center Party put in the tax committee could not be carried out. If a new notification is made in accordance with the general block exemption regulation, GBER, in the EU, Sweden needs to ensure that it does not constitute overcompensation without prior notice from the Commission. This is not easy, as each company must be tried one by one. In addition, a notification under the GBER does not guarantee that the tax exemption will not be rejected by the European Court of Justice.

Ref. 81 HELENA LINDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you, Boriana Åberg!

I also think it is important to say that it is not the government that has decided that it should be this way, but this is an EU ruling.

However, I have said before, and I say it again, that I think it is important that the government communicates the conditions and the work that is done externally. Right now there are a lot of people who live in limbo and are very worried, for example biogas producers and farmers, because you don't know anything more than what you might read in the newspaper.

Should one then wait for a review of the state aid rules, which takes 15 to 18 months, or try to apply via GBER, the block exemption regulation? For me personally it doesn't matter as long as it goes as fast as possible. The industry has wanted GBER, and they have also read through all the conditions and counted on it. They say that you would rather get a yes or no earlier in the process than wait up to a year and a half and possibly then get a no, because in that case the biogas market is dead.

In the meantime, you live in limbo. It is very expensive for, for example, all haulage companies that have invested in new biogas vehicles. A few months ago, you paid almost SEK 5 more for gas at the pump than for diesel. It is clear that it will be very much more expensive plus it will not provide any incentive for others to change their truck fleets.

When I have spoken to the industry, they say that they have very close contact with the government and that they still think, through the calculations they have made themselves, that GBER is the best. I'm just assuming this.

Ref. 82 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Unfortunately, there is no option to get a quick yes or no. A change of law is required for the tax exemption to meet the conditions from the EU level, so the proposal is by no means something that can be realized overnight.

Even more complicating, however, is that a notification of tax exemption, as the Center Party has proposed, does not change the question of whether the tax exemption constitutes an overcompensation of the EU's state aid rules. The only option left is to hope that the machinery grinds faster than the 15 to 18 months.

Ref. 83 HELENA LINDAHL (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I hear what Boriana Åberg says, and I also know that State Secretary Carolina Lindholm at the Ministry of Finance was here and told us. However, I have spoken to the industry, and they say that they see only a small risk of overcompensation and that the Energy Agency had made an incorrect calculation. The risk is therefore not as great as the ministry thought.

On the other hand, we can stand here and divide as much as we like about who is right and wrong. I just assume that the industry also knows what they are doing, and I understand that they want it to go as quickly as possible. There is still a difference between 18 and 9 months, although in both cases it is a long time when you are worried and do not know what will happen to your investment. After all, the producers probably owe the banks quite a lot of money, and they have put a lot of time and effort into the investments. The trucking industry is also extremely worried.

I think that Boriana Åberg and the government are very aware of this. My role is more to be a blowtorch, and I will continue with that after the summer. Until then, I wish Boriana Åberg a really nice summer! As I said, we will continue to discuss the matter in the future.

Ref. 84 CECILIA RÖNN (L):

Madam Speaker! The Liberals' approach is that the tax system should be designed so that it favors diligence, ambition and education. When it is more attractive to work, invest and start a business, we get a bigger pie to share for the all-important common welfare.

In order to build a strong common welfare, we need good tax conditions for individuals and businesses. This is how we can ensure that there are more teachers in the classrooms, doctors and nurses in the health centers and police officers in the square. The more people who work and start businesses, the bigger the pie becomes for our common welfare.

So it is not as many of the left-wing parties claim: that more tax will enter the system if taxes are as high as possible. Lowering taxes can lead to more growth and thus to higher tax revenues. It is a good distribution policy that leads to more resources for the welfare that we all want. The Liberals want to fight poverty. The socialists want to fight wealth.

Madam Speaker! Sweden is leaving a historic era behind. Interest rates have been very low, and indebtedness has been rewarded. This has led to a high level of indebtedness among households and companies, which has grown at a high speed in line with the interest rate increases. Now a more normalized time awaits, but many households and companies enter it with large private debts when the Riksbank raises interest rates.

In these times, it is therefore reasonable to set a tight budget and a spring change budget that targets the most vulnerable. This is exactly what this government did in its budget and what we are now doing in our amending budget, and this is the view we have in the economic policy guidelines.

The most important thing now is to fight inflation. High inflation makes us all poorer and affects the most vulnerable households and our municipalities and regions. Then having an expansive budget is like pouring gasoline on the fire.

I would also like to add that Sweden is very resilient. We are now in a situation with more normal interest rates, and we can see that unemployment has not risen. But note that the situation is very serious and that it needs to be managed wisely in order not to worsen the situation with the high inflation! If the economic experts are to be believed, we can expect further interest rate increases from the Riksbank.

In addition, we have a historically low valued currency which means that we import inflation into Sweden. It is time to once and for all put an end to the krona and join the euro cooperation in order to have a more stable and predictable economic development in Sweden. When we woke up this morning, we could note that the krone had almost hit a record low last night. The krone is at historically low levels. Therefore, I want to repeat my party leader Johan Pehrson's demand: Now is the time to investigate an entry into the euro cooperation.

Madam Speaker! It must become easier to run a business, and those who work must be able to live on their wages. The line of work is more decisive than in a long time. Nobody benefits from a policy that drives people into unemployment.

Therefore, I am very happy that the autumn budget passed and that this and the next report on the spring amendment budget also look set to receive a majority in the chamber. The

opposition's sprawling budget proposal with inflationary and destructive proposals is not something that Sweden needs in tough times like these.

What the government has done and is doing are important measures to make it easier for the most vulnerable households through an extended and increased housing allowance for families with children. We provide an inflation-protected grant to the most vulnerable and invest in training places that the business world demands to give those without work an opportunity to enter working life and to give companies the opportunity to get the skills they need to, among other things, cope with climate change.

Having a job to go to is the most important thing in these tough times. Coupled with a strong school that focuses on learning outcomes and sees each student's potential, this is the very best recipe for countering exclusion, crime and mental illness and for creating meaning for each individual. In addition to all this, it brings more money into our common welfare.

That is why the Liberals' and the government's investments and priorities on school and preventive work are so incredibly important and right. We showed in the budget that was laid for 2023 that this is our focus, and we will continue to prioritize investments in schools on the part of the Liberals so that every student will have the conditions to pass school wherever in the country they live.

Madam Speaker! It is also important to say that we would need to review several parts of the Swedish tax system to improve it in the direction of simplicity and clarity and to ensure that it enables entrepreneurship and increased competitiveness. As a small country in northern Europe, we constantly need to ensure that we are attractive for people to want to start and run companies in Sweden that lead to jobs and development.

Sweden has several advantages here. There is great trust in research and development, which has taken Swedish innovations out into the world both for increased growth, for climate change and for reducing our emissions. That is why it is so welcome and good that we will now improve the conditions for entrepreneurship and innovation even more with a strengthened R&D deduction.

Another liberal victory I look forward to and which will become a reality this mandate is that we will tax-exempt the first 300,000 kroner in ISK - the Swedes' most popular form of savings. In times like these, we see that it is incredibly important to have a buffer. I am fully aware that not everyone has that opportunity in their everyday life. But now we are making a difference so that every hundred Swedish kroner you can save will be worth more in the ISK account on the day you need the money to, for example, buy your home or make another important investment for the future.

Madam Speaker! I believe that this is the most important thing: We must have strong faith and high demands on everyone who can work when it comes to doing just that and contributing to welfare. I am also convinced that the vast majority want this.

The state must, as far as possible, refrain from interfering in the choices and lives of individuals. We must allow individuals to have as much money as possible left in their wallets so that they can make their own life choices, which suit them best.

At the same time, as a social liberal, I myself have experienced and constantly see the importance of having strong welfare. Welfare must be a strong safety net that is there if you fall. It must be without holes so that all individuals can share in welfare, and no one must risk falling through. The safety net should contribute to a school that allows you to cope regardless of where you live or your parents' background.

There must be a strong society that, among other things, sees the children who get hurt and who act. Society must see the oppressed or vulnerable woman and help her, see the sick and provide the right care and support and make sure that you get the support you need when you get older.

The beauty is that these two visions can be combined. I am completely convinced of that, and that is what I will work for every day as long as I have this role as a member of Sweden's Riksdag.

Madam Speaker! With that, I would like to conclude by saying that it has been an exciting and interesting first year. I also want to thank the office and colleagues in the Riksdag and wish you a happy summer.

(Applause)

Ref. 85 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP):

Madam Speaker! Tax policy can be a powerful tool for steering society in a more sustainable direction. We showed evidence of this during our time in government when, among other things, we lowered the tax on repairs and introduced a bonus malus system that caused electric car sales to soar. We also ensured that aviation would be involved in paying for its climate impact. The tax was reduced for residents in sparsely populated areas as part of the green tax change. We decided on a new, more climate-smart travel deduction that would cover more public transport travelers.

Unfortunately, this government seems to have a different view of the situation; it actually seems to take quite the opposite view. The tax on repairs is raised. Then the tax on emissions is lowered. It's an upside down world.

I think the vast majority of people agree with me that it is reasonable to favor what is sustainable. That was the idea when we lowered the tax on repairs. We want to move away from the throw-away society and instead encourage repairing and reusing what you already have. It contributes to job opportunities, entrepreneurship and craft skills.

The government simply chose instead to double the VAT for, among other things, tailors and cobblers from 1 April this year. Unfortunately, it is completely in line with how the government acts on sustainability issues in general.

Climate and repairs are connected in a very important way. It may sound like a small thing, but textile waste actually has the fourth largest environmental and climate impact from a global perspective. In the media, we have been able to take part in what has unfortunately happened in some cases with clothing recycling. Customers who want to do the right thing take clothes to stores for recycling - they think. Instead, we have seen that the clothes are sent to poor countries where they are dumped or burned. The average for discarded textiles in the world is 9 kilos per person per year. In Sweden, that figure is 14 kilos – a lot more. This is not a sustainable lifestyle. We need to rethink and use the planet's finite resources more wisely.

Madam Speaker! We in the Green Party think that tax policy should contribute to the transition towards a more circular economy where things are used more efficiently. In addition to lowering the tax on repairs, of course, we think that the tax system should be restructured to favor circular business models where the price of products is calculated from the grain to the loaf, so to speak.

Tax policy also plays an important role in terms of distribution policy. We in the Green Party stand behind a progressive tax system. If the tax is to be reduced, it should primarily be for low and middle income earners.

Unfortunately, the government does not seem to share that view with us. This year the tax was greatly reduced for high income earners, and based on what the finance minister said earlier, there are unfortunately perhaps conditions to do so in the future as well.

In addition to seeming to be adamant about raising the cut-off point for state income tax, the government has also forwarded a proposal to specifically lower the tax for high income earners. It is completely the wrong priority in a situation where municipalities and regions have a very tough financial situation. Unfortunately, this is perhaps what one should expect from the Tidö gang. It's classic right-wing politics: Welfare is put on a starvation diet, while taxes are cut for high-income earners.

Madam Speaker! When we stand here in the House debating taxes, I also want to address the situation of those born in 1957. On 1 January 2023, the age limit was raised in several parts of our pension system. When the retirement age is raised, transitional rules are normally applied so that there are no unreasonable consequences. This has also happened this time - but with one exception, namely with regard to the increased basic deduction for people born in 1957. The consequences of this are that people born in 1957 have to pay more in tax than other people who have reached retirement age. It is not OK. The situation for those affected was also made worse by the fact that for a very long time there was no correct information about what applied to the 57s.

That they are now hit with a higher tax is very unfair. We in the Green Party want to remedy this injustice and retroactively compensate the 57 for the higher tax they are forced to pay as a result of failing to introduce transitional rules.

I would like to conclude by asking for approval of reservation 4. I would also like to thank the Bureau, the members of the Tax Committee and the Chancellery and wish you a pleasant summer.

The discussion was hereby concluded.

(Decisions were made under § 9.)

§ 6 Spring amendment budget for 2023
The Finance Committee's report 2022/23:FiU21

Spring amendment budget for 2023 (prop. 2022/23:99)

was preferred.

Ref. 86 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD):
Madam Speaker! I would like to begin by asking for approval of the committee's proposed decision.

What I and the other speakers here in the chamber seem to focus on within the framework of this report is the proposal for a new energy policy target for the composition of electricity production in 2040.

Madam Speaker! In 2018, the Riksdag decided on a new energy policy goal. The goal was to have 100 percent renewable electricity production by 2040. The proposal and later the decision arose out of the energy agreement that all parties except the Sweden-friendly Sweden Democrats entered into in 2016.

The newly set goal read in its entirety: "The goal in 2040 is 100 percent renewable electricity production. This is a goal, not a cut-off date that bans nuclear power, nor does it mean shutting down nuclear power by political decision."

I note, Madam Speaker, that care was taken to point out that the goal would not involve a direct ban on nuclear power and that it was clarified that this goal would not lead to a premature shutdown of nuclear power either.

It is interesting with bureaucratic political formulations. You kind of have to read between the lines. Yes, I usually ramble on about it, but as the former investment controller that I am anyway – you've heard it before – I'm now going to translate the text into investor language, i.e. plain text.

The goal, written in plain text, could have been formulated something like this: We will not forbid you - yet - to invest in planable, fossil-free nuclear power. But remember: We will not lift a finger to facilitate your business. On the contrary, we will favor other types of energy. And the day you have to shut down due to non-technology neutral market conditions, it's not our fault.

Madam Speaker! In a few decades, we went from being a country with simple standards and a relatively poor population to becoming a successful, modern export nation with a high standard of living and general welfare as a result. The small country in the north became a pioneer country. Investments in planable, low-fossil and large-scale energy have laid the foundation for competitiveness, which in turn laid the foundation for jobs and general prosperity. Our unique energy mix, where fossil-free water and nuclear power have formed the base, has long given us an edge over the rest of the world.

Madam Speaker! Sweden's first major commercial reactor, Oskarshamn 1, was commissioned in 1972. In 1975, the first reactors were commissioned in both Ringhals and Barsebäck, while the Forsmark nuclear power plant began supplying electricity in 1980. All Swedish nuclear power plants were strategically located on the coast to have good access to cooling water . They were also strategically placed to be close to the more populous regions in terms of transmission.

All reactors in these four plants except Ringhals 2–4 are of Swedish construction, developed by Asea Atom. We'll take it again, because it bears repeating: All reactors in these four plants except Ringhals 2–4 are of Swedish construction. In 13 years, twelve Swedish nuclear power reactors were put into commercial operation – twelve reactors, nine of which were Swedish engineering.

The Swedish nuclear power history is impressive from the beginning and almost to the end. We are talking Swedish research, Swedish engineering and construction, Swedish jobs, Swedish competitiveness and Swedish effective political decisions – impressive!

Madam Speaker! What the hell happened? I have asked the question in the past in many contexts and also here in the House. Well, common sense, concern for Sweden and building for the future were exchanged for beautiful promises, castles in the air and naivety. Power became more important than the country and the citizens. The Peripheral Center and the dogmatic Green Party were left to manage energy policy, a policy built on the delusion that there is always enough wind, that electricity production does not need to be planned, that the storage possibilities as well as the transmission capacity are enormous and that the green energy transition is actually green.

Is that really so, Madam Speaker? How green and carbon dioxide-free is the so-called green transition actually for Sweden? What do we really gain from replacing nuclear power with wind power?

For example, it is a fact that wind power at power plant level produces three times more emissions than nuclear power. At the system level, it is considerably more. Wind power requires ten times larger areas, defiles the natural landscape, threatens the fauna, releases dangerous microplastics and is several times less energy efficient. It also does not function as a base for the electrical system, as it is not always windy.

The previous government, the current opposition, talks a lot about the big investments in the north and about massive electrification that will require an extremely extensive expansion of the country's electricity system. But while emphasizing the importance of a robust electricity system and competitive prices, they talk very quietly about how we should manage the electricity system and the need for electricity when it is not windy. In practice, they also show no willingness to do anything for the types of energy that benefit the electricity system as a whole: the types of energy that can be planned, not least large-scale nuclear power.

Madam Speaker! The major investments in the north, including steel without coal, are estimated to require 80 terawatt hours of fossil-free electricity. That is more than half of Sweden's current electricity consumption. The question that constantly hangs in the air and lacks an answer is: Where will the electricity come from?

Since the opposition is not fond of nuclear power, I assume that what remains is that the fossil-free electricity is produced with wind power. I also assume, for the sake of simplicity, that it should be produced close to where it is used and that offshore wind power therefore falls away, given that the Gulf of Bothnia is ice-bound for large parts of the year and that maintenance is complicated during the winter months. This also applies to the mooring of the works so that they can withstand the enormous forces that arise when the ice moves. These questions have not yet been resolved.

Due to variable wind conditions, land-based wind turbines only produce the equivalent of approximately 40 percent of installed power. In practice, this means that the winch part must be balanced with stable base power. Hydropower is, as is common knowledge at this point, largely maxed out.

Against this background, the vision of 100 percent renewables is usually combined with the vision of the fossil-free hydrogen society. This means that we must use hydrogen as a balancing and regulating force and produce electricity with hydrogen when it is not windy. So what does that calculation look like? I usually ask myself that question, true to my habit.

Converting electricity to hydrogen and then to electricity again means an energy loss of around two-thirds. It therefore takes 3 kilowatts of wind power to produce 1 kilowatt of hydrogen gas. For every kilowatt of hydrogen gas, the equivalent of 7 kilowatts of installed wind power with an effect of 40 percent is therefore required. Even when the wind is blowing at full blast, the majority of the electricity produced by the wind turbines must therefore be diverted to produce hydrogen gas that can be used to produce electricity when the wind is not blowing. There are a lot of numbers here, Madam Speaker. But it needs to be said.

To produce 48 terawatt-hours of hydrogen gas for the electricity grid, 144 terawatt-hours of wind turbine electricity is needed. Four fifths of the wind turbines' electricity production must be used to produce hydrogen, which produces electricity when there is no wind. Since land-based wind turbines only produce the equivalent of 40 percent of installed power, it would require wind turbines that, if the wind was optimal all the time, would produce 440 terawatt hours. It's complicated. But it must be said.

Another important aspect, which is talked about too little, is the extremely poor utilization of the electricity grid that this would lead to. It would be incredibly expensive to build an electricity grid that is able to temporarily transmit radically higher power than today, but which must stand idle or operate far below maximum capacity for a large part of the time.

An investigation by the OECD has also shown that the costs for electricity transmission can be at least as great as for the electricity production itself when the production facilities are spread over large areas, which is often the case with wind power.

Madam Speaker! It is said that the road to hell is often lined with good intentions. The vision - the dream - of a 100 percent renewable electricity system based on wind and hydrogen must be embroidered with all kinds of good intentions. But there must be an end to the dreaming, Madam Speaker. It is our responsibility as politicians, as managers of Swedish citizens' assets and trust, to make decisions that benefit the entire electricity system and ultimately all citizens.

We are not alone in making bad decisions. In Tidningen Näringslivet, one could recently read: "German business leaders are sounding the alarm that important industries may leave the country as a result of the country having closed the last remaining nuclear power plants... Now Germany is facing a shortage of electricity."

Germany is facing an electricity shortage that will force critical industries to leave the country after the government shut down the last remaining nuclear power plants in favor of renewable energy. This is emphasized by a number of business leaders. The intermittent nature of these green energy sources, which makes them susceptible to sudden voltage drops during cloudy or windless periods, means that Germany's electricity system remains vulnerable to power shortages and price volatility.

Madam Speaker! I'm nearing the end. Switching to 100 percent renewables by 2040 was a problematic goal to say the least. In my opinion, it was completely unrealistic, in any case if you simultaneously want to electrify, massively expand electricity production and have a robust, affordable and reliable energy system.

With the Tidö Agreement, Sweden has taken a big step in the right direction, towards once again becoming a safe, well-functioning nation with an efficient and competitive energy system. With the proposed formulation of the new energy policy goal, that by 2040 we shall have 100

percent fossil-free electricity production, the importance of technology neutrality is clarified. This also opens up future investments in fossil-free, planable and efficient nuclear power.

In this speech, Josef Fransson (SD) agreed.

Ref. 87 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! There's a lot I'd like to say, but I'm going to limit myself somewhat.

To begin with, I intend to read what Uniper's CEO said after the energy agreement in 2016: "The energy agreement is important for Sweden because it laid the foundation for a long-term energy policy. The agreement has given a welcome signal to the energy industry, which is capital-intensive and needs predictability to be able to count on long-term investments."

It is not at all in line with what Jessica Stegrud tried to translate into investor Swedish at the beginning of her speech. I think it is important that we stick to the truth.

We can keep talking about the truth. There are a couple of myths that we have to kill in this House and stop repeating. Jessica Stegrud spoke about microplastics from wind turbines. It is true that there is approximately 150 grams per wind turbine per year, mainly from paint. If Jessica Stegrud thinks it's problematic with color, I think she needs to think about how all homeowners in Sweden should manage their houses.

If we have 150 grams of microplastics per year from the wind turbines, I can say that we also have 13,000 tons from things like tires, artificial grass pitches, laundry and acetate fiber, bottom paint on boats, road traffic and other things.

When it comes to the death of birds, we are talking about approximately 36,000 birds being killed by wind power every year. We also know that 13 million birds are killed by our cats. And if we talk about birds of prey, which we like to do, we know that 40-45 percent of all golden eagles are killed by trains, simply because the trains run over game. Then the birds come and sit on the rails and get killed.

So my question to Jessica Stegrud is: Why are SD not equally committed when it comes to microplastics, biological diversity and bird death except in the case of wind power?

Ref. 88 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! I can start by commenting on what the member said about Uniper. When you work with investments, you want to have a long-term perspective. What the agreements contain is one thing, but long-termism is important. Therefore, it is good to have broad agreements. It's not about anything else.

However, one can ask whether more or less nuclear power has been built after the announcement. Has it been shut down, expanded or life extended? I think we all know the answer to that. That's what I mean by reading between the lines. Who invests billions in

something that will not be allowed to exist beyond 2040? We are therefore talking about life spans of 60–80 years. These are large investments that are capital intensive at the beginning, very profitable and very good for the energy system in the long run.

When it comes to the Center's sudden craze for nature, it is the case that nothing is free. It's all about priorities. If wind power had had a lot of advantages in the form of, for example, planability, it would have put wind power in a different light, but now it is rather the case that it destroys natural values, sabotages the energy system, makes prices volatile and destroys both industry and households. That is the difference.

Ref. 89 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I think it's fun that SD has now really realized that it's good to have broad agreements, so we're looking forward to being able to settle together with SD and the government and that SD will push for broad agreements. That is not what is done in this chamber today, but it is nice that you have come to an understanding.

I don't really know what to say about the Center Party having a sudden craze for nature. After all, the Center Party was the party that tabled the first environmental motion in Sweden's Riksdag - back in the 60s! I think that Jessica Stegrud needs to read up on her history in order to have any type of correctness in this debate at all.

I can only state that there is no type of environmental interest at SD except when it comes to wind power. If SD now thinks it is so important with microplastics, bird death and other issues - which are certainly important - why do they not make proposals about it other than when they stand in the lectern and talk about wind power? Why repeat things about 150 grams per year compared to 13,000 tons? It's just spreading myths and ensuring that we get a problematic situation.

If we are going to talk about profitability, we know that the entire business community is clamoring for new construction of, among other things, wind power. Why does SD make a completely different calculation than all investors in that market? There is something about SD's policy that does not add up. Obviously, it is mainly about the fact that they do not want any wind power. They even say that existing works should be taken down.

My question is again why people become so committed to microplastics and bird death when it comes to wind power and not at any other time. Why are these issues never raised in the environment and agriculture committee, for example?

Ref. 90 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! There was a lot here. That thing about us wanting to dismantle wind turbines, the member also knows that is not true. That thing about studying might be something for the member himself. It is simply not Swedish Democratic politics.

I think the big difference is that as a Sweden Democrat I look at the entire electricity system. The Sweden Democrats have no vested interest in serving large international wind power companies that receive enormous credit guarantees from, among other things, the EU with the help of tax funds. My task as a politician is to look after the whole system. The whole system must work.

In southern Sweden, there are already problems due to the fact that the planned nuclear power has been shut down. You shut it down - not us. The situation means volatile prices, overproduction when it's windy and deficits and power shortages when it's not windy. It is not to take responsibility for the entire system, and it is my task as a politician to do so – not to favor a certain type of large business, which today also often has Chinese ownership. I think that is the big difference between us.

What I mean by "a sudden craze for nature" is that there is a huge difference. The member can look around - what does it look like in the large wind farms? Well, people get their property values destroyed, and animals and nature get hurt. That must also be taken into account.

It is fascinating that you pick up on the microplastics in particular. I am trying to highlight a broader view of wind power, but the main thing is that it does not help the electricity system because it is not planable. That is the big sticking point here, and I wish the Center Party took a little more account of it.

Ref. 91 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! I want to continue on the same track. Naturvården is an interesting opening.

The member and the Sweden Democrats talk warmly about nuclear power, and I wonder how the member views the raw material for nuclear power: uranium. After all, it is imported from rogue states and dictatorships such as Saudi Arabia and Russia, which is one of the world's largest producers of uranium. Shall we continue with it? If not, I wonder where in Sweden the member has intended to mine uranium.

The climate minister welcomed uranium mines in Sweden the other day, and I wonder if the member also welcomes uranium mining in, for example, Östergötland, Öland, Skåne, western Götaland and so on.

Ref. 92 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Uranium can be procured on an international market, and of course we must have trade relations with countries we can trust - above all, democratic countries that are Western-minded. It is also what you are constantly steering towards. I agree with the problem, but it is simply fixable. It is continuously being worked on.

Regarding uranium mining in Sweden, I think that if you are to allow and are in favor of nuclear power and the whole green transition, you must also be willing to contribute the metals - special

metals, earth metals - that are actually required. Here we have – not least the member's party – a dilemma with legislation that goes against each other. Again: Politics is about prioritizing.

Exactly where the localization would take place I am of course not equipped to tell you about, but I think the basic approach should be that you cannot go into a total conversion that requires completely new raw materials and metals and then consider that only someone else should be responsible for the mining. The basic assumption is that this can be reviewed, but of course the environment, safety and so on must be taken into account. It is complex and extremely important.

Ref. 93 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! I share the view that we must contribute nationally with the substances needed to manufacture, for example, batteries, but I asked about uranium in particular because it is a very special extraction that in that case would be done in Sweden.

Uranium is extracted from something called alum shale. That extraction process is quite special. There is a mine in Finland called Talvivaara. Nickel was mined there in the same way as uranium would be mined in Sweden. One of Europe's biggest environmental disasters occurred there in 2012.

Earlier we talked about wind turbines and how they can disrupt, lower property values and so on. If you were to mine uranium in Sweden in, for example, western Götaland, Närke or one of the designated areas, it involves so-called precipitation basins that can be as large as 140 hectares. These are huge areas. In the case of Talvivaara, it was one such basin that had started leaking and created a huge natural disaster.

So I wonder if the member wants to see mining of uranium in alum shale in Sweden.

Ref. 94 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! The question is not on my table, and I am not familiar with it. I admit that right away. The basic principle is that you should investigate the matter, because if you are to be part of the transition, you should also be able to review the possibilities of actually contributing the raw materials that are needed. I want to turn the question around, because without nuclear power and planable electricity, we have no electrification to speak of and no transition ahead of us. One must therefore understand that this is about priorities.

The idea that we can have wind farms just about everywhere and that this would secure Sweden's electricity supply is deeply unrealistic. It was something I returned to in my slightly too long speech. It's time to stop dreaming! We have an electrical system that must work. With all the plans for increased electricity demand and electrification, we need a large, planable source of power in the foundation. Nuclear power is incredibly important there, and it is often forgotten.

It is utopian to think that you should be able to phase out nuclear power and replace it with, for example, hydrogen and renewables. Therefore, it is a great decision that the majority in the

chamber will hopefully make to move from the renewable vision to the fossil-free one. It is the one that affects the emissions, and it is the one that paves the way for competitiveness and adjustment for Sweden in the future.

Ref. 95 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S):

Madam Speaker! Right now, there is a global race where countries and companies are doing everything to adjust in order to manage to reduce their climate emissions in a way that can create new jobs, improve competitiveness and increase prosperity.

In the tough competition, Sweden has made it to the global leadership group. With political decisions and a close collaboration between politics and business, we are at the very forefront in many different areas. Existing companies invest not only to survive but to gain new market share. New companies are lining up to invest in new industries and use our country as a base for their green operations.

The reason for the positive development is that there is a strongly growing global demand for things that are fossil-free and renewable. But if the Swedish potential is really to be realized, electrification is required in a way that we have not seen in 50 years. The use of electricity will have to increase sharply, in the long run it may even double or more. And that will require new generation from all fossil-free forms of power. It really is the case that all power strokes are needed.

The Swedish production of electricity has for decades been almost completely fossil-free. The development of hydropower, nuclear power and wind power has made the Swedish electricity mix climate-smart. The goal that the government now wants the Riksdag to decide on is really that it should continue to be like this in 17 years. Of course, that doesn't have to be wrong in itself, but it is a prerequisite that we don't change that thing. But you don't actually have to be that defensive. We simply need a more powerful steering wheel for politics, and this is not it. Rarely has a new goal been perceived as so trivial in an area that demands so much.

The goal for the energy policy, just as Jessica Stegrud said earlier, has its basis in the energy agreement from 2016. The Moderates and the Christian Democrats then voted for the proposal when it was put forward in the Riksdag. The reason was what Jessica Stegrud reproduced from the bill, I dare say, namely that it was not a cut-off date that prohibits nuclear power, nor did it mean any shutdown of nuclear power due to political decisions. On the contrary, it was made clear that one could invest in new reactors. In addition, the policy improved the competitiveness of nuclear power. It was done through reduced taxation and by better managing the Nuclear Waste Fund, which reduced the costs of provisions by a few cents per kilowatt hour. That was extremely important because electricity prices were low, and expected to remain low,

We social democrats, of course, believe that it is perfectly fine to discuss a new goal formulation for energy policy, not least because the electrification that is now being carried out places new major demands. Such a discussion about the goal would probably have been an excellent first question in a broad cross-bloc round of talks, at least for a government that has the ambition to

create broad majorities across the bloc borders and that wants to create stability and long-term perspective.

The basis for a goal for energy policy should of course be that it should harmonize with the climate policy we are to pursue. By 2045, policies in many areas should have led to net zero emissions in Sweden. It is of course important that there are long-term goals. But the risks are of course that you miss what needs to happen right here and now if the target is a little too long. That is where we risk ending up, and that is the problem.

In Sweden, electricity production has increased sharply in recent years. Sweden is Europe's largest exporter of electricity. After this term, Sweden risks losing that position. On the contrary, our expert authorities point out that Sweden will be net dependent on electricity - from exporter to importer - and thus also have an increased dependence on others. That is what risks happening in the near term.

In this matter, we social democrats highlight the need to have a goal in the shorter term to underline the strong will we have to bring new electricity production into the system. Already by 2030, we think that at least 60 terawatt hours of fossil-free electricity are needed. All powers are needed.

Madam Speaker! A new parliament-bound goal should also be set after a broad discussion and in common agreement that gives statute and credibility over time. It is not something you unilaterally cobble together at the ministry and send over to the Riksdag and hope that everyone will vote for it. A goal that aims 17 years into the future is probably not just something that has already been achieved when it has been decided. We also want to focus on getting more electricity production in place quickly. Sweden was the EU's largest electricity exporter. Already in the next mandate period, we risk being dependent on imports from other countries.

I am of course behind all the reservations in the matter, but I request approval for reservation 2. Namely, it would give a clear signal to all actors who want to invest in Sweden that we are the right country to invest in and the right country to grow in, if we also dare to say that in the next few years more electricity production will take place in our country.

Just as Sweden has a surplus of electricity, I have a certain surplus of time, but it was others who needed it.

(Applause)

Ref. 96 CAMILLA BRODIN (KD) replica:

Madam Speaker! If I have understood it all correctly, the Social Democrats will today say no to a new energy policy goal of 100 percent fossil-free and yes to a self-formulated goal that the Riksdag should adopt a goal of 60 terawatt hours of fossil-free electricity production by 2030. It is an ambitious goal, but there is a lack of a sustainable plan to get there.

When it is wind power that accounts for the majority of the expansion, it will not give a marked increase in power allocation to new industries. Wind power contributes energy, probably at lower prices seen over a year, but it does not contribute to any large amount of power, i.e. megawatts, and will therefore not enable the transition to 2030, as the Social Democrats seem to envision.

Madam Speaker! It was also the member's party that pushed for the record-breaking expansion of wind power, which has proven not to contribute to the safe and efficient operation of the electricity system. Although we have had Europe's fastest expansion of wind power over the past five to ten years, it has not contributed to the electricity system's ability to connect industries or even to secure electricity supply to existing customers when we need it most.

Have the Social Democrats not learned from their previous mistakes, that it is not possible to just pour arbitrary production into the electricity system without taking into account the laws of physics? Since the Social Democrats want to see rapid expansion by 2030, I wonder how wind power will contribute to the output so that new industries can connect.

Ref. 97 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! The absolutely most important message in what I said today and what we write in our motion is that we want to see unity around energy policy with common goals.

We think it is fundamentally bad that the government proceeds on its own without acquiring a solid foundation here in the Riksdag. It would have been a much better way to handle handling the issues. Now the government has not done it. But we don't want to be boring and just say no, but we want to highlight what could become a discussion issue in the conversations that we would like to see come to fruition. There it is also about the shorter perspective, because we need to bring more electricity production into this system.

Then Camilla Brodin is absolutely right that we social democrats have promoted wind power, just as we promoted hydropower and promoted nuclear power once upon a time. This is what means that we have an energy mix that is fossil-free, where we have a surplus that we can also export to other countries. That is why industries want to come to Sweden. It is precisely this combination, together with talented entrepreneurs and a well-educated workforce that knows the process industry, that means that we are now getting all these huge investments.

But now I am no longer in the majority. It is Camilla Brodin who does it, so my question to her is: If you think that the target that we have put on the table of the Riksdag is not sufficient for us to produce more electricity by 2030 and if Sweden goes from being the export king in EU to become dependent on imports, how will you then ensure that we do not lose the lead that we have acquired?

Ref. 98 CAMILLA BRODIN (KD) replica:

Madam Speaker! I thank you for the answer, even if it was a non-answer that member Olovsson delivered here.

I say this: Wind power has a 9 percent capacity factor, while nuclear power has close to 100 percent. For example, 1,000 megawatts of nuclear power would enable approximately 1,000 megawatts of connection of new electricity customers, while 1,000 megawatts of wind power would enable less than 100 megawatts in allocation to new industries.

Does the member really understand the difference between energy and power and what the consequences will be if one option has a capacity factor one tenth as large as the other option? It sounds as if the Social Democrats lack a plan based on how the electricity system works. How will 60 terawatt hours of fossil-free electricity production by 2030 that does not include new nuclear power work? New nuclear power must be accepted if one wants to bring in as much wind power as S seems to want and at the same time connect more industries.

Come on now! Are the Social Democrats really not prepared to contribute in a constructive way to sustainable development and say yes to a goal of 100 percent fossil-free, which includes new nuclear power?

Ref. 99 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! What is revealing here is that the government side is saying that there will be no power for the industries. There will be no opportunity to invest in Sweden in the next five six seven eight nine years. That is the message that is now given here. It is therefore not possible to increase electricity production in this country at all. It is not possible to get these industries in place. That's the message. That's what all investment controllers will now hear. It's not possible.

I'm not talking about a power stroke; I'm talking about all power strokes. We need to maximize everything we have in the coming years. This means that we must do everything we can with hydropower and everything we can with nuclear power, which has increased its output in recent years and where there is a little more room further on during the shorter period that I am talking about.

But the very sad message from the government side is that there will be no major change. It won't be what business wants, because it won't work.

In fact, we think it's just the opposite. We must do even more. We need to do everything we can. It won't always be easy, and we'll have to do it in slightly different ways. We will have to help each other. We will have to share the effect in a smarter way, for example in Norrland, where some are now blocking and others have to stand and wait.

There are things we can do to get started. I think we should sit down and work on this together, because then Sweden has fantastic opportunities that we shouldn't squander on energy policy squabbling.

(Applause)

Ref. 100 MATS GREEN (M) replica:

Madam Speaker! We would never have been here to begin with if it hadn't been for the fact that the Social Democrats and the Green Party have dismantled an extremely well-functioning energy system - perhaps the world's most well-functioning energy system - by shutting down nuclear power, tearing out hydropower and phasing out cogeneration. We would never have needed to have this discussion if you had not spent eight years in government dismantling the most basic parts of the Swedish power system.

I also note that after eight months this government has made more decisions, put forward more proposals and appointed more investigations than the previous government was able to do in eight years. It is fact.

So we would never have had this debate if you hadn't made all these wrong decisions, where you gave in to the most important thing in Swedish power production.

I have two questions for Fredrik Olovsson, Madam Speaker.

The first concerns the goal of 60 terawatts fossil-free, which they now say they have. It is part of the Tidöpartierna's goal of at least 300 terawatts in 2045. But my question is why you did not decide on such a goal yourself during your entire time in government - especially during the last period, when Sweden's energy problems were only too obvious.

This morning, business asked for clarity in the Social Democrats' stance on the nuclear power issue. You are not clear at all, so I have a question. Will the social democratic goals of phasing out nuclear power be removed from your party guidelines for the goals that you decided on at the party congress in November 2021, when we had a rampant energy crisis?

Ref. 101 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! Mats Green and his party were very happy when the agreement with this goal and the conditions given to nuclear power were decided, first in the agreement in 2016 and then also in the bill they voted for in 2018. That was the last thing that happened that summer, before the Riksdag closed shop and went home.

This has meant that we see power increases in nuclear power. It also means that in a very clear way we have had a discussion about lifetime extensions but also, now that above all electricity prices have become high, a discussion about building new nuclear power - which is entirely possible within the framework of the agreement and with the goal we have today. We have been very much in agreement about that.

Concerns were raised that technology development in the nuclear power field had advanced so far when it came to SMRs that the regulatory framework was not up to date. Magdalena Andersson's government then tasked the authority with producing an update. The final report will be made this summer. The image that Mats Green wants to portray is therefore not quite true. It is set for political reasons, not because you want the best for the electricity system or the Swedish business community.

We will have nuclear power in Sweden for a very long time. We social democrats think that this is a reasonable development in this situation. We also have the opportunity to see new nuclear power being built. For example, we will see what the review that the state-owned company started during our time in government ends up in the future.

But we agreed on this. You thought this was very good. And now you describe it exactly as if it were a big problem. It is not really credible, especially not when we are, after all, the largest electricity exporter and have the lowest electricity prices – albeit too high – in the EU.

Ref. 102 MATS GREEN (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! I can live with Sweden exporting a little less electricity.

Three things. The first concerns the energy agreement. Yes, we were there together with the Christian Democrats to make sure that what could be saved from Swedish nuclear power was saved because the government at the time with the Social Democrats and the Green Party did everything they could to partly shut down existing reactors and partly put an end to the two new reactors which Vattenfall had planned, which if they had not been stopped could have been ready to be put into operation around today. We were there to save what could be saved by Swedish nuclear power.

We would also have been able to save Ringhals 1 and 2 if the Social Democrats, the Green Party, the Center Party and the Left Party had not passed that proposal with a margin of one vote in the Riksdag. Then we could have kept Ringhals 1 and 2 in operation.

Then I actually want an answer to the question about the social democratic congress decision from 2021, i.e. after the energy agreement had been concluded, about phasing out nuclear power - that's what the decision says - and gradually replacing it with renewable energy sources. My question is again: Are you going to delete that congressional decision? If you are going to delete it, you need to do it in the near future, because otherwise it has no credibility when you stand and say that you want more nuclear power. Although you are not saying per se that you want more nuclear power, you are saying that you can accept that we still have nuclear power - that it is reasonable. It is not really, in all parts and in full, an affirmative answer, Madam Speaker.

The third and last thing I still want an answer to concerns your goal of 60 terawatt hours fossil-free. Why didn't you set that goal yourself during the last social democratic government in Sweden? Then there were all the problems. Why didn't you set such a goal yourselves, when everyone else saw what was happening?

Ref. 103 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is interesting that Mats Green raises the issue of Ringhals 1 and 2. It is a bit of a sequel now in government circles, where you have obviously come to the same conclusion as everyone else - there are only the Sweden Democrats left - namely that it is not possible to

save on some reasonable terms. It is good if more people see reality as it is. Then you can put this aside.

The second question, which I didn't have time to answer in my last reply, was about the 60 terawatt hours being included in the 300 that the Tidö parties want to have in place by 2040. That is absolutely true, and it means that you can set this type of goal, which was questioned earlier. It is of course entirely possible to do so. It doesn't seem to be bound by the Riksdag yet, but maybe it will be.

It is clear that they are included. But the only thing is that if we don't now get more electricity into the Swedish system and don't get all the investments that Swedish companies and new stakeholders want to get in place in our country, with new jobs, new welfare and better competitiveness, maybe these won't stay. Then we don't have the large industries that use a lot of electricity today. That's how serious this is.

That is why we want to point to the shorter perspective. And we are not alone. Many industries and industry associations also point out that this has to happen here and now, and then we have to use all the power we can use. Do more with hydropower, and increase power where possible. Do more with nuclear power, and increase power where possible. Expand wind power, and convert old wind power so it becomes even more efficient. Those are the tools we have at our disposal.

We would like to point out that it is important to do this. We are happy to do it together with others and in conversations that can make energy policy more long-term.

Ref. 104 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! The member talks about broad agreements. I'm thinking about what we're going to talk about. Isn't it time? Isn't coffee finished now? The member's party is not so enthusiastic about inviting all parties on other issues, but now they suddenly want to drag this out and talk about energy agreements.

It is time for the Social Democrats to decide on nuclear power. I hear it constantly, and I heard it in connection with the Moderates' question here earlier: There is no answer to how this with nuclear power is to be done.

But we do it like this: Explain instead! We are phasing out nuclear power, because that is obviously what the Social Democrats want, even if they pretend otherwise. What should we have instead? That was question number one.

The concrete question number two is: Should the 60 terawatt hours that are now to be built be installed and ready in five years? Is this what the Social Democrats see in front of them, Madam Speaker? Where is this supposed to be? And what kind of power? Will a balancing force be required, and if so, which one?

Ref. 105 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! I think it is very contemptuous to talk about politicians having coffee. In that case, one has a poor understanding of what Swedish political tradition looks like and of what our country really is at its core.

For a very long time, we have been a cooperative democracy, where we reach out to each other. It could be anything from liberals and social democrats who arrange the right to vote to unions and employers who agree on the Swedish model or social democrats and farmers' confederations who - contemptuously, at the time - negotiated the important issues. And so we can continue.

It has been very important for Sweden that we stick together and do things together. It is not so strange, because we are a rather small country – albeit big in many areas, and successful. So it is clear that we need to do more together.

In addition, it is exactly as Jessica Stegrud said in her speech and as Rickard Nordin said before about Uniper: It is important for the business world and for those who want to invest that there is a long-term perspective. It is a problem for Sweden that we have so much short-termism now. We should all be able to see that, agree on it and try to do something about it, even if it is sometimes very difficult.

The coffee talks that Stefan Löfven had during his years in government led from the fact that the industry in Sweden was "basically gone", as Prime Minister Reinfeldt said when he went to world meetings, to the fact that the industry is on its toes in a fantastic way. You are hiring. I was in Ludvika yesterday and saw the future, with all the people who are going into those businesses - which are also connected to the electrification that is now happening.

These are fantastic opportunities. We should take them by coming to an agreement, in our case with the government. But the government gets to decide who they invite.

(Applause)

Ref. 106 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! If I hadn't been here I would have actually thought I was at stand-up comedy. It is actually absurd, Madam Speaker, to stand here as a social democrat and claim that everyone should be invited to cross-block talks and invited to participate and cooperate. There is no party that has excluded my party as much as the Social Democrats when it comes to broad agreements. It's actually just bullshit.

But I understand why the member spends time on this colorful description of cooperation, because the member does not want to answer concretely. Where will the 60 terawatt hours be built in just over five years? What kind of power? What type of balance and reserve power will be required? Where in Sweden will this take place? Is it reasonable? Will it be able to happen, simply? Now I want concrete answers.

Then I would also like to have the final answer regarding nuclear power. What do we do without nuclear power in the energy system? With social democratic politics, which thankfully cannot prevail at the moment, we will not have nuclear power in the system in 15, 20 or 30 years. What do the Social Democrats want instead?

Ref. 107 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! I think it was probably appropriate to tell the members of the Sweden Democrats what Sweden really is. You don't always know that. So it may be appropriate to give a small historical review of what has built Sweden strong. There, we social democrats have always been the ones who stand first. We are the ones you can rely on when you really need it. I also believe that this government will eventually discover that.

When it comes to nuclear power, we will have nuclear power for the foreseeable future in Sweden, probably even the reactors that are running today because they will probably have lifetime extensions. We think it is good that they are also increased in efficiency, above all if it can be done quickly. It is good.

The same applies to hydropower and wind power. It is about the existing wind power that can actually deliver more if you upgrade it, which will be possible in the coming years, but we will also need to expand – which we now agree with the government about some offshore wind power. The only question is what Jessica Stegrud and the Sweden Democrats think of this, because we hear every single time such a decision is made how wrong it is, what problems it creates and how reprehensible it will be if we go that way.

It is good if the government can resist. You might do that for a while longer, but the risk is that you will have to pay dearly in some negotiation so that it will be a little worse for Sweden in another way instead.

(Applause)

Ref. 108 MATS GREEN (M):

Madam Speaker! I would like to begin by calling for approval of the budget and of what this debate will deal with, namely the government's proposal for a new energy policy goal of 100 percent fossil-free instead of renewable, since renewable is just a code for excluding nuclear power, and Sweden does not have that or the climate affords. The parties in here – the Social Democrats, the Green Party and the Left Party – who oppose this with all their might also need to reflect on what it means.

Madam Speaker! Electricity bills for the month of May have landed in mailboxes around Sweden. Residents in southern Central Sweden and north may when the bill is opened get the impression that the last two years of electricity crisis have passed, because there await lower bills for most. But this is unfortunately not the case. Southern Sweden, electricity area 4, can attest to that. There, prices have still been more than double compared to a normal year.

The situation is very serious, and the latest power balance report from Svenska Kraftnät made Energisverige put the coffee down its throat. The situation we find ourselves in is a direct consequence of the previous government's failed energy policy and lack of a long-term plan. That's really what it's all about. That is why I am happy that the moderate-led government and our colleagues in the Christian Democrats, the Liberals and the Sweden Democrats are now changing the energy policy to rebuild a functioning, stable and clean electricity system.

Rebuilding the energy system and then planning for it to stand strong for a long time to come is a massive project that is not done overnight. The first clear step was taken when the Tidö collaboration was formed, where all participating parties were in broad agreement on the importance of a long-term, stable and technology- and climate-neutral energy system. To achieve this, nuclear power is of paramount importance. It is currently the only type of power that can be placed where the electricity is needed, that can produce when the electricity is needed and that can produce electricity with the smallest possible emissions. This is not only something that all parties in government cooperation understand, but also a very large part of the Swedish people.

Madam Speaker! Therefore, on this very day, we take the next step on this long road. After this day, we put on paper that nuclear power is a welcome part of the society of the future, where it is no longer under the constant threat of politically set cut-off dates.

Despite today's difficult energy situation, there are several parties represented in this assembly that have not learned anything from their past mistakes.

Learning from one's mistakes and especially passing these lessons on to future generations is of the utmost importance. Therefore, I am now forced to briefly touch on a number of historical facts about how Sweden, where the world's perhaps best electricity system existed, ended up in this strained position. I mention this only because it plays a huge role for the present, for the future and for dealing with the here and now that all this has been done.

For 20 years, the Social Democrats, with the help of the Green Party, dismantled Swedish nuclear power. Twelve nuclear power reactors have become six. At the same time, the red and green stopped Vattenfall's plans to build two new reactors at Ringhals, which otherwise would have been in principle ready to be put into operation exactly now, when they were most needed.

Karlshamnsverket has not only had to burn 140,000 liters of oil per hour during strenuous winters, but it has also had to do so in the month of August to supply southern Sweden with electricity. Fossil oil thus needs to be used because southern Sweden does not have enough electricity production. And where was the nuclear power that the Social Democrats shut down? Yes, in southern Sweden. If these reactors had remained today, Sweden would have been significantly more resistant to the crisis that the whole of Europe has been thrust into through Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

In addition to dismantling nuclear power, with obvious consequences for both the climate and electricity prices, it was made more difficult for cogeneration and for hydropower through a number of new and increased taxes, which we abolished in the previous autumn budget. They also introduced a number of permit processes aimed at tearing out large amounts of electricity-producing hydropower, again primarily in southern Sweden, where this hydropower is most needed.

Magdalena Andersson spent eight years in government to, among other things, dismantle the foundation for Swedish electricity production and now wants a new government to clean up after her in eight months. That says a lot about what we are talking about, Madam Speaker.

I am not going to spend more time in this speech describing the consequences of the previous red-green government's energy policy, because the facts and reality speak for themselves. Otherwise we wouldn't be standing here discussing this. Above all, I will talk about what we in the government have now embarked on in both the short and long term, but if I had been a social democrat or an environmentalist in this assembly, I would have been much more humble than what we have seen from these parties so far.

Madam Speaker! The situation Sweden finds itself in is far from sustainable for either households, businesses or the climate. The fact that electricity prices repeatedly break new records and that electricity bills are unpredictable is not acceptable. The fact that companies are also unable to expand their operations due to a lack of sufficient clean electricity is deplorable. The energy crisis is a threat to Sweden as a modern industrial country. We really can't have it like that anymore.

Let me just describe a small part of all that we are now doing in the short and long term. I'll start with the short term.

Svenska kraftnät was given a clear mission to secure the availability of power in Skåne. The Öresund Agency was about to be shipped completely disassembled to Southeast Asia. This has now been stopped, and the plant will now be on standby from 2025 to support southern Sweden. Yesterday, the assignment was presented to Swedish Power Grid and the Energy Market Inspectorate to shorten the connection times to the electricity grid. The week before, an inquiry was appointed to review the structure of all authorities involved in Swedish energy supply to ensure that they are ready for future challenges.

The cogeneration taxes, which the previous government introduced or increased, are abolished - both the waste incineration tax and the carbon dioxide tax for cogeneration. This means that you can quickly increase electricity production in existing cogeneration plants. We are therefore talking about unused electricity production corresponding to at least one nuclear power plant. These are the amounts that have been taxed away and become unprofitable due to the policies of the previous government and its supporting parties.

The government has also decided on new support for energy efficiency, which will go to approximately 150,000 single-family houses throughout the country that are heated with direct-acting electricity. The tax reduction for the installation of solar cells is increased from 15 to 20 percent. These are investments of 1.2 billion which really affect many people all over Sweden.

The government has also paused the permit tests for existing electricity-producing hydropower. This is important for both electricity production and the countryside and, not to be forgotten in these times, crisis preparedness.

Let me add that the evictions that have been carried out have been a pure assault on the Swedish countryside. But there will be more discussions about it in other contexts.

As I said, what I have listed is only a small part of what is being done in the short term. Now, Madam Speaker, I will say a few words about the long term.

Perhaps the previous government's greatest sin is that they did not care about the future. Svenska kraftnät's balance report, which I touched on earlier, is a nightmare to read. It shows the risk of a catastrophic power deficit when the need is at its greatest next year. The question then is: Could this have been foreseen?

I took a look back in time and looked at what Svenska kraftnät wrote in its report in 2018. I quote:

"The power balance during the peak load hour will likely deteriorate, as a large volume of planned production disappears and is mainly replaced by wind power and to some extent solar power."

So five years ago, our expert authority wrote this. It is clearly stated that the problems will worsen when the planned nuclear power is closed.

Madam Speaker! The information was there. Despite that, the previous government left the shelves empty of plans for Sweden's energy system. Not a thought about the future of this energy system existed.

We Tidöpartier have a completely different view. We aim for a long-term planned and stable energy system. That is why we are now starting to open up all fossil-free electricity production. The Swedish Energy Agency estimates that electricity demand will double by the year 2045 - at least. For that reason, 300 terawatt hours annually is the planning horizon, which is also described in the Tidö Agreement. The Tidö agreement does not end there, but it is also part of our plan to introduce a security of supply target to ensure the Swedish electricity supply.

In order for there to be the slightest chance of meeting a doubled electricity demand, Sweden needs more electricity production - electricity production that is fossil-free but also planable.

We can get more electricity production on such a large scale through nuclear power. We need new reactors, and we absolutely cannot shut down the reactors we have, as some in this room want. In order for new nuclear power to come into place, political as well as legal and economic conditions are needed. We are betting on new green credit guarantees of 400 billion for this. The state must not oppose a fossil-free, stable and planable energy system – quite the opposite.

Madam Speaker! Let me conclude by stating that the political prerequisites are about clearly showing from the political side that all fossil-free energy types are needed. Therefore, we must have an energy policy goal of 100 percent fossil-free electricity production, which also includes nuclear power. The industry must be able to feel secure in investing in nuclear power without having to fear that a future government will make decisions that force the closure of reactors.

We also need new rules for the energy market. It is about equal playing rules for all types of power, where power types that contribute with important support services are replaced by producers who do not contribute with these.

Madam Speaker! The Tidö parties have only begun the massive change of course of energy policy across the board for more energy for Sweden in both the short and long term. It is a paradigm shift if anything, Madam Speaker.

I want to use the time that I don't really have to wish the Speaker a nice summer. I also want to state that we do not have climate problems in the nutrition committee. We have a good and respectful collaboration across all party lines. Above all, I want to take the opportunity to wish my colleagues a really nice and wonderful summer.

(Applause)

Ref. 109 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! Member Mats Green talks about the importance of sticking to the facts. Therefore, I am very curious when he says that the Karlshamnsverket has been run to support the Swedish electricity system. I have a very straightforward question there: When was the Karlshamnsverket last run to support the Swedish electricity system? It would be nice to hear it.

We are now taking a position on a new goal of a 100 percent fossil-free electricity system by 2040. It is a goal that, in principle, has already been achieved today. With a few exceptions, we have achieved that. I think the electricity system was 98.2 percent fossil free last time.

For me, this is most likely to be seen in a context with a government that increases emissions and thus begins to thumb its nose at the climate goal. They want to introduce goals that have already been achieved in practice.

Then my question is: Can the member name any other targets that have been put before the Riksdag that have already been achieved when they are introduced, despite the target date being almost 20 years away?

Ref. 110 MATS GREEN (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is always interesting when the Center Party appears as the voice of reason in the energy debate. I really welcome it, because historically the Center Party in the energy debates has actually provided dogmatism, prosecution exercises and prohibition of thought. I am glad we have now moved away from that.

As for the Karlshamnsverket, I could be wrong, but there was indeed a fire at the Karlshamnsverket last winter. I suspect that Rickard Nordin wants to see that part of the Karlshamnsverket's electricity together with other electricity is also exported. It is, but that is not the point here. The Karlshamnsverket has also been set on fire to ensure that it is able to meet the energy needs in Skåne and other parts of Sweden.

Do you really seriously think that 140,000 liters of oil per hour spewing out carbon dioxide and other environmental toxins is a sign of a successful energy policy? I ask the question to the Center Party because they have been very involved in the energy policy which means that six out of twelve fully functioning reactors in Sweden have been decommissioned. All those reactors were decommissioned by social democratic governments. Not a single one of them has been dismantled by a moderate-led government.

As far as the energy policy goal is concerned, it is not at all the case that we have now achieved it. We are talking about a doubling of fossil-free production by 2045.

I would like to ask a question there. The Center Party's current party leader has said that they are certainly not closing the door on nuclear power and even spoke more positively there than the Social Democrats have done. How will the Center Party now approach a new goal of 100 percent fossil-free and new nuclear power?

Ref. 111 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! Yes, it is just as certain that moderates and others will talk about nuclear power no matter what question you ask, as the Sweden Democrats tend to talk about immigration in the same way.

I asked questions about the goal and whether there are other goals that you can see have already been achieved when you face them and about the Karlshamnsverket.

I will come back to the Center Party's position regarding nuclear power, but the member could perhaps read for himself in the newspaper today that we have no problem with talking about this. But it is completely unreasonable to introduce goals that have already been achieved. If you really want to be ambitious, you should make a 100 percent fossil-free energy system. The member is concerned about 140,000 liters of oil per hour. It is 4 million liters of diesel per day

that the government increases emissions with on the fuel side. It is the energy system that is important.

In the summer, the Karlshamnsverket was run on commercial terms, not at all to support the electricity system, because it has no such mission at all. It is because we have had high gas prices and nuclear power that has been down for audit in Sweden, and there have been problems in France. It really has nothing to do with what you think about anything else. It's about the market. In that case, you may have market views.

What the Center Party has been clear about when it comes to Karlshamnsverket in particular is that it should run on bio-oil. The opportunities to procure it are there, but this government and previous governments have simply chosen not to.

The thing that worries me the most is that they say that you have to have this goal in order for us to double the electricity system. It must mean that the Moderates see a risk that we will get more fossil fuels. This is actually the path that has been followed when taxes on fossil fuels, including electricity production, have been reduced, and no requirements have been placed on renewable fuels in the power reserve, for example. I am very surprised by that attitude and that you should have unambitious goals that have already been achieved.

My question is again: Can you mention when the Karlshamnsverket has been run to support the Swedish electricity system? It hasn't happened. Rather, it has been Poland that has been supported. It has been a very long time since the Karlshamnsverket was run. Let's stick to the facts! Then I would like to hear about another goal that has already been achieved when it is introduced, because that is what we are actually voting on now in the Riksdag.

Ref. 112 MATS GREEN (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is about a fossil-free goal instead of a renewable goal. Renewables are just code for ditching nuclear power in all its parts, fully. The Center Party says that they can certainly imagine new nuclear power. I welcome it. Then we'll see how many party leadership changes there will be - we don't really know that. But I welcome that reversal.

I hope that the Center Party supports the government in making it 100 percent fossil-free by 2045 and that we also have doubled electricity production.

We can always discuss the reduction obligation. We were able to take part in an interesting report from the National Audit Office. If you read the entire report, you can see that there is quite sharp criticism, above all regarding the consequences for the environment of the reduction obligation that has been introduced. You have to admit that in some way.

Then to the question of the Karlshamnsverket. Karlshamnsverket was set on fire, among other things, to support a hopeless electricity situation in southern Sweden. The fact that some of it was exported, just as some other electricity is exported, is a question in itself. The electricity market is part of the EU's internal market.

It was also set on fire to deal with all the damaging effects of, among other things, the Center Party's involvement in dismantling the most basic parts of the Swedish power system.

Again: Nuclear power has been shut down, cogeneration has been discounted and hydropower has been scrapped. These are the problems that we are now putting enormous effort into trying to solve.

It will not be solved overnight. This is precisely why the work needs to continue and that today we need to make a decision on a new energy policy goal for Sweden.

Ref. 113 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you for your speech, Member!

I want to talk a little about nuclear power, a dear subject. The member's own party once pushed the issue of decommissioning nuclear power. Now it feels like a very long time ago. Sometimes it seems that there is a certain amnesia about the history of nuclear power.

We had a referendum in 1980 that was a result of a nuclear accident in Harrisburg, USA. This made the Swedish people vote to phase out nuclear power.

My question is actually connected to the exchange of words that the member had with the Social Democratic member. There, the member claimed that the Social Democrats shut down nuclear power. I have worked with energy issues for a long time. I didn't even know the Social Democrats owned nuclear power. That was news to me.

In addition, the member said that there had been increased costs for nuclear power. That's right. In 2011, an accident occurred in Fukushima that was equivalent to 168 Hiroshima bombs. After that, it was decided to have independent core cooling. The Swedish nuclear power plants did not have that, so they had to upgrade.

I wonder if the member thinks it was an unnecessary measure. At the same time, I wonder why the member's party chose to leave the energy agreement where the extra cost was balanced by removing the effect tax for nuclear power. It might not have been something that my party had chosen in the first place.

Ref. 114 MATS GREEN (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! It may be that in these minutes I cannot answer the approximately 36 questions that I received from the colleague, but I will give it a good try.

As a very proud conservative, I can say that the Moderates have never wanted to shut down Swedish nuclear power. It would be interesting to get an example of this. It's the first time I've heard that. That would be a paradox.

While we're still on the subject of paradoxes, it's a fact that the Green Party are also pretty big opponents of wind power. In a report two weeks ago, I think it was, it was concluded that in the boards where the Green Party is part of, the probability of saying no to wind power increases by 11 percent. I fully understand that. People probably say no to it for the right reasons. But that says quite a lot about the environmentalists there.

It is also interesting to note that when it comes to offshore wind power, the government has approved twice as many offshore wind farms in eight months as the previous S-MP government approved in eight years. That says quite a lot. It is also a fact.

A question was asked if I have any views on additional safety measures being taken when various accidents occur in different types of power and in this case nuclear power. Obviously not. You must always make sure that nothing is saved in order to have the highest possible security.

It is interesting when the environmentalists think that we are sloppy who accuse the Social Democrats of having dismantled nuclear power. I note that everyone who previously went and chanted in the streets and squares that nuclear power should be removed, and also said that they have removed nuclear power, now say: We never said that. They don't want to torture us with any kind of factual knowledge here.

We can also state that Magdalena Andersson promised to phase out nuclear power in 2013. That was perhaps the only promise she kept.

Ref. 115 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you member! I note that I didn't really get answers to all the questions, but there may be many.

It is certainly the case that the member's party pushed line 1 of gradual decommissioning in 1980. On the other hand, there was no alternative that said no to decommissioning.

My question remains. The cost increases that hit nuclear power producers had to do with various types of safety mechanisms that had to be put in place after Fukushima. In our opinion, you as a producer should bear those costs yourself.

I also want to ask a little bit about uranium mining. I asked the Sweden Democrat member earlier. Where in Sweden does member Mats Green think we should mine uranium? Or should we be dependent on importing uranium from, for example, Russia?

Ref. 116 MATS GREEN (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Where in Sweden should uranium be mined? There are, of course, a number of factors that may be included in that assessment. But if we have uranium and need uranium, I think we should mine it.

I can answer the question. Sweden is very rich in earth metals. Earth metals are needed in almost all environmental technologies. Where does the Green Party think they should be broken?

It is not considered that they should be mined in Sweden. Then the friend of order says: Then the Green Party only wants to mine the earth metals in countries with disgusting environmental conditions and disgusting working conditions. It is of course completely unsustainable.

We say exactly the same thing as colleague Jessica Stegrud here earlier. If we need minerals and earth metals for our green transition and we have them in Sweden, we should not have any fundamentalist ban on mining them here where it is appropriate.

Then it must be noted that the Swedish uranium is unfortunately not as high-quality as, for example, the Canadian one. But we still have to get rid of all the prohibitions on thought and stop laws that exist in Sweden if we really believe in the green transition.

Then I will say a few words about the power tax and nuclear power. It was the power tax that was used to shut down Swedish nuclear power in addition to a number of other tools, including agreements in 1997.

The Green Party was not there. But the Center Party, the Left Party and the Social Democrats made an agreement in 1997 to close Barsebäck. Then you started with all this, and then you continued.

Vattenfall's former manager says that the impact tax was the single biggest reason why it was forced to start shutting down fully functioning climate-smart nuclear power in Sweden. Those are the facts, Madam Speaker.

Ref. 117 BIRGER LAHTI (V):

Madam Speaker! Now it's getting a little hard to stick to the script after everything I've heard. But I will try.

The debate is about the spring amendment budget. It is somewhat unusual for me from the food committee to get involved in the debate on the amendment budget.

The government submits two proposals for ordinary amending budgets per year to the Riksdag. It is the proposal for the spring amendment budget that is presented in connection with the spring economic bill and the proposal for the autumn amendment budget that is presented in connection with the budget bill.

The Left Party of course presents its budget alternative by moving on the budget bill. The government's amendment budgets are presented in relation to the budget bill.

The Left Party does not normally move on the government's two ordinary amendment budgets. The main reason for this is, of course, that the proposals for the amendment budget are presented in relation to the government's budget proposal, for which the Left Party cannot take responsibility. In order to be able to put forward meaningful proposals for budget amendments, the Left Party would have to put them forward as proposals for changes in its own budget motion as soon as possible, which of course is not possible.

Madam Speaker! In order to realize our policy, a different approach than that proposed by the government is needed, and we therefore do not participate in the decision on the spring amendment budget for 2023.

However, the government has chosen to put forward a new energy policy target. I don't know how many times the parties that are part of the government today and its support party have trumpeted this with 100 percent renewables. I've been hearing that for years, and I wouldn't have bothered to react if the parties pushing that line had at least been honest in their argument. But it is claimed time and time again that politics has closed reactors. Sometimes they have referred to some statements from the Green Party, and I can agree that not all statements may have been so well thought out. But if the owners of these reactors had the same idea of why they were taken out of service, the compensation demands on the government would have arrived like a letter in the mail.

The Left Party stands behind the reservation under the decision point about a new energy policy goal and the reservation under the decision point about broad energy policy talks during the current mandate period. I therefore want to make it clear that we request approval of both of the reservations we have in the report, Madam Speaker. I hope someone else lifts the other one, so I don't have to lift two.

Our reservation regarding a new energy policy goal is about promoting long-termism in energy policy. However, we want to highlight some crucial aspects regarding a new energy policy goal and what conversations about energy policy should concern. For the Left Party, it is important to have clearly defined milestones for expanding wind power and solar energy to the extent and with the intensity required.

The Left Party has for a long time pursued a policy that promotes a 100 percent renewable energy system and that gives us cheap and competitive electricity. I and the Left Party do not share the reservists' faith in market pricing, i.e. how electricity should be priced to avoid unreasonably high prices for Swedish-produced electricity. Therefore, we will continue to push the demand for Swedish prices in the future.

Households and businesses are broken by the high electricity prices. They are admittedly low now, but we'll see when autumn comes. At the same time, Sweden is the largest exporter of electricity in Europe. A different price model is simply needed, which brings the electricity price back to normal levels – a kind of price protection for Swedish consumers.

Sweden prices means that we regulate the market by decoupling the Swedish electricity prices from the sky-high export prices for electricity sold to the continent. We heard, for example, why Karlshamn was running - there was economy in selling the electricity to Poland at a high price during those hours. With Sweden prices, we get significantly lower electricity prices for households and speed up climate change. We believe that this model is the best solution in the near term to counter the price shocks that come in the wake of the electricity price model we have now.

Electricity supply is fundamental to a functioning society, and greater national control over both energy and prices is necessary. Electricity cannot be treated as any market commodity, disconnected from geography and history. It is part of a historical and strategic context with national industrial and residential structure and investments in production and transmission, now and in the future. This must form a starting point for energy policy.

That the EU's common market and pricing does not work as intended, I think that the last year's high electricity prices have clearly shown. Since the price of electricity is set based on what it costs to produce the last purchased electricity on the market – this is what is called marginal pricing – this means that the expensive fossil electricity sets the price for all consumers. We want to get away from that.

Sweden must, of course, continue to export electricity to our neighboring countries, but consumers and industries in Sweden must not have to suffer from the fact that other countries have failed in their domestic energy supply and thereby driven up electricity prices for everyone. What is happening today is that we are paying these prices to the electricity companies, who are making huge profits. I think it is high time to take back control over such a socially important function as how electricity is priced - and above all over at least our self-produced electricity, which goes to our consumers, companies and industries.

Madam Speaker! Earlier today I listened to the debate on economic policy guidelines. I listened to some exchanges where the government's support party, the Sweden Democrats, asked themselves where all the electrical energy needed to implement the transition that is underway regarding steel without coal and everything else is going to come from. And it is clear - with the government's policy of actively slowing down renewable electricity to the market, questions like this actually arise. But they don't realize that it is precisely the pursued policy, which the SD themselves support, that makes it more uncertain.

With the incentive investigation, for example, the tool that would have made a difference in such a way that more municipalities would say yes to more wind power was removed. Namely, the government thought that the money that the property tax would have contributed to the state budget was better needed to lower the tax for the most affluent.

I actually think that the government is harmful to competitiveness and above all to the industry of the future, which now sees itself overtaken by the industry of countries that realize that cheap

energy production can be built in the near future. The industry cannot wait for nuclear power, which may be in place in 15 years.

Ref. 118 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! I thank Birger Lahti for the speech.

The member talks about the goal of 100 percent renewables and that it is an important goal for the Left Party. I continue, true to my habit, to ask completely concrete questions. How will that happen? What does the Left Party see as a coup instead? What do you think of as balance, reserve and effect power? And when in time could this be feasible?

Ref. 119 BIRGER LAHTI (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! I thank Jessica Stegrud for the questions.

Today we have a system where nuclear power is a very important part. It is struggling, and the Left Party is not in favor of closing it by political means. It will certainly be tough for quite a while. But I think that the Sweden Democrats are missing something in their eagerness to pursue nuclear power policy.

If you listen to the industry, you hear that they want cheap electricity production, which today actually means wind power. It is volatile in terms of prices, and the industry wants a large surplus - because then they make hydrogen. It is hydrogen that is the key to the industrial transition. It is not that the industry needs power for a few hours at a certain time, but the strategy to get away from coal in production is simply based on hydrogen.

This is what does not come into place with this eagerness to slow down renewable wind power in the belief that everything will be solved with nuclear power. If we get investors who are willing to invest in nuclear power, it is quite possible that we will have it in place in 15 years, but the industrial investments in northern Sweden need cheap electricity production - and preferably volatile, because then you can make a lot of hydrogen when prices are low.

The Sweden Democrats never have that discussion. People talk about paint coming off the wings of wind turbines, but they don't talk about the thousands of tons of waste from Sweden's nuclear power that we still don't have an answer on how to deal with. I think that's a bit strange. People strain mosquitoes and swallow camels.

Ref. 120 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! I note that it is not possible to get an answer on this question. I can draw no other conclusion than that it is about very utopian goals that cannot be reached. At least it is not possible to set a time frame or a price for them or say how it will be done.

This is the constant question when talking about hydrogen. I gave a much too long speech earlier – I apologize for that, Madam Speaker – and spent a large part of the time explaining how incredibly much electricity is required to produce the hydrogen that the Left Party likes to

talk about using in electricity production and also for storage. This requires enormous capacity. The question remains: Where will this electricity come from?

We need something to settle with today. There is a reason why it looks the way it does in southern Sweden. You can brag about the fact that we lead the export league, but that doesn't help. It's volatile, and it mixes. Lack of power is mixed with electricity surplus. This is not a sign of a healthy market.

The left party wants to step in and change the price model and run a planned economy in an attempt to stabilize prices. It might be possible to do that, but I don't think it will lead to incentives for the right types of power to be established in the parts of the country where we need them.

The constant question remains: How will it be done? What kind of balance and reserve power do you envision in a transition? All this with hydrogen is infinitely far into the future. It also hasn't been tried on a large scale, so we don't actually know if it will even work.

I also have one last question. How does the Left Party view the fact that the type of power that it advocates, i.e. wind power, is increasingly owned by the Chinese state and Chinese investors? Is this a problem for the Left Party?

Ref. 121 BIRGER LAHTI (V) replica:

Madam Speaker! I request approval of both of the reservations that we are on.

Yes, the Left Party thinks it is a problem that the Chinese own a lot of wind power. We have missed something there - Sjöbo also said that during a hearing in the committee.

It is not as easy to expand offshore or onshore wind power with the policies pursued by this government. With precision, the incentives in the investigation that would have made municipalities say yes are removed. Then it becomes more difficult.

Speaking of hydrogen storage, it is not above all the storage that we need today, but what we need is hydrogen for the industrial transition. It must be used in the reduction in steel production.

I listened to Stegrud's speech, and the historical description was correct in itself - from being one of the poorest countries, Sweden became that industrial country. I am convinced that we would not have succeeded if we had had a party like the Sweden Democrats in the Riksdag when we needed immigration. We brought in so many people – you can't even count them. Sweden has been an open country, and that has made Sweden successful. We would not have succeeded with the policy that this government, with the help of the Sweden Democrats, is pursuing. The member only focuses on energy production, but there were other pieces of the puzzle that were oh so important at the time.

Ref. 122 CAMILLA BRODIN (KD):

Madam Speaker! Today, there has been a desire for a special focus on the debate regarding the spring amendment budget. This is because this Spring Amendment Budget proposes a new energy policy target from the Government which means that it should be 100 per cent fossil free instead of 100 per cent renewable, as so many before me have said in this rostrum over the last hour.

The energy policy really engages, and that pleases me. Energy and electricity production is a core issue for our society and has been for a very long time, but we have been so spoiled by having a world-class system that we have barely even thought about it.

In recent years, however, we have had many reasons to not only think but act to restore our country's ability to produce stable, reliable and fossil-free electricity at a competitive price. That is why I am happy that we now have a government that is able to point out a clarified goal that all electricity production should be fossil-free. The wording "renewable" does not work if we seriously believe that we should be able to double electricity production.

Madam Speaker! It is very positive for Sweden that the Social Democrats and the government have a consensus regarding the need to quickly expand fossil-free electricity production in Sweden. That politicians agree that all good forces are needed is a good basis for the green transition.

In order for us to succeed in implementing the extensive electrification required to achieve the climate goals and enable the green industrial transition, all fossil-free power types are really needed, which I have talked about so many times in this chamber over many years.

The description of the needs that the Social Democrats make in their motion, including the needs in the shorter term than until 2040, the governing parties fully agree with. Unfortunately, it is very likely not practically possible, no matter how much we would like it, to achieve such a large addition as 60 terawatt hours already by 2030. The government is working purposefully to shorten the permit processes for all fossil-free energy production and for electricity grids and remove the obstacles which exists when it comes to building new nuclear power. However, a target bound by the Riksdag that is not realistic does not please anyone.

Madam Speaker! Based on an overview analysis of the authorities' latest scenarios, the following can be said: In 2022, electricity production was approximately 170 terawatt hours, and electricity use was 137 terawatt hours. The net export was thus 33 terawatt hours. The Energy Agency's latest scenarios establish a need for around 35 terawatt hours of new electricity production between 2021 and 2030.

Since the increase in the near term mainly comes from wind power, a continued surplus - exports - over the year is required to cover the need. According to calculations, it looks like production in 2030 will end up somewhere around 210–220 terawatt hours. This means an increase of 40–50 terawatt hours from 2022.

When it is wind power that accounts for the majority of the expansion, it will not give a marked increase in power allocation to new industries. Wind power contributes energy and probably to lower electricity prices seen over a year, but it does not contribute any large amount of power - i.e. megawatts - and will therefore not enable the transition to 2030 as the Social Democrats seem to envision.

Wind power has approximately a 9 percent capacity factor, while nuclear power and hydropower have close to 100 percent. For example, 1,000 megawatts of nuclear power would enable approximately 1,000 megawatts of connection to new electricity customers, while 1,000 megawatts of wind power would enable less than 100 megawatts of allocation to new industries.

So it is not enough to only have a plan for terawatts, but it is important that, in addition to 100 percent fossil-free and planning goals, we respect the laws of physics and develop an efficient electricity system that delivers stable electricity at stable prices during all hours of the year. It is a goal of delivery security.

Add to that all the wind turbines that need to be renewed because their lifespan is 15-20 years for the slightly older ones and possibly 25 years for the slightly newer and taller wind turbines. This will not be invested in by itself, and the debate about the waste from this is largely non-existent in Sweden.

Madam Speaker! When the Nutrition Committee debated the energy issues a few weeks ago, I said the following, and I want to repeat it:

I note that several parties in the opposition are calling for broad energy policy talks. I'm just saying: What are you waiting for? Don't sit on your hands and wait to be invited! The dance is already underway, and the floor is free to tread! Soon you won't even need a dance license to dance.

It is high time that politics aligns itself with what the business world and citizens want, that is, to be constructive and work to create conditions where the market players will dare and want to plow down billions to give our country the electricity that is needed for us to meet climate goals and welfare and be able to continue to be competitive.

The government is giving all political parties in the Riksdag this chance, because you are all invited to contribute to the energy policy bill to be presented this autumn. What we don't have time for is creating conversation preparations where time just passes without anything actually happening. It is actually time to move from words to action.

I request approval of the committee's proposal.

(Applause)

In this speech, Cecilia Engström and Camilla Rinaldo Miller (both KD) agreed.

Ref. 123 RICKARD NORDIN (C):

Madam Speaker! Today, the Riksdag votes on the proposal for the spring amendment budget. It is a rather unusual budget because it is not only about the budget itself, but almost by a side sentence the government wants to change Sweden's energy targets. Instead of anchoring the new energy target, the government has chosen a path that creates even more uncertainty.

Sweden needs an enormous amount of electricity in the coming years for the electrification of transport and for the green industries that invest in the production of fossil-free products. Forecasts from the Energy Agency show that the need for electricity can already double by 2035, and the energy companies estimate that Sweden's need for electricity in 2045 will be 330 terawatt hours, which can be compared to our current production of around 170 terawatt hours.

Recently there was a report that industry alone may need over 70 terawatt hours in 2030, and then the Social Democrats' new goal of 60 terawatt hours by 2030 seems a little unambitious. But I get even more concerned when the Christian Democrats say that 60 terawatt hours by 2030 is unrealistic and impossible. Does the government and the Christian Democrats' energy minister want to send the message to business that its needs are unrealistic? To me this is astounding. The business world, the green industry and the energy industry are incredibly clear that in order to manage the energy supply and start investing, not only new conditions are required but long-term rules of the game. But the Christian Democrats argue about this in the rostrum and talk about dance permits.

If we are to cope with climate change and the energy supply, all fossil-free forms of power are needed. It's nothing strange. Ever since the energy agreement in 2009, the Center Party has accepted that new nuclear power may be built. It was also confirmed in the broad energy agreement in 2016, and we stand by that. However, it makes sense to start with what is fastest and cheapest to build, and we see investors across Europe investing more in onshore and offshore wind power, which has become much cheaper and more efficient.

Sweden has an enormous wind power potential corresponding to several times today's total electricity production. But while our neighboring countries in the EU are fast-tracking new wind power, the government is delaying wind power and even making it more difficult for it, apparently under pressure from the Sweden Democrats, while here in the chamber people like to talk about it being a problem in various ways.

Most new onshore wind power projects are also stopped due to a lack of decisions on reasonable local compensation for municipalities and local residents. There is now an investigation, and I expect the government to proceed with it but also look more broadly at electricity grids and other things. The problem is that many times it is the Tidö parties that stop the expansion locally, not infrequently together with the Green Party. Therefore, we see that the expansion rate falls sharply.

We have the same solar conditions as Germany, and there are lots of projects about solar power waiting on the table of the authorities. If the government had clarified the regulations, which the county administrations are requesting, they could have prioritized this more clearly. Not least in Skåne, enormous potential is waiting to be realized. And the solar tax that taxes own consumption is still there.

The pause in the environmental review of hydropower is important. The center party has clearly pushed for this here in the chamber. We have taken committee initiatives and other things that the Tidö parties have followed up on, which is excellent. But the government has not done anything concrete. They have sent out a couple of investigative missions but have not been able to answer clear questions about what they actually intend to do. There is a rush because the trials start again on February 1 next year, and we are already seeing how potential is being unleashed. An important chance to set things right is thus being squandered away.

The combined heat and power strategy that we and the Tidö parties agreed upon and made an announcement about is said to have already been completed, even though there are no proposals. The only thing that exists is the mission, the mission that the previous government gave to the Energy Agency. Nevertheless, the government thinks it is time to write off the announcement.

The government has also actively made it more difficult for those who want to use flexibility and storage and with legislation made this more difficult and less profitable, including by going further than the EU requirements require. Even though the government said just a week ago that they should not over-implement, they have already done so.

The investigation into energy efficiency was dropped despite the fact that the potential is enormous and that the realization of this potential is absolutely crucial to buy us time during the expansion of new production.

I can go on. In the case of energy communities, where many private individuals come together to expand electricity production, the government does nothing. Storage, networks and other things that you can do with your own funds, I thought that a libertarian-minded government would welcome, but bourgeois, liberal politics is probably only the Center Party that stands for these days.

The only thing the government has really embraced is nuclear power, and there are a lot of things you can do there. The center party has highlighted, not least, power increases so that the network problems that have been experienced in Forsmark are resolved. The big problem, however, is that the Tidö parties time and again pit nuclear power against wind power. In the debate, we have heard that nuclear power must be expanded so that wind power can be expanded or that wind power should not be expanded because nuclear power must be expanded first. This is simply not true.

The government says it accepts all fossil-free power. But you don't do that in reality, and that's the problem. Instead of just waiting for new nuclear power, which may come when other conditions are given to build it, one can at least do what can be done in the meantime and create long-term rules of the game in broad energy agreements. We even heard the Sweden Democrats highlight this as important. Instead of a box of questions to dance around, it makes sense that we get together for real conversations. It doesn't have to take a long time to come to an agreement.

At the same time that Sweden appears to be missing its climate targets, the government is scrapping climate measures without replacing them with anything else, despite the fact that we hear how the business community is crying out for measures.

Today's vote is a clear example of how the government is trying to create conflict instead of cooperation on the energy issue. Instead of including it in the spring amendment budget and almost forcing the opposition to, as is customary, vote no to the government's spring budget, they could have invited broad discussions. Now they are squeezing in a goal of completely fossil-free electricity production by 2040 to mark how much they stand behind nuclear power. To me it is a strange handling. Why should we have a goal for 2040 that we are basically already achieving today? After all, we produce almost only fossil-free energy in the form of hydropower, nuclear power, biopower, solar power and wind power. For me, this will just be another step in the government's weak climate ambitions, where environmentalism is lowered.

In this context, it may be appropriate to quote Verner von Heidenstam who, like the government, started out as a liberal and then went in a more conservative direction: "It is nicer to listen to a broken string than to never string a bow." This government pulls no punches; it has hardly even been manufactured. With such a goal, it feels more like you are working with attack being the best defense, because in the Swedish energy system, fossil-free electricity production is nothing new under the sun.

In addition, if you really want long-term and broad anchoring, why do you put the goal in an afterthought? This is political theatre, and that is also why we are asking for approval of reservation 1.

The green transition is an opportunity for Sweden, but the government seems to think that it is about green varnish that plays less role and that it is not so important to be ahead. But nothing could be more wrong. The green transition is absolutely crucial for the competitiveness of Sweden and the business world. From the business community, it is crystal clear that the 2030 goals on the climate side are the most important. There was a hundred percent turnout when a survey was conducted with all participants from the business community at the government's climate meeting last Friday.

These targets simply create an adjustment pressure - an already achieved 2040 target does not. They create an adjustment pressure, and they provide the opportunity to export

climate-smart products to the world after they have been tested in a stable domestic market. The government's laxity threatens both the climate and jobs.

Let me be clear: The Center Party has nothing against a goal of a fossil-free electricity system by 2040. But the logical thing would be to have a goal that actually means something, such as that the entire energy system, including transport, heating and inputs for industry, should be fossil-free by 2040. It would have been a goal that we could really work towards. It would have been a much better goal. Then you would have shown that you understand the sector connections that we now see. We see an electrification not least of heat, fuel and inputs, but sometimes electric heating should be removed in favor of other sectors, cogeneration or district heating for example. There will be demand for many different types of fossil-free power in the future. There is no doubt about it. They fulfill different roles in our energy system. Therefore, it is foolish to block profitable power now in anticipation of nuclear power later.

My call to Ulf Kristersson, Ebba Busch and my colleagues from the Tidöpartierna is: If you are serious about securing long-term access to fossil-free electricity in Sweden, then you know where you have us. You don't need to sneak meaningless goals into spring change budgets. Make sure that the invitation you recently sent is not just a coffee break with a suggestion box, but instead turns into serious conversations. We are ready to do our part. It is crucial for the climate, for household electricity prices and for Swedish competitiveness.

Ref. 124 BIRGER LAHTI (V) replica:

Madam Speaker! If there is any energy policy spokesperson who deserves respect, it is Rickard Nordin. I pretty much agree with everything he says.

Madam Speaker! I requested a reply because I forgot to wish a really nice summer to Madam Speaker, the Chancellery and my colleagues. Now that I have the chance, I want to wish a really nice summer and respect to Rickard Nordin. I wasn't going to use my second line.

Ref. 125 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I thank Birger Lahti. I was very curious as to what kind of reply I would get. I was looking forward to it!

But I can also wish Birger Lahti, the colleagues and the Speaker a happy summer when I soon step down after the next line.

Ref. 126 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! I thank Rickard Nordin for the speech, and now we are here again.

I heard that the member - and I have also heard it in other contexts - likes to talk about the Center Party as a liberal, bourgeois party. I read today, or if it was yesterday, the Center Party's proposal for the EU and the climate goals in the EU. It made me think of a planned economic alternative. It didn't feel very liberal or bourgeois.

I have a concrete question about EU politics, which also reflects how you see politics here at home. This applies to the proposal that by 2040 there should be no fossil-based energy production within the EU. We are therefore talking about the fact that in a little over 15 years there will be no fossil fuels in energy production. We have very large countries, such as Poland and Italy, which are 80 to 85 percent dependent on fossil fuels.

My question is how it should be done concretely and realistically. What would it cost, and what would the consequences be? I was of course thinking in terms of price and purely concretely for competitiveness and so on. I understand you can't go into details here, but I'd love to hear the reasoning. Because it is undeniably an extremely ambitious goal that I personally find very unrealistic.

Ref. 127 THIRD DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I remind you that the subject is the spring amendment budget for 2023.

Ref. 128 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! It was undeniably a splicing from the member. But I can inform the member that these countries that the member refers to are behind this. It is not just about a goal that the Center Party has. But I think it's a pretty good goal. I think we should have the same goal in Sweden, that is, one that also applies to the entire energy system and not just electricity production.

All electricity production is included in the EU's emissions trading. The EU's emissions trading is moving towards zero by 2039, and these countries have signed up to that. This is therefore not a conflict within the EU.

If the member thinks it is unrealistic, let it stand for the Sweden Democrats. Rather, I think it is absolutely necessary. This is needed to phase out fossil fuels where we know there are alternatives and where we need to do everything we can to take our responsibility in the climate issue. Rather, I see this as fully realistic and fully possible, and the other countries have also signed up to it. So there is no conflict here.

Ref. 129 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! I want to take the opportunity to do what I missed in my speech, namely to wish everyone a happy summer and thank you for good cooperation in the committee!

Ref. 130 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I thank Jessica Stegrud for this. We can only hope that the next National Assembly, which opens in September, will involve more cooperation and less conflict and that the invitations we have received are genuine and lead to the broad agreements that we heard Jessica Stegrud call for. I think that would have been something to look forward to during the summer.

Ref. 131 LOUISE EKLUND (L):

Madam Speaker! Sweden needs a new energy policy. I think all of us in this room can agree on that. We never want to get back to such a winter as we went through. We saw power shortages, we had rampant electricity prices and we had production that was not always where it was needed geographically. That is why it is so important that we now get a new energy policy goal in place where we change the energy policy goal formulation from 100 percent renewable to 100 percent fossil-free. Through this change, technology neutrality is restored in that no fossil-free power source is discriminated against. We thereby increase the possibilities for investments in all kinds of energy production. This is of course perfectly fine.

Madam Speaker! The production, distribution and use of electricity will need to double within 20 years. We have heard a number of figures in the last few hours, and I will not repeat them, but it is clear that if we are to pass the green transition and reach the goals we have set, we will need to expand electricity production of various types in balance at the same time as the power grid is strengthened. We therefore have a big and responsible job ahead of us.

We need to invest a lot, not only in energy production but also in an expansion of both the transmission network and the local and regional networks. It is only through such an expansion that we are able to handle the energy challenge, both in the long and short term. As has been said here several times before, in the long term it is precisely about expanding capacity and production so that we can meet the doubled need. Here, nuclear power and, to some extent, offshore wind power are decisive. As has also been said here before, this government has actually managed to achieve a number of more permits for offshore wind power than the previous government managed.

Here and now, we simultaneously need to remedy the extensive problems we have with the energy supply, mainly in southern Sweden. It is important to make use of all forms of energy, not least to make better use of the potential of cogeneration. It is important to secure a power reserve, as Svenska kraftnät has now done with the Öresund Agency, and it is important to ensure that investments in the networks continue. Of course, we also have to continue with the energy efficiency improvement that we saw taking place throughout the country during last winter. Here, too, the government has provided incentives to continue that work. In the short term we need to strengthen the energy system, and in the long term we need to greatly expand it.

Madam Speaker! Against this background, I emphasize once again the importance of us setting a new energy policy goal. It has been a little waved off here in the chamber that it would be needed. I don't share that image at all. On the contrary, the changed objective is important as a signal value to energy producers, to the business community and to the entire Swedish people that we need to secure energy production going forward.

Nuclear power has a special position as it is the only fossil-free energy type that can both be expanded on a large scale and is planable. For the electricity system to function, electricity production is required that can meet the demand regardless of the weather. This is why the

government is now putting so much effort into ensuring that the obstacles to building new nuclear power are removed.

For decades, Swedish electricity customers have been able to trust that the electricity works. The cost has also been predictable. That is the order we need to get back to. Changing the energy policy goal so that we can now again use all the types of power that are available is a big and important step for Sweden to continue to be both an industrial country and a welfare nation.

I therefore request approval of the committee's proposed decision.

(Applause)

Ref. 132 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP):

Madam Speaker! The Swedish energy system is facing hugely exciting challenges, as we have heard before here today. In just over ten years, until 2035, Sweden's electricity needs will double at the same time that our existing stock will have to be replaced as it will become too old. After that, the need for electricity will continue to increase, as Sweden's industry and vehicle fleet become electric instead of fossil.

It is important to underline that this challenge is in many ways something positive. It is the result of Swedish and international companies choosing Sweden to establish new industries and companies. These are businesses that contribute to Sweden's economic prosperity and to Swedish green jobs. These are activities that, in the long run, create conditions for living and living in our entire long country. These activities are the foundation of the social transformation we are facing.

Without active politics, however, this vision will not become a reality. The Green Party's policy rests on three energy policy pillars: new production, energy efficiency and smart grids - flex.

First, we must invest in the power production that can be quickly expanded on a large enough scale to meet the needs, and that is wind power, both on land and at sea. Unlike the government, which makes it more difficult for the wind power companies at point after point, we instead want to increase the expansion rate for wind power and create the conditions for municipalities, nearby residents and local communities to make money from the establishment of wind power. It should be an engine in local economic development and provide much-needed money for schools, health care and welfare.

But just building new power generation is not enough. We have heard representatives of the government and the Tidö parties stand here and talk about the enormous energy needs that we have going forward. And then there is constant talk about production. The Liberal member mentioned energy efficiency, which was good, but this loose with its absence from the others.

All energy production has an environmental impact. If we are to keep our societies within all planetary boundaries, the climate and energy transition must also relate to the fact that we live on a planet with finite resources where our ecosystems are already under enormous pressure.

We must learn to do more with less. The way we use energy simply has to become smarter, more efficient and better without this automatically meaning that it becomes more complicated for our households and businesses.

For this to become a reality, we must welcome, not oppose, the technologies, business models and companies that will exist and operate in the energy market of the future. We must welcome aggregators and flex markets, both nationally and locally. Then electricity customers will be able to make money, not only from lower prices but also from flex in kroner.

I will talk a little more about energy efficiency. There are many reports that show big gains with energy efficiency. Industry can save as much as 10 terawatt-hours, and when it comes to the potential from buildings, there is talk of 53 terawatt-hours. It is about a large part of the consumption that we have today, which can actually be removed and used for both the transformation of industry and the electrification of the transport sector. It is therefore not only about adding new production, but also about using energy smarter.

If we are to be able to keep pace with business, politics must pick up the pace. Otherwise, neither households nor companies will be able to reap the benefits of a smart and modern energy system. And what does that mean in practice? Yes, more expensive electricity for everyone.

Madam Speaker! The government has put forward a proposal for a new energy policy goal: 100 percent fossil-free electricity by 2045. I want to start by dwelling on how the government chooses to present the energy policy goal.

Sverige AB is, as I said, facing an exciting development with a restructuring of the industrial sector and the transport sector. This transition will help Sweden a bit on the way to achieving our climate goals.

When five parties reached an agreement in 2016, both energy players and the business community breathed a sigh of relief that such a central part of Swedish infrastructure finally got long-term rules of the game. The goal was set at 100 percent renewable electricity production by 2040. It is worth noting, as has been said many times in this chamber, that this in itself does not mean a stop date for existing Swedish nuclear power.

It is therefore remarkable that the government chooses to propose a new energy policy goal in a spring amendment budget without this having been preceded by any initiative for cross-block talks. The question of our energy system and the long-term investments required to create the right conditions for society's needs deserve to be treated with a greater sense of responsibility than that. It is of utmost importance that players can feel confident in making the significant

investments required in the long term without worrying about what happens over four-year cycles.

About a quarter of an hour ago, the Tidö parties announced that the opposition parties are welcome to submit proposals in the energy area. It feels serious. Is it really to take the issue of the energy system seriously and to recognize the importance of long-term agreements?

Then we have the goal itself, which previous speakers have covered. This goal is strange for several reasons, not least because Sweden's electricity is essentially fossil-free already. It has to be the least ambitious change of position in Swedish political history – a bit embarrassing actually.

Simply put, this is about symbolic politics. I would like to focus on what actually matters: the energy market. Today, almost all electricity production that is built globally is renewable. Even in Sweden, it is renewable energy production that the market demands, above all wind power.

Wind power produces cheap energy, and increased volumes of wind power lead to lower electricity prices for households and businesses. New nuclear power is many times more expensive and actually leads to increased prices for customers. In addition to all the other issues that speak against nuclear power - the time aspect and the safety aspect - this should be reason enough. We want to give Swedish households and businesses Europe's cheapest electricity. Then there is only one way forward, and that is, among other things, with a greatly expanded wind power.

The Green Party wants the government to use the money where it does the most good for households, businesses and climate change. This means that we should not use taxpayers' money to make expensive investments in new nuclear power, a technology that exposes our communities to enormous risks and whose societal benefit is highly questionable compared to, for example, wind power.

Therefore, the Green Party still wants the goal for Sweden's energy production to be 100 percent renewable by 2040. However, the Green Party does not want to work for political control to close nuclear power reactors prematurely, as long as they meet high safety requirements and do not require large government support.

In conclusion, I want to dwell a little more on the question of nuclear power.

As I mentioned earlier, all types of production involve an environmental impact. But you can probably still say that nuclear power stands out a little extra. When a nuclear accident occurs, for example through a direct attack or the human factor, the consequences are immense with death and radiation damage. In addition, the possibility of living, living and farming in the affected area is destroyed.

Let's leave that detail for now and instead do a little retrospect.

In 1979, a nuclear accident occurred in Harrisburg, USA. It led to a referendum on nuclear power in Sweden in 1980. All three alternatives were for a phase-out of nuclear power, including line 1 which spoke of a gradual phase-out.

As a result of the vote, a lot of regulations came into place to work in the direction of the result, for example those related to uranium mining.

What actually happened when the energy agreement came into place? After all, we sometimes hear rumors that the red-green government has shut down nuclear power. It was actually Vattenfall that in January 2016 made a statement that they would shut down all nuclear power reactors before 2020 if the power tax was not removed. They referred to the large investments that needed to be made to achieve the requirements for independent core cooling, a requirement that came after the Fukushima accident.

The nuclear power owners were thus faced with a decision to either upgrade the safety of existing facilities or to refrain and thus shut down the facilities in 2020. But then the politicians got together, took a stand and concluded an energy agreement. Sweden thus received a plan for an orderly transition where nuclear power would be replaced by renewable energy and energy efficiency. It would be followed by a plan for implementation.

Just as oil makes us dependent on dictatorships like Saudi Arabia and fossil gas makes us dependent on Russia, there is a corresponding problem with nuclear power, as Russia is one of the countries in the world that produces the most uranium.

There were probably many people who were happy in Västra Götaland, the southern Storsjö area in Jämtland, Närke, Östergötland, Öland and Skåne after the climate minister's announcement that we are going to open uranium mines in Sweden. We have 27 percent of Europe's uranium resources, and in these regions there is uranium-rich alum shale.

It may sound promising, but, for example, LRF does not think that prospecting and mining alum shale should be allowed. The shale coincides with our most fertile agricultural areas, and they are needed in the long term to produce more food and energy. The need for food will increase by 50 percent by 2030 and 100 percent by 2050.

So there are a lot of reasons why there was a referendum and why there are great benefits with the ambition of 100 percent renewables. We believe that it is reasonable and necessary to work towards a goal of 100 percent renewable energy. It must take place through a responsible and planned transition, but then it is required that politicians take responsibility and step in to discuss a long-term energy agreement with a plan for implementation.

I conclude by asking for approval of reservation 1. As a former speaker, I would also like to wish my colleagues, the chancellery and Mrs. Speaker a happy summer.

(Applause)

In this speech, Camilla Hansén, Daniel Helldén, Annika Hirvonen, Katarina Luhr, Jan Riise and Jacob Risberg (all MPs) agreed.

The discussion was hereby concluded.

(Decisions were made under § 9.)

Adjournment

The Chamber decided at 16.15 on the proposal of the third deputy speaker to adjourn the meeting until 16.25, when voting would take place.

Resumed meeting

The meeting resumed at 16.25.

§ 7 Decision on matter that was finally debated on 15 June
MJU18 Food policy

Point 1 (Public procurement of foodstuffs)

1. the committee

2. res. 2 (MP)

Voting:

225 for the committee

15 for res. 2

63 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 60 M, 21 V, 20 C, 16 KD, 14 L

For res. 2: 15MP

Absence: 62 SD, 1 -

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Point 4 (Origin information in restaurants and in other large households)

1. the committee

2. res. 4 (SD)

Voting:

225 for the committee

63 for res. 4

14 abstained

47 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 60 M, 21 V, 20 C, 16 KD, 14 L

For res. 4: 62 SD, 1 -

Distance: 14MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 4 MP, 2 L

Item 13 (Preparation work within the food chain)

1. the committee

2. res. 19 (S, W, C, MP)

Voting:

153 for the committee

150 for res. 19

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 19: 94 S, 21 W, 20 C, 15 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Item 14 (Simplification of rules)

1. the committee

2. res. 21 (C)

Voting:

219 for the committee

21 for res. 21

63 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 60 M, 21 V, 16 KD, 14 MP, 14 L

For res. 21: 20 C, 1MP

Absence: 62 SD, 1 -

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Amanda Lind (MP) reported that she intended to vote yes but was marked as having voted no.

Other points

The House approved the committee's proposal.

§ 8 Decision on matters that were finally debated on 19 June
UU10 Operations in the European Union in 2022

Point 5 (Ecocide)

1. the committee

2. res. 8 (S, W, MP)

Voting:

174 for the committee

129 for res. 8

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 1 S, 62 SD, 60 M, 20 C, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 8: 93 S, 21 V, 15 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Kadir Kasirga (S) reported that he intended to vote no but was marked as having voted yes.

Item 10 (Terrorist listing of the Wagner group)

1. the committee

2. res. 14 (S, W, C, MP)

Voting:

153 for the committee

150 for res. 14

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 14: 94 S, 21 W, 20 C, 15 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Paragraph 11 (Israel)

Proposals were first made regarding the committee's proposal for a decision and then regarding the justification.

Proposition for resolution:

1. the committee
2. res. 15 (W, MP)

Voting:

266 for the committee

36 for res. 15

1 abstained

46 absent

The Chamber approved the committee's proposal for a decision.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 62 SD, 60 M, 19 C, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 15: 21 V, 15 MP

Tolerance: 1 C

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Anna Lasses (C) reported that she intended to vote yes but was marked as having abstained from voting.

The justification:

Approval of

1. the committee's justification
2. the justification in res. 16 (S)

Voting:

155 for the committee

94 for res. 16

54 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's reasoning.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 16 KD, 2 MP, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 16: 94 S

Resistance: 21 V, 20 C, 13 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Paragraph 13 (Iran)

1. the committee
2. res. 19 (S, C)
3. res. 20 (SD)

Preparatory vote:

113 for res. 19

64 for res. 20

126 abstained

46 absent

The Chamber assisted res. 19.

Fredrik Olovsson (S) reported that he intended to vote yes but was marked as having voted no.

Main vote:

125 for the committee

114 for res. 19

63 abstained

47 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 60 M, 21 V, 16 KD, 14 MP, 14 L

For res. 19: 94 S, 20 C

Distance: 61 SD, 1 MP, 1 -

Absent: 13 S, 11 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Amanda Lind (MP) reported that she intended to vote yes but was marked as having abstained from voting.

Paragraph 14 (Cuba)

1. the committee

2. res. 21 (C)

Voting:

260 for the committee

20 for res. 21

23 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 93 S, 62 SD, 60 M, 1 V, 16 KD, 13 MP, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 21: 20 C

Resistance: 1 S, 20 V, 2 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Louise Thunström (S) reported that she intended to vote yes but was marked as having abstained from voting.

Samuel Gonzalez Westling (V) reported that he intended to abstain but was marked as having voted yes.

Other points

The House approved the committee's proposal.

JuU26 Extended police powers in border areas

Point 1 (Extended police powers in border areas)

1. the committee

2. res. 1 (V)

Voting:

268 for the committee

21 for res. 1

14 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 62 SD, 60 M, 20 C, 16 KD, 1 MP, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 1: 21 W

Distance: 14MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Item 2

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Item 3 (Strong Discrimination Act)

1. the committee

2. res. 4 (MP)

Voting:

267 for the committee

15 for res. 4

21 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 62 SD, 60 M, 20 C, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 4: 15 MP

Voltage: 21 V

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

JuU27 Sharpened view of crimes against journalists and certain other socially useful functions

Point 1 (Government's bill)

1. the committee

2. res. 1 (V)

The House approved the committee's proposal with acclamation.

Point 3 (Strong criminal protection for opinion leaders etc.)

1. the committee

2. res. 3 (MP)

Voting:

288 for the committee

15 for res. 3

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 62 SD, 60 M, 21 V, 20 C, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 3: 15MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Other points

The House approved the committee's proposal.

JuU29 Account of the activities within the joint parliamentary control group for Europol and the work of the Riksdag delegation in 2022

The House approved the committee's proposal.

JuU30 Secrecy at the Courts Agency for individuals' contact details

The House approved the committee's proposal.

TU13 Traffic safety

Point 7 (Traffic safety during road works and rescue operations)

1. the committee

2. res. 10 (S)

3. res. 11 (SD)

Preparatory vote:

96 for res. 10

63 for res. 11

144 abstained

46 absent

The Chamber assisted res. 10.

Elisabeth Thand Ringqvist (C) reported that she intended to abstain from voting but was marked as having voted yes.

Main vote:

146 for the committee

94 for res. 10

63 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 60 M, 21 V, 20 C, 16 KD, 15 MP, 14 L

For res. 10: 94 S

Absence: 62 SD, 1 -

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Item 9 (Traffic safety for mopeds and A-tractors)

1. the committee

2. res. 14 (C)

Voting:

219 for the committee

20 for res. 14

63 abstained

47 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 60 M, 21 V, 15 KD, 15 MP, 14 L

For res. 2:20 C

Absence: 62 SD, 1 -

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 4 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Item 13 (Eye checks and other road medical issues)

1. the committee

2. res. 19 (V, C, MP)

Voting:

184 for the committee

56 for res. 19

63 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 60 M, 16 KD, 14 L

For res. 19: 21 V, 20 C, 15 MP

Absence: 62 SD, 1 -

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Item 15 (Certain questions about driving license privileges)

1. the committee

2. res. 20 (C, MP)

Voting:

268 for the committee

35 for res. 20

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 94 S, 62 SD, 60 M, 21 V, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 20: 20 C, 15MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Other points

The House approved the committee's proposal.

TU14 Railway matters

Point 2 (Organization of railway maintenance)

1. the committee

2. res. 2 (S, W, MP)

3. res. 3 (SD)

4. res. 4 (C)

Preparatory vote 1:

63 for res. 3

20 for res. 4

219 waived

47 absent

The Chamber assisted res. 3.

Preparatory vote 2:

130 for res. 2

63 for res. 3

110 abstained

46 absent

The Chamber assisted res. 2.

Main vote:

153 for the committee

130 for res. 2

20 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 2: 94 S, 21 V, 15 MP

Tolerance: 20 C

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Other points

The House approved the committee's proposal.

§ 9 Decisions on matters that have been debated at the end of today's meeting
FiU20 Guidelines for economic policy

1. the committee

2. res. 1 (S)

3. res. 2 (V)

4. res. 3 (C)

5. res. 4 (MP)

Preparatory vote 1:

20 for res. 3

15 for res. 4

267 waived

47 absent

The Chamber assisted res. 3.

Preparatory vote 2:

21 for res. 2

20 for res. 3

261 waived

47 absent

The Chamber assisted res. 2.

Amir Jawad (L) reported that he intended to abstain but was marked as absent.

Preparatory vote 3:

94 for res. 1

22 for res. 2

187 abstained

46 absent

The Chamber assisted res. 1.

Ann-Christine From Utterstedt (SD) reported that she intended to abstain from voting but was marked as having voted no.

Main vote:

153 for the committee

94 for res. 1

56 abstained

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 1: 94 S

Resistance: 21 V, 20 C, 15 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

FiU21 Spring amendment budget for 2023

Item 2 (A new energy policy goal)

1. the committee

2. res. 1 (S, W, C, MP)

Voting:

153 for the committee

150 for res. 1

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 1: 94 S, 21 V, 20 C, 15 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Item 3 (An energy policy goal of power production expansion)

1. the committee

2. res. 2 (S)

Voting:

209 for the committee

94 for res. 2

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 21 V, 20 C, 16 KD, 15 MP, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 2: 94 S

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Item 4 (Cross-block energy calls)

1. the committee

2. res. 3 (S, W, C, MP)

Voting:

153 for the committee

150 for res. 3

46 absent

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Distribution of votes by party:

For the committee: 62 SD, 60 M, 16 KD, 14 L, 1 -

For res. 3: 94 S, 21 V, 20 C, 15 MP

Absent: 13 S, 10 SD, 8 M, 3 V, 4 C, 3 KD, 3 MP, 2 L

Other points

The House approved the committee's proposal.

Adjournment

The Chamber decided at 16.48 on the proposal of the third deputy speaker to adjourn the meeting until 18.00.

Resumed meeting

The meeting resumed at 18.00.

§ 10 Annual report for the state 2022

The Finance Committee's report 2022/23:FiU30

Annual report for the state 2022 (skr. 2022/23:101 and redog. 2022/23:RR4)

was preferred.

The second deputy speaker noted that no speaker had been registered.

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 11 Subsidiarity review of the Commission's proposal for a directive on combating corruption

The Justice Committee's report 2022/23:JuU33

Subsidiarity examination of the Commission's proposal for an anti-corruption directive (COM(2023) 234)

was preferred.

The second deputy speaker noted that no speaker had been registered.

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 12 Changed transparency rules in energy taxation

The Tax Committee's report 2022/23:SkU21

Changed transparency rules in energy taxation (prop. 2022/23:112)

was preferred.

The second deputy speaker noted that no speaker had been registered.

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 13 The Swedish Tax Agency as competent law enforcement authority for simplified data exchange within the EU

The Tax Committee's report 2022/23:SkU22

The Tax Agency as the competent law enforcement authority for simplified data exchange within the EU (prop. 2022/23:104)

was preferred.

Ref. 133 HANNA WESTERÉN (S):

Madam Speaker! We have gathered here this evening to debate information sharing aimed at preventing and deterring crime. During the spring term in the Riksdag's chamber, we social democrats have on several occasions brought up workplace crime. I also want to take the opportunity this evening to talk about rampant workplace crime.

Madam Speaker! In recent decades, the map has been redrawn for Swedish workers. Since I was a child in the early 90s, Sweden has become a full and active member of the European Union. Free movement of people, goods, services and capital has given Sweden many fantastic business opportunities and given many Swedes a much larger and more exciting job market. There have also been smooth border crossings in many places.

However, freedom has its downsides. It is still too profitable to be careless with accounting, personnel management and safety in Swedish and European workplaces. It is still too profitable to exploit vulnerable people from other EU countries as well as third countries.

Madam Speaker! It is quite obvious that the toolbox for combating tax fraud, tax evasion and workplace crime needs to be expanded. With the bill that is being put on the table of the Riksdag today, the Tax Agency gets another tool to deliver on the task it has been given by politics. The purpose of the proposal is to improve the Swedish Tax Agency's ability to conduct effective law enforcement activities and exchange information with other law enforcement agencies in the EU.

This is an important step forward, but hopefully it does not stop there, but follows it up from the government with more measures to close the loopholes for the forces that are constantly on their toes to exploit the systems and withhold resources needed to meet our common needs. Cheating on taxes, exploiting labor and illegitimately profiting from free movement must always be punished.

As a social democrat, I also want it to always be worthwhile to sign a collective agreement and to be part of the union. For me, it is a very important factor in the fight for healthy competition. We are not quite there yet, but we social democrats are not giving up.

The work to provide the Tax Agency with this tool began during the Social Democrats' shift in the Government Office. Now it is becoming a reality, and it is only to be applauded. Any party

that claims to want to fight the criminal gangs – it is an area that, for obvious reasons, is often debated in the Riksdag's chambers today – must also take every chance to turn the faucet that supplies the gangs with resources. The crime of today is brutal, organized and internationally branched and spares no means. That we politically increase transparency and break down barriers to secrecy is and must remain a priority.

Madam Speaker! I would therefore like to request approval for bill 2022/23:104, The Swedish Tax Agency as competent law enforcement authority for simplified data exchange within the EU, and wish you a happy summer.

(Applause)

Ref. 134 ILONA SZATMÁRI WALDAU (V):

Madam Speaker! In the matter itself, the committee is unanimous. We need to say yes to the Swedish Tax Agency as the competent law enforcement authority for simplified data exchange within the EU. But the committee goes a little further in its position. Therefore, the Left Party, together with the Green Party, has presented an alternative proposal for a position for the committee. It does not change anything in substance in the case itself, but I want here and now to request approval of our reservation.

As it is my last debate before the summer break, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the members of the committee for good cooperation and to thank the chairman for a well-led committee. I also thank the committee's office as well as the Speaker and the Speaker's office.

Ref. 135 MARIE NICHOLSON (M):

Madam Speaker! To begin with, I would like to request approval for the tax committee's proposal in SkU22 and thus for the government's changed rules that make the Tax Agency a competent law enforcement authority.

International connections in various types of crime, tax crime as well as other, have increased. Half of all reports passed on by the tax crime unit contain links to foreign countries.

Organized criminal groups are also increasingly cross-border in their activities. With border controls removed, it is increasingly difficult within the EU to access this type of crime. A higher degree of international cooperation is needed here. But for it to function effectively, the Swedish Tax Agency needs the same opportunities to share information as its European and international counterparts.

The rule changes proposed herewith enable the Swedish Tax Agency to provide classified information and classified intelligence to foreign counterparties in order to make crime-fighting activities more efficient. Personal data will be able to be provided to Interpol and Europol, to police authorities and prosecution authorities in states connected to Interpol, and to customs and tax authorities within the EEA. The exchange of information may take place for the purpose

of preventing, preventing or detecting crime or fulfilling obligations arising from international commitments if it is compatible with Swedish interests.

This of course also means that corresponding information can be obtained from our international collaboration partners. The proposal covers both private individuals and companies.

Madam Speaker! Financial crime and tax evasion are problems in themselves. They can also be part of a larger problem and serve as a way to finance other illegal activities. The proposal that is before us today unfortunately does not solve that whole challenge, but our privacy legislation must not put "proboscis" on us. This is a good step in the right direction.

Madam Speaker! I wish everyone present a pleasant and – to put it mildly – just the right amount of rainy summer.

In this speech, Jesper Skalberg Karlsson (M) agreed.

The discussion was hereby concluded.

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 14 Medicines and dental care
The Social Committee's report 2022/23:SoU15

Medicines and dental care

was preferred.

Ref. 136 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M):

Madam Speaker! The new moderate-led government has not come to a table. The situation in Sweden is, as we all know, serious. Long care queues, too few staffed care places and healthcare that is not equal are three major problems and challenges that deserve political attention and the will to reform. Now is the time to get healthcare in order - for the sake of both patients and employees.

Madam Speaker! The development of new drugs and treatment therapies is very fast, perhaps faster now than ever before. It is good. Medicines improve and prolong life, which is why their availability is so crucial. In this context, I would like to say that accessibility is a very broad issue. It's about new treatments being approved in Sweden, it's about introducing them in an equivalent way in the regions, deliveries working and follow-up regarding treatment taking place.

It is against this background that the new government has, among other things, put a lot of focus on strengthening the information chain so that patients and the healthcare system must be given a warning when there is a risk of shortages occurring. Earlier in the year, we debated

precisely this, then in connection with the National Audit Office's report on the wholesale trade in pharmaceuticals.

Madam Speaker! The moderates and our partner parties want to secure access to medicines in Sweden and ensure that we are prepared for crises that may arise. War in our immediate area, new pandemics and unpredictable supply chain disruptions are three important things to continue to watch closely. It is a high priority for both the Minister for Civil Defense and the Minister for Health Care, which we see in the initiatives that have also been taken during the spring.

We also want to create the conditions for an industry within life science in Sweden that contributes to new innovations, creates jobs and export revenue and also extends and improves people's lives. Then more clinical trials and faster approval processes are needed. Peter Asplund's recently presented investigation into the life science sector will be an important part in that context, and we look forward to Minister Busch and Minister Forssmed taking it further.

We also want to continuously evaluate and adapt the rather technical processes behind the approval, financing and distribution of medicines so that they work in the new landscape that is emerging in life science. Here it is worth mentioning that the EU's new drug strategy contains very good intentions. However, the Social Committee and the EU Committee will have to do a great job in the coming time so that the end product does not hamper Swedish competitiveness.

Madam Speaker! It is remarkable that around ten government investigations in the last decade, all of which had a bearing on the pharmaceutical supply, have not resulted in more and larger political proposals being put on the table of the Riksdag. The explanation lies partly in the complexity of the issues, partly in the fact that other things have happened along the way that you have been forced to prioritize. But when the burden of the EU presidency is lifted from the Government Office, at the same time as we have four ministers in the Ministry of Social Affairs, there is reason to have both good hope and high expectations that more will be done in this area.

Madam Speaker! The new government has changed the course for Sweden in a short time. But we also want to do more. In the agreement we have concluded between our four partners, we state, for example, that the pharmacy's role in the care chain needs to be developed. We want certain services, for example health examinations and not just blood pressure checks and the like, to be offered at pharmacies. We will also come forward with proposals for a new range of pharmaceuticals that will be an intermediate position between non-prescription and prescription. In addition, a high-cost cover in dental care must be investigated to more closely mimic what exists in other care.

Madam Speaker! I note that we have a big job to do to secure access to the medicines and treatments of the future in Sweden. But we have solved big problems in the past, and step by step we will now tackle this. With a line of work that creates resources to share, with regulatory

simplifications that strengthen competitiveness and a reform agenda that ensures equal access, we take responsibility for getting Sweden in order.

I request approval of the committee's proposed decision.

Ref. 137 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! The pharmaceutical issues have yielded a very large commitment in the chamber, not least during the last mandate period when the Center Party and the Moderates and others pushed forward a number of announcements.

One of them was about one of the perhaps most upsetting parts of medicine in this country, namely that we have a way of valuing orphan drugs for some of the sickest individuals. They have diagnoses for which very few need medicines, and this means that they have not been given access to these medicines. It was not a unanimous Riksdag, but not far from it, and the Moderates were very driven that something had to happen.

Now Jesper Skalberg Karlsson says that now, indeed, the moderate, SD-led government has changed course with regard to the Swedish healthcare system. Then I wonder: Why hasn't the course been changed at all to ensure that people with rare diagnoses can get access to orphan drugs? In regard to that, there has not been a single active decision from this government.

Now they reject motions on this topic and point out that a year ago the previous government gave TLV a mission to see if a solution could be found. That, Madam Speaker, is not what I call a new government changing course. They do not take any initiatives at all, but say that what the old social democratic government did in this area is suddenly completely satisfactory.

When there was such a strong commitment on the part of the Moderates and several other parties, why, Jesper Skalberg Karlsson, have you not changed course?

Ref. 138 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you, member Jonsson, for the question!

The commitment to more people getting access to the treatments and medicines they need remains strong. It can also be mentioned in this context that the rare diagnoses we are talking about may be rare in themselves, but it is not that rare to have a rare diagnosis in particular. Overall, the group is still quite large, and it is important to keep track of these concepts.

I can only maintain what I said in the rostrum, namely that it is reasonable to have continued good hope and high expectations for the new government when it comes to moving forward on more issues than what has been done before. In the current case regarding TLV, I look forward to TLV delivering on the assignments it has been given both during the previous and this term and also coming up with new proposals on how this can be managed in a better way.

It is a priority for more medicines to be approved in Sweden and for them to benefit patients, but as the member also knows, it is a complex system, and it will take time.

In that context, it can be mentioned that TLV needs to come to terms with its own personnel supply. It is difficult for TLV to retain competent personnel, because they become so incredibly attractive in the market where life science companies are also present. When you meet Swedish drug developers, it is not unusual that some of the management team or employees actually come from TLV.

Much is about giving TLV peace of mind, but it is also about continuing to work so that more treatments and therapies can be approved in Sweden. That is the goal, and I am convinced that it is something that we share with the Center Party and the opposition.

Ref. 139 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! For those who have followed this debate for some time, Jesper Skalberg Karlsson's answer is remarkable. So there was a high tone here in the House, and quick action was demanded from the government of the day, precisely because it was about people who actually died because they did not get medicine - medicine that was available but which we did not have a Swedish system to be able to provide. Not least moderate representatives were very keen to point the finger at the social democratic government – rightly so, I think – because nothing happened.

Now I ask Jesper Skalberg Karlsson why the new government has not changed course in this area. Changing the course of the Swedish healthcare seems to be the watchword, but here they have done nothing at all.

What is happening now is that we are waiting for TLV to fulfill a mission that the old social democratic government gave. In that case, the Moderates should have said in the election campaign that precisely when it comes to this issue, we are completely satisfied with what the Swedish government has done: They have given a task to TLV, and we await it. That is what this government has done. There is nothing concrete in action to help this group of vulnerable people.

When I now ask the question to Jesper Skalberg Karlsson and try to get an answer as to why nothing has happened, I am told that many people have rare diagnoses and that they are therefore probably not rare. No, everyone knows that. In addition, I am now told that TLV apparently has staffing problems.

The answer to the question is therefore that we have not changed course due to the fact that TLV has staffing problems and that rare diagnoses as a group are also not rare. Therefore, we do not need to change course, but that is why the moderate-led government is now completely satisfied with what the previous government did, that is, it gave a mission to a state authority. It's distressing.

Ref. 140 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:
Madam Speaker! Thanks to member Jonsson for the follow-up post!

It can be tempting to use outrage as a debating technique, and I'm sure people of all stripes have done so in this House over many years. However, I do not think that this is what brings us forward in the discussion. Much of the grudge that the member seems to feel, I think, is actually directed at those who were members of the social committee during the last term and not at me as a person.

With this, I still want to say that it is urgent that we get more drugs and treatment therapies approved in Sweden. Just as the member mentions, more people need access to medicines that save, prolong and improve lives. There is a great deal of work to be done in this area. I look forward to the four ministers at the Ministry of Social Affairs, but also other ministers who have influence in the area, not least Minister Busch who received Asplund's investigation, doing more.

All good forces are needed for this to get better, and I look forward to following an interpellation debate where Anders W Jonsson directs the questions to those who sat on the social committee during the last mandate period.

Ref. 141 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply:
Madam Speaker! I think the healthcare system will have to live with this. Inflation eats up healthcare money. That's exactly what we'll be talking about today and the days to come next year.

Now we are talking about medicines. There are amazingly potent drugs that can do incredible things when it comes to saving seriously ill people. This was something we discussed a lot before the election, and the parties that now stand behind the Tidö Agreement were very progressive when it came to pharmaceuticals and what would and would not happen. You can say that it was not immediately walk the talk.

I have some questions. It primarily concerns seriously ill people who need, for example, precision medicine. For them, it is very unequal today. It's about which region you live in and which class you belong to. I can't see that the new government has any answer to this.

The second is clinical trials, Madam Speaker, which are very difficult to carry out in a stressful work environment. We've heard that for a long time, and it won't be any less stressful for the staff. The pharmaceutical companies, doctors and everyone who works with the issues have been very clear that as long as the healthcare system looks the way it does - and now it actually looks worse - it is difficult to do clinical trials. Is there something that the member can answer?

The third thing I want to ask about is about the teeth and the high-cost protection, which is stated on page 8 of the Tidö agreement. I wonder: How far down the priority list is this?

Ref. 142 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thanks to member Rågsjö for a cavalcade of questions! If I miss someone, it is of course possible to return in post number two.

First, inflation is the absolute worst enemy of wage earners and the government. With the high inflation we have had recently, the state's budget needs to be slightly austere or at least neutral. The budget that the Riksdag has adopted is the one that my party and the partner parties put forward. It is our task to hold back and ensure that we do not throw more money on the inflation fire and to prioritize within the reform space that the expert authorities assess that we have. That's the one.

As for the second, the investigation into high-cost protection for dental care, the Tidö agreement is an agreement that regulates what we must do during a term of office. Today I cannot give a date for when the investigation into high-cost protection will be added or completed, but this is part of the Tidö Agreement and must of course be carried out.

I may come back to the third question, if Karin Rågsjö can repeat it.

Ref. 143 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! The question is about clinical trials, which is what you have to do when it comes to new types of medicine, precision medicine and so on. It is very difficult to conduct clinical trials in a work environment where people are running around to a great extent and have poor conditions for doing their job in healthcare. I also don't think it will get any easier now.

It was sad that you - and all of us - would end up in inflation. But I don't think that welfare and investment in it, such as investment in schools, health care and patients, is what drives inflation. I also do not think that the member Skalberg Karlsson and I should have a discussion about this, but there are several who say that it is so. We are in a very bad situation when it comes to health care in the regions, and I hope that the SD-dependent government will take a little extra look at that.

When it comes to dental care, it is something that the Left Party has also drawn up proposals for. There is also a proposal that is in an investigation that you can look at. This is a reform that is really needed, because teeth in particular are a terribly strong class marker in various ways. It turns out that the less money you have in your wallet, the less often you go to the dentist.

Dental care itself is also in crisis. In northern Sweden, there is a lack of dentists and other conditions. It may not be something that this government can be blamed for, but it is a joint responsibility to ensure that we get dental care throughout Sweden that works.

Ref. 144 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thanks to Karin Rågsjö for the second post! With regard to clinical trials, it has been a goal in the Swedish life science strategy for a number of years that we should have

more clinical trials. I think that is basically good. What has been the problem is precisely that there have not been many activities linked to this goal.

We can see around the country that in the places where clinical trials are carried out, it is often dependent on individuals, that is, there are individual zealots who get projects like this started. But there is thus no coherent system and no coherent structure. It is against this background that I mention Peter Asplund's investigation, which was recently presented to Minister Busch and Minister Forssmed. I look forward to taking it further.

Finally, I can say that I agree with Karin Rågsjö that we need more dentists in Sweden. We also need more professors to train a new generation of dentists. It will be difficult, and it will be demanding. We will also have to work more on validating dentists from other countries and make sure that they undergo knowledge tests when they come to Sweden with their degree so that we know that they maintain a high quality.

There is a lot to say about dental care, but basically it boils down to this: We need more dentists in Sweden.

Ref. 145 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! In an earlier post, member Jonsson addressed a large part of the question I had intended to ask member Jesper Skalberg Karlsson about the allocation of resources for medical treatment of rare diagnoses.

When I listened to the member's speech, it sounded big: We have changed course! If you use such terminology, Madam Speaker, you must also be held accountable for what has happened with that course change.

The member cannot be blamed for what his party colleagues have previously said in these debates, but the Moderates have been extremely clear that when they came to government they would set aside money especially for orphan drugs, Madam Speaker. On the proposal of the committee, two announcements were made to the government last term in that direction, the last one just over a year ago. There, among other things, the current Tidö parties highlighted that we should set aside money specifically for that group.

My question to the member Jesper Skalberg Karlsson is then the following: When will this money bag arrive? The government has ruled for a year, and now we are starting to want delivery notices.

Ref. 146 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thanks to member Dahlqvist for that question! I really have no other answer than that announcements must be processed according to the process that exists in the Riksdag. I look forward to the government delivering an answer to this question. After all, several of the ministers were members of the social committee during the last term, and I know that their commitment to these issues is very great.

Then both member Dahlqvist and I are aware that it has been an intense spring with the Swedish EU presidency. There are many other processes that have been brought to port during the spring. There has been a lot of work at the Government Office. As I said in my speech, there are reasons to have good hope and high expectations for the government in these matters. I share that opinion with member Dahlqvist.

Ref. 147 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you, Jesper Skalberg Karlsson, for your answer!

Of course, it is always easy to be in opposition, but now that you have ended up in the government, you may see that the situation is more complicated than you thought. In view of the debate during the last term of office, perhaps I, along with others, call for greater humility in the face of difficulties. Unfortunately, we were then met with the rhetoric that the previous government was too slow, too tough and so on. Perhaps it is an experience that the member can take with him for the future that there is little difference between governing and not governing the country.

I look forward to the special money you have promised. There are many in Sweden who are waiting for them.

I will just briefly ask one more question, Madam Speaker. I will address this issue of rural pharmacies in my speech. It's a sad child, but I want to ask a question there. We think it is great that you are investigating this with pharmaceutical assortments, that you as a patient can have the opportunity to get access to more medicines. But my simple question is: How does member Jesper Skalberg Karlsson intend to solve the situation in sparsely populated areas, where we do not have pharmacists? If this reform is carried out, which I am convinced we will support, how do we ensure that people in the interior of Sweden where there are not even pharmacies can take part in this accessibility reform, if I may call it that?

Ref. 148 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:

Madam Speaker! I have sat in opposition in the Riksdag. It is very rewarding. I have sat in opposition in Region Gotland. I have also sat on the board of the Gotland Region. Now I sit here and support the current government. It's fun with variety. Change pleases, as they say. In opposition, of course, you can use this chamber as a stage, and that has its place and its charm. But it is only when you are involved and in charge that you can make a real difference with the decisions you make. At least that's the simple model; then we know that things happen along the way. You don't always have a majority and so on.

Madam Speaker! The question concerned pharmacies in sparsely populated areas.

(MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S): Pharmacist range.)

There is special support for pharmacies in sparsely populated areas. It is also worth noting that we have gained several pharmacies but above all more open pharmacies in the last ten years, which is very welcome. When pharmacies are closed in sparsely populated areas, it usually has to do with the health center closing down. That's what cuts the bones for the local pharmacy.

This is an issue that I know that Health Care Minister Acko Ankarberg Johansson is working intensively on. Of course, we need to ensure equal access throughout the country and also look at new solutions for how the medicines can arrive at the door and in the hands of the patient. It is an intention that I know many of us stand behind. Then there are a lot of bureaucratic hurdles that we may have to tear down on the way to that.

Ref. 149 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S):

Madam Speaker! Today we are debating motions from general motion time that deal with pharmacy and pharmaceutical issues and dental health.

The pandemic and the ongoing war in our neighborhood have really challenged us, although the situation is of course worse for the Ukrainian population.

The global situation we find ourselves in right now has exposed a number of weaknesses in our society. One of these, Madam Speaker, is access to medicines and medical technology products, protective equipment and the like.

The number of remaining notified medicines increased in 2022 by 54 percent from the previous year. Backlisted medicines, I want to explain to the listeners, are what it is all about when you come to a pharmacy and have a prescription and your product is not in stock - it is out of stock. The remaining notified medicines amount to 4.6 percent of the total number of medicines in Sweden. They are therefore not available at the pharmacy when you need them.

This is of course a huge problem for the individual, especially if you suffer from a serious illness, for example if you have diabetes and have run out of insulin. It is a problem for healthcare, for the pharmacy and for everyone.

Both the previous government and the current one have given a number of assignments to try to review what is happening and how to mitigate the effects. That is of course good. However, during the last mandate period we often received criticism in this matter as well. The previous Social Democrat-led government was too slow and too stubborn, it was said. Therefore, I am now asking myself the question, Madam Speaker, whether it was just empty words from the current government representatives. The government will soon have governed for a year - a parliamentary year tomorrow - and we are waiting for delivery.

Madam Speaker! Another important issue I want to raise based on our committee motion is the consequences of the deregulation of the pharmacy monopoly, which has led to a lack of pharmacy availability in some parts of the country. I know that pharmacy availability and opening hours are better in the cities. In sparsely populated areas and in smaller towns, however, it is

the other way around; just look at reliable statistics. There is also a mix-up between owners and other roles that we need to sort out.

Recently, Apotea's CEO Pär Svärdson spoke out in a debate article with the headline "Swedish preparedness almost non-existent". What he was referring to was the availability of medicines in the pharmacies.

I think that the issue of access to medicines and to rural pharmacies must be raised on our agenda. Even if there is a pharmacy in a smaller town, Madam Speaker, we now see a tendency that it often closes during the summer when the staff are on vacation.

Another question I asked in my exchange with member Skalberg was about pharmaceutical assortment. Basically, I think it's a good proposal, but how will it work out in the country where you don't even have a pharmacy?

Madam Speaker! In our committee motion, we also highlight rare diagnoses and access to medicines. Here we have to find an arrangement where TLV ensures that there is good access and also find long-term financing. As I said in the reply, previous governments have received this announcement twice. We are anxiously awaiting results regarding the allocation of funds for this.

Madam Speaker! In conclusion, the big question regarding pharmaceutical issues still remains: funding. The government must come up with proposals on how to secure long-term funding for Swedish medicines and these treatments. Above all, it is about reviewing the processes for drug management in the country. Or will the government, as so far, prioritize tax cuts before welfare needs and development?

(Applause)

Ref. 150 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD):

Madam Speaker! I want to start by calling for approval of the committee's proposal in the report.

Medicines and medical devices are an integral part of health care and care. When you get sick and need care, it is important to get a medical assessment quickly. Can I manage it myself with the help of self-care, or do I need to be part of the efforts of primary care or inpatient care?

If self-care is best, pharmacies are an indispensable part of providing approved medicines and medical devices. The pharmacies can also contribute with advice to a greater extent than today in light of the pharmacists' high level of competence. If I need to take part in the efforts of primary or inpatient care, medicines and medical devices will probably be an important part of the treatment.

Within care, pharmacies, pharmaceuticals and medical technology products are equally important parts of maintaining good quality and providing care recipients with good living

conditions. The Christian Democrats' view of medicines and medical technology products, the role of pharmacies and pharmacists in healthcare and a safe supply of medicines is that they are important for the whole to function. All parts are also needed if we are to manage to have need-based care and care on equal terms for the entire population.

The pharmacy industry is not just any industry. Whoever takes on the responsibility of a business in this large sector also takes on the responsibility of providing many essential medicines and medical devices to the population. The Christian Democrats want to secure quality and availability by guarding and developing the re-regulation of pharmacies.

By giving more people the opportunity to start and run their own pharmacies, entrepreneurship and initiative are freed up. It is also about strengthening the role of pharmacies and pharmacists in the healthcare chain. It is an important development, not least to attract more people to the pharmaceutical professions.

When the Christian Democrats in 2006, in the then coalition government, took over responsibility for the pharmacies, Sweden was at the bottom of the OECD area in terms of the number of pharmacies per inhabitant. In 2009, the re-regulation of the pharmacy market was carried out with the aim of ensuring a safe and good supply of medicines. All over the country today there are pharmacies with generous opening hours and highly trained staff. Citizens have a high level of trust in pharmacies.

Madam Speaker! Since the reregulation of the pharmacy market, pharmacy density and availability have increased. The figures in the Swedish Pharmacy Association's industry report from October 2022 show that the number of pharmacies has increased from roughly 900 in 2008 to just over 1,400 today. This is an increase of approximately 50 percent. We Christian Democrats think this is a positive development. In addition, all pharmacy chains offer e-commerce via the internet pharmacy.

The reregulated pharmacy market is still a relatively young market that can develop further. The players today are both large and small, government and private, and all meet the strict requirements that regulate the market.

Overall, the increased accessibility, customer benefit and service range together with the stable and high customer satisfaction show that the re-regulation of the pharmacy market was a successful and appreciated reform. However, the Christian Democrats see that we must continue to strengthen access to pharmacies also in sparsely populated areas. The number of pharmacies in these areas today is roughly unchanged compared to before the reregulation. Some have been started, but in recent years some have unfortunately also been closed down.

Madam Speaker! Apoteken's e-commerce plays, according to an analysis from the Dental Health and Medicines Benefits Agency, TLV, a major role in sparsely populated and rural residents' access to pharmacies. E-commerce can therefore be seen as a good complement to physical pharmacies in both densely populated and sparsely populated areas. But they cannot

fully replace the physical pharmacies, among other things because certain medicines, for example drugs classified as narcotics and antibiotic solutions, must be prepared in connection with dispensing. They cannot be handled in the same way via e-commerce.

The Christian Democrats also believe that it is important that even people in sparsely populated areas have the opportunity to visit a physical pharmacy. There is security in visiting a pharmacy and getting advice from the pharmacy's competent staff about the use of prescription drugs and about self-care.

Ref. 151 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! In the election campaign, KD tried to portray itself as the great champion of sparsely populated areas. They fought for the countryside. But after the election, it has been much quieter about it. In this report, what some party leader said becomes obvious – you say one thing before the election, and after the election it's something completely different.

Dan Hovskär touched on one of the really big problems: access to medicines in sparsely populated areas. The report contains concrete proposals on what could be done. The first thing you should do is quickly go in and review the special grant that goes out to pharmacies in sparsely populated areas. It is the wheel that we can turn to make it more profitable to run pharmacies even in the smaller towns. KD says no to that.

The second is to open up the possibility of using a pharmacist remotely. The lack of pharmacists and prescription shops is a big problem. This could be remedied if the legislation said that prescriptions do not need to be physically available at the pharmacy, but you can have digital access to them. It is a proposal that we have put forward. That too would drastically improve the situation in sparsely populated and rural areas. But KD says no to that.

Perhaps the most surprising thing is to hear Dan Hovskär say that e-commerce is an important part, except when it comes to narcotic preparations and antibiotics that have to be prepared. They are not included in e-commerce. But right now the Swedish Medicines Agency is sitting and filing, with the government's good memory, a proposal that would put a complete stop to e-commerce. You have to be at home for maybe six to eight hours and stand by the door and wait with your ID to be able to get the antibiotic you have been prescribed. It seems KD is prepared to let it go completely.

Why are KD so hostile to improving access to medicines in rural areas?

Ref. 152 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! When it comes to the Christian Democrats and the job with rural issues, you don't have to be as anxious as Anders W Jonsson is. We work with these questions in different parts. When it comes to sparsely populated areas grants, there is one now that I believe 44 pharmacies received in 2022. They paid out 12 million kroner for it. So it exists today. I know you are also working on this issue and want to strengthen it.

Regarding prescriptions digitally, as far as I know, we have not said no to that proposal. But they have looked at various possible solutions.

The member talks about e-commerce and TLV's new investigation. A decision has not been taken on that yet. I know that there are quite a few parts that cause problems, but according to the information I have received, no final approach has been reached on it yet.

Ref. 153 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! Maybe I expressed myself a little unclearly. There are three sharp proposals to improve the availability of medicines in sparsely populated areas.

The first involves directly reviewing how the support is constructed. The support has existed since 2008/2009 and must be reformed. The report contains such a proposal from the Center Party's side. KD intends to vote no and reject that.

The second concerns the proposal for remote pharmacists. It must be investigated depending on whether it requires a change in the law. In this report, the Center Party has put forward a concrete proposal that you should be able to have a pharmacist remotely, that is, not have a pharmacist present during the entire opening hours at the pharmacy in the small community. Instead, you should be able to have that access remotely. KD votes no to that. You do not support the Center Party's proposal.

The third is that the Swedish Medicines Agency - not TLV - intends to put a stop to the possibility of distance trading of medicines in rural areas. They do this by saying that if you want to receive medicine in the countryside, you must stand there at your door between 1pm and 7pm with your ID in full swing. In the cities it may work, depending on the fact that it is significantly more dense there, but for the countryside it will mean a cross-stop for the possibilities to easily - not least for the elderly and those who may not even be able to drive - get medicine home.

We have submitted all three of these proposals. These are concrete proposals that would improve the situation fairly quickly. All three say no to KD. As for the third point about stopping e-commerce, they certainly let the Swedish Medicines Agency hold the axe, but I don't understand how a party that said in the election campaign that it is for the Swedish countryside can so consistently stop proposals that mean better access to medicines in the Swedish countryside.

Ref. 154 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! As far as e-commerce is concerned, the member is absolutely right that it is about the Medical Products Agency, not TLV. They are now looking at whether it is possible to find new solutions so that people do not have to stay at home, because that would be a killing blow to, among other things, the countryside and sparsely populated areas. I know that they are looking into whether it is possible to find other solutions to that issue. We'll have to come back when the final decision comes.

Ref. 155 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! When the former alliance sold out Apoteket AB, it might have been good to have some directives regarding that business. They talked very nicely about small pharmacies. Now it didn't turn out that way, but there are large business chains and clusters that are connected in different ways. These are, for example, grocery stores with pharmacies, pharmacies with healthcare companies, digital doctors – you name it. It's a giant market.

One can think about where the public health aspect went in this. For example, it is not possible to check the entire supply of medicines among pharmacies.

As for sparsely populated areas and believing that market forces should take responsibility for rural areas, I think it is quite naive. In an establishment analysis that was done in 2022, you can see the reduction of pharmacies that were located more than 6 kilometers from another pharmacy. Simply explained: The number of pharmacies in rural areas, where access is already at its worst, has decreased. Instead, they increase in the cities, where I myself live. I have an extreme access to pharmacies, I must say! I live in Stockholm's inner city.

I wonder if this isn't something that needs to be addressed somehow. Accessibility only gets worse and worse if you live in sparsely populated areas or a little further from the cities. What do the Tidö parties, i.e. the SD-supported government, intend to do about this?

Ref. 156 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! In my speech, I touched on the fact that since this whole reform was implemented, there has been a roughly 50 percent increase in the number of pharmacies – from 900 in 2008 to about 1,400 today. This means that accessibility has increased significantly, also in terms of opening hours, which have become significantly better.

I also mentioned that a number of pharmacies in sparsely populated areas have closed down. Most often, it is connected to the fact that health centers have disappeared, because then it is difficult for pharmacies to survive.

These are questions that we monitor to see how we can work further. I also mentioned that it is important to somehow be able to visit a pharmacy in your local area to get advice and so on. It is thus an important issue that Karin Rågsjö raises and which is important to monitor going forward.

Ref. 157 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! This development has been seen for several years. Nothing has appeared now. I have spoken about this since 2014, when I ended up in the Riksdag and had to work with healthcare issues.

It is clear that there are lots of new pharmacies. Anyone who lives in the inner city or in larger suburbs such as Täby can see how many pharmacies there have become. There are fewer

pharmacies if you go outside. I think of, for example, Birger Lahti, my comrade in the Left Party, who lives in Pajala. How many pharmacies are there?

As far as the connection to health centers is concerned, it is probably also about the market. Where does the market want to position itself? Where is it profitable to locate?

If you open the door to the market, it will be according to the market. You don't have to have attended the School of Economics to understand that. There will be greater conditions for the market to open here on Kungsholmen or Södermalm or down in Gothenburg's inner city. There is not much cash to be gained from opening in Pajala. This has thus become a market issue.

Madam Speaker! I believe that it is always the case that if you hand over something to the market - then it will be on the market's terms. As a politician, you then have to sit in the stands and hope that things go reasonably well, if you can't find steering instruments. So I still wonder what the SD-dependent government intends to do.

Ref. 158 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) replica:

Madam Speaker! We have seen a doubling, Karin Rågsjö, of the number of pharmacies since the new reform came into force. It is thanks to the opening of the market. You too must see that there have been many more pharmacies, and it is a positive effect that the market has gained space. There have been more pharmacies and longer opening hours. Both state and private companies have been involved in the development.

Just as I highlighted, there are concerns. We must continue to monitor the sparsely populated establishments. More needs to be done there. But the market has been positive for pharmacy development.

Ref. 159 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! Member Rågsjö brought up the conditions of the market, and I completely share her opinion. It is clear that we should be happy that there have been more pharmacies - in some parts of the country. But it does not help those who live in sparsely populated or rural areas.

I myself come from a relatively small town called Hagfors. We have a pharmacy with the same opening hours, and we have not received more pharmacies. It would be nice if the member had an idea about how political decisions should be made that the market does not need to take into account. After all, the market is governed by supply and demand. This is generally the case in the public sector. That is the concern of the Social Democrats in terms of executors. There is no question that there are many good performers. The problem is who takes into account or is responsible for the whole.

Exactly the same question applies to the pharmacy market. The market will never establish a pharmacy in Sysseleback in northern Värmland. Here I am calling for more activity and creativity from government representatives.

Madam Speaker! The Christian Democrats are a party that keeps healthcare issues high on its agenda, and the party should be honored for that. But pharmaceutical issues are largely about funding, and there is a lack of money. The regions pay a large part of the drug costs. We know that we are facing a welfare crisis in Sweden's municipalities and regions. In the forecast for 2024, the figures show that 31 billion are missing. This will of course affect the ability to purchase medicines. How do the Christian Democrats in the government intend to ensure that welfare is financed?

Ref. 160 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) replica:

Madam Speaker! I thank Mikael Dahlgvist for the question.

Everyone knows that we live in a tough economic reality. We have ensured that municipalities and county councils have received NOK 12 billion this year. Large parts of Municipal and Regional Sweden have had large surpluses in recent years. I have worked in the Västra Götaland region and in Falköping municipality. Many municipalities have large surpluses. But now we are in tougher times, and that calls for action.

The government has added 12 billion during this year. Then we will look at what is needed going forward. There are large expenses. Inflation was rampant earlier, but now it is dipping downwards. And that is positive.

The first question concerned how to stimulate the establishment of more pharmacies in sparsely populated areas. I mentioned earlier that there is a so-called sparsely populated area grant. We paid out 12 million in 2022 in sparsely populated areas. But I honestly said earlier that we need to look at what additional stimulus is needed. So there is a grant, and the regulation of the grant meant that 44 pharmacies received the grant last year.

Ref. 161 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! I thank Dan Hovskär for the answer.

Politics is about prioritizing. It is true that you have given an extra 12 billion to Sweden's municipalities and regions. It is also true that the Social Democrats have doubled that amount in their budget motion. Politics is about prioritizing. It would be interesting to hear how the member views the prioritization that was made, where they chose to lower the tax for you and me with high incomes instead of stopping the indexation and giving the money to, for example, healthcare.

Madam Speaker! The member says that the Christian Democrats protect and stand as a guarantor of health care. But in my eyes, you are a guarantor of the high income earners' finances. Politics is about wanting and prioritizing.

Then it is good if the government comes back in the autumn budget. The situation is urgent. It is true that the previous S-led government received historic grants, and there were surpluses for a

number of years. But now the member must remember that there is currently inflation. Then there is a pension agreement that costs billions extra. The entire surplus in that sector is gone. That is why they forecast a deficit of 31 billion in 2024 if nothing is done on the part of the government. It is important to keep that in mind.

Madam Speaker! I don't think I can get an answer from the member if you intend to give notice before midsummer about priorities for the sector. It would be welcome because municipalities and regions are already laying off staff. It's a little late to make an announcement in November.

Ref. 162 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Politics is about taking responsibility. We can both agree on that.

There has been gigantic inflation in our society, and we all lose from that – even low-income earners as well as municipalities and regions. Therefore, we must prioritize trying to bring down inflation and balance the economy. We have been working on that.

It must also pay to work. By getting more people into work, our country is doing better. Therefore, we believe that if more people have access to work, Sweden and the individual will be better off. Therefore, we work with many different parts. Then we get to come back to what the budget looks like for the coming year. I don't think you will get word before the Riksdag ends tomorrow. But we'll see!

Ref. 163 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD):

Madam Speaker! We look at medicines and dental care a little differently. As a specialist nurse specializing in psychiatry, I have met and treated children and young people with most types of medication within the walls of psychiatry. We know the great benefit medication can have for children so that they can function in today's world which can be extremely stressful and stressful. And it's even worse if you have some kind of NPF diagnosis, i.e. neuropsychiatric diagnosis.

But medication with antidepressants must never be the casual first choice for overcoming children's problems. It is something that is unfortunately done to an excessively large extent today. This happens because of too long queues in psychiatry and bup, which means that society does not have time to deal with those who need help.

Madam Speaker! What does it look like then? The number of children aged 0-17 years prescribed ADHD drugs increased from almost 28,000 children in 2011 to almost 77,000 children in 2022. But what is more worrying is that the prescription of antidepressants to children has increased from almost 12,000 children in 2011 to just over 37,000 children in 2022.

This worries not only me but also the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. In an examination of how Sweden lives up to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the committee has noted, among other things, the high levels of depression, anxiety and self-harm among children, as well as the long waiting time for psychiatry.

Madam Speaker! The increase over the past ten years has meant that today it is three times more common for children to be prescribed antidepressants in Sweden than in our neighboring countries Norway and Denmark, and the difference between the countries is said to have increased for a long time.

Psychiatry, child and youth psychiatry and care for children and young people are strained in Sweden as a result of previous governments' dismantling and prioritization for a long time. Those who seek care do not receive help in time, but end up in year-long queues. At the same time, mental illness is increasing and spreading further down the ages.

Around 70-80 percent of children and young adults who are diagnosed with depression begin treatment with antidepressants. The proportion has remained unchanged for at least the last ten years. A similar situation prevails for various tranquilizers or anti-anxiety agents and sleeping aids, where prescriptions are made to 20 percent of children and 35 percent of young adults for depression and anxiety disorders. This suggests that treatment practices in mental illness have not changed. But as the number of cases of illness has increased sharply, the total prescription has also increased.

Madam Speaker! The increased use of antidepressants needs to be reviewed to get to the root of the problem. We must be absolutely sure that it is really depression that is the basis for children and young people being prescribed more and more antidepressants. It is unacceptable and downright inhumane if antidepressants are prescribed as an easier solution due to a lack of resources in psychiatry when young people who are unwell mainly need to be offered the support, treatment and care they need.

The Sweden Democrats believe that the government should review the increased use of antidepressants for young people and map the reasons for this. Everyone deserves a safe and healthy future.

With this, Madam Speaker, I would like to request approval of reservation 4.

Madam Speaker! I also want to highlight another pharmaceutical issue now that we are on the subject, namely the handling of pharmaceuticals and the environmental aspect of pharmaceuticals.

Medicines consist of substances that are structured and designed to have a biological effect. As such, they can potentially produce effects in nature when released. Many medicinal substances are so stable that they pass through the human body fairly unchanged or in another biologically active form. Medicines that get into nature already affect fish and aquatic animals at very low concentrations. Antibiotics in the environment can also seriously threaten our health.

We believe that more knowledge is needed about the impact of medicines on the environment. Medicines are a special group of chemical substances because we need them to cure and

alleviate diseases. Other substances that affect the environment can be banned, but this does not apply to pharmaceuticals.

Medicines are developed and used in large quantities. This applies not least to over-the-counter medicines. Large emissions are made of the substance diclofenac, which is part of the group of pain-relieving drugs. Emissions of substances included in hormone preparations such as birth control pills are also extensive.

Several harmful substances have been shown to have negative effects on birds. Relatively recently, a Swedish research group showed large occurrences in Swedish watercourses. The findings shed light on the question of whether an environmental assessment should be carried out at some stage. It should at least be current regarding non-prescription drugs. The most important function of medicines, to save lives and improve the health of people and animals, must of course weigh the most. Given the evolution of emissions and risks to the environment, trials must be considered. Such a trial could accelerate the development of medically equivalent preparations with lower environmental effects and alternative treatment methods.

Madam Speaker! The Sweden Democrats believe that an inquiry needs to be set up to review how an environmental assessment could be designed as part of the approval process for medicines and as part of the prescription of such and what consequences different forms of regulation may have.

Madam Speaker! In the election campaign, the Sweden Democrats highlighted the need for a new dental care reform, and dental care is also presented in the Tidö Agreement.

The Sweden Democrats want to see the high-cost coverage of dental care changed to more closely mimic what exists in healthcare, which would make dental care more equal and accessible so that even the elderly with a low income or pension have the opportunity to visit the dentist before their oral health gets too bad and the costs even greater.

Exactly what such a reform should look like is not yet complete, but the Tidö parties will come back with that after the issue has been investigated. But the Sweden Democrats' position is that the mouth is part of the body and that this should be reflected in the systems.

Ref. 164 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! I noted that there were a few sentences at the end where Johnny Svedin from the Sweden Democrats touched on dental care. I can understand that there weren't many sentences, because here you can see how a sharp election promise turns into a thumbs-up or maybe not even that.

During the election campaign, the Sweden Democrats were extremely clear that high-cost protection would be introduced. It would be of the type that is in other health care. It would cost SEK 7 billion, and the money would be raised by reducing aid and reducing climate work. They

have cut back on climate work; aid has been reduced, but there is no money for high-cost protection.

By the time this came to the Tidö Agreement, that had changed. Then the issue would be investigated and priority given to the elderly.

In the budget bill for 2023, one would review and investigate during the mandate period, and then it was no longer about all elderly people but the elderly people who have the worst oral health.

From a general high-cost protection for 7 billion, they have thus ended up investigating a high-cost protection for the elderly who have the worst oral health.

Everyone here knows that if you are going to introduce a new high-cost protection, it is required that the government appoints an investigation, that you draw up an investigation directive and that you appoint an investigator who will then have to have probably two years to work before there is a completed proposal to be forwarded, processed in the Government Office and perhaps pass the Legislative Council before it possibly becomes a bill. It is therefore clear that nothing will come of the election promise of a high-cost protection during this mandate period.

You may wonder what it is due to. Either it was the case that for you in the Sweden Democrats this was a rather uninteresting election promise that you dropped all at once in the negotiations, or it is the case that you have been thoroughly deceived by the other parties. I wonder why you haven't pushed this issue harder if it was so important that it even made it into the election manifesto.

Ref. 165 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply:
Madam Speaker! Thank you for the question, Member!

Yes, it was an election promise that we had and went to the election with. We said we were going to do dental reform of some sort, quite rightly.

It is still in the Tidö Agreement, and thus we expect it to be implemented during the mandate period.

Ref. 166 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:
Madam Speaker! It is, after all, an obvious change from the election promise of a high-cost protection for everyone at a cost of 7 billion, which then means that everyone gets the high-cost protection, to the increasingly weaker formulations and also finally that one must investigate and that it is about the elderly who have the worst oral health.

Anyone who knows anything about how to change legislation and work with the budget in Sweden knows that it is not possible to sneak a new bill out of one's nose from one day to the next and think that it will become a reality a few months later. If you sit down and look at this and

calculate the lead times that exist, it becomes obvious. There's no government order, there's no directive and there's no investigator, so this is going to be something that possibly ends up on the other side of the 2026 election.

Again my question is why have you released this. If it had been an urgent issue for the Sweden Democrats, they would have made sure to not only have a loose formulation in the budget bill for 2023 but an actual timetable where it is clear that the directive must be drawn up before May 2023 and the investigator appointed before June 2023 with a delivery date of two years later to at least have a timetable that makes it even theoretically possible to get this in place during this mandate. But that has been completely ignored.

For my part, there are only two possible interpretations of this.

One is that the Sweden Democrats are aware that this was not an important election promise. You don't mind it being swept under the rug and placed somewhere far into the future. The second is that you have simply been blown away on this issue - that other parties do not think this is important and have therefore been able to handle the Sweden Democrats in this way.

I think it would be interesting to hear an explanation, alternatively an announcement now that this will be implemented in the near future, as it is usually called when ministers speak. What is the explanation for the fact that this central election promise in the election manifesto did not even bite an inch?

Ref. 167 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Anders W Jonsson is of course right that it takes time. A reform like this cannot of course be done overnight.

Firstly, we have not swept anything under the rug – I can say that right away. This is an important reform; it is needed. And who needs it the most? Well, probably older people with poor dental hygiene and dental health. We are fully aware that they also have the most difficulty getting to dental care. We would of course like to see much more done here. So it is not a question of deprioritizing this in any way, but the question is when it ends up on the agenda.

We have approximately 28 points in the Tidö agreement that affect the social committee in one way or another. For other committees, there are probably more points. It is a matter of prioritization what we need to focus on at the moment. I think this issue will end up on the agenda pretty soon.

Ref. 168 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! The Sweden Democrats are part of the government now. They don't physically sit in the government, but they control the government, I believe - with the help of the Tidö agreement, a chancellery and leading posts you have here in the Riksdag. You thus have a great influence on the current government's policy and also on certain issues that are regulated in the Tidö Agreement.

I want to say to member Johnny Svedin that I agree with a lot of your speech. The queues for child and youth psychiatry are a dilemma and have been for many years. When it comes to treatment methods, even you, Johnny Svedin, who works in the industry yourself, know that it also has to do with competence and access to resources.

I am reacting to one thing in your speech, Johnny Svedin, namely that the previous government would have dismantled healthcare. I just want to remind the member that we added over 100,000 new public sector jobs when we were in government. It will be interesting to see what it looks like when this government, together with SD, makes its financial statements.

We had historic funding for health care. We even secured the value of the government grants, according to SKR.

I want to ask a simple question to the member Johnny Svedin, Madam Speaker. We are facing a welfare crisis. 31 billion is missing for next year. The government, together with the Sweden Democrats, has prioritized tax cuts for you and me. How will the member ensure that the necessary resources are added to Sweden's municipalities and regions?

Ref. 169 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you, Mikael Dahlgvist, for the questions! You claim that you have added 100,000 new public jobs during your government period, and also a lot of funding for health and medical care. I guess they have gone to the 100,000 public administration jobs instead of healthcare professionals. This is a huge problem today. We have a large administrative colossus but very few people who work outside the business. Thanks for that!

As for the budget, it is set for the past year, and there are major investments underway. Then money is not always the solution to a problem, but it is also about how you manage the money. It is proven that if you add a lot of money, the administration increases; we have seen that during these eight years. And the money does not go to care-related professions, which we are most in need of and where we currently lack staff.

Ref. 170 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you, Johnny Svedin, for your reply. Those who are listening and have got jobs in healthcare or elderly care are probably thinking a little about your statement now that the money has only gone to administrative jobs. I think that one should be extremely careful in drawing such conclusions in this House, Madam Speaker. I agree that administrative jobs are increasing faster than they should. There is a problem; we see that too. We are also one of the parties that wants to remove a lot of the regions, but then the bourgeois side said no earlier. It is a problem with administration, but such generalizations and myths, I would like to call it, do not benefit the political debate, Johnny Svedin.

How does the member think that the queues for bup will be shorter, if you don't add more money? The member himself says that it is about how you work and how you administer. Yes I

agree. I want to say that if you have too much money you waste and if you have too little money you become smart. I myself have managed and worked at different levels, so I also have experience in this.

But now look the truth in the eye, Johnny Svedin! Tens of billions are missing. It is written every day in the newspaper that staff are notified, both within the health and medical care and within the municipalities. This will ultimately, if we are to take the area we are debating here today, affect the pharmaceutical budget. And what will the consequences be?

Ref. 171 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thanks again, Mikael Dahlgvist, for the questions! We can talk about the administrative part as much as we like, but in my home region, Kalmar County, the increase was significantly greater for the administrative positions than for the care staff. This is saying no small thing, and it is probably quite comparable across the country.

You yourself admit that you have seen with concern that the administration has grown and become larger, which is a problem. You need to work on that problem. What do we need to have? Another administrative position that is not close to care or a new nurse, assistant nurse or care assistant on the floor? I think the choice is obvious.

We need people who work close to the sick and needy. There is probably money to be found there too. It is up to the regions to decide such things. We cannot do that here, but we are talking about the big picture.

But as I said before: We have 28 points in the Tidö agreement that in one way or another concern the social committee and aim to improve health care in the direction we want. Among other things, we are talking about finally trying to get to grips with the role of primary care in the healthcare chain. We are talking about the pharmacy. The Tidö agreement also states that we must develop the role of pharmacies in the care chain.

So it's coming. I'm not one bit worried about it. I actually feel quite sure that these are good measures that will benefit Swedish healthcare in the long run.

Ref. 172 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! Member Johnny Svedin, I wonder a little. I am standing here with a newspaper, Dagens Medicin, where it says: "Inflation swallows health care money". Hiding behind the fact that only administrators are allowed to leave care doesn't feel right to me. This is a crisis in the entire health care system.

The member raised this with children who have various mental health diagnoses and fare quite badly. We are in complete agreement there. There is a huge prescription of, for example, anti-depressant drugs and also anti-adhd drugs. What is prescribed looks very different around the country.

We had some simple little proposals in our little motion, namely that the government should carry out a national review of the prescribing of antidepressants and that the government should initiate a review of guidelines for the medication of children and young people. But it was only us in the Left Party and the Green Party who were positive about this, which was a bit sad.

Of course, I wonder if the member might think that it is something that he can take forward, because the Sweden Democrats have a huge impact on this government. It is because of you that there is a government at all right now, so to speak.

My second question is about the dental care reform that you came out and said would be implemented. Just as Anders W Jonsson said, it sounded very bloated: Now there will be a dental care reform! It has since dwindled down to very little. Now it applies to older people with the worst oral health, and it is something completely different from a general dental care reform, which we think is needed.

How does member Johnny Svedin think this will turn out in the end?

Ref. 173 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Karin Rågsjö gets the same answer as the previous speaker when he asked how I saw this. I am quite confident that this will be implemented during this mandate. We need to do an investigation. It will definitely take some time. But these are not empty promises.

That we then talk about the elderly's oral health or the elderly's lack of good oral health is quite natural, because that is how it is today. This is a huge problem in elderly care, and that is why we have also highlighted it as one of the big problems and a reason why we should implement this dental care reform.

Then there was the matter of neuropsychiatry and such. Yes, how do we deal with that? There are a lot of measures within the Tidö Agreement that will lead us in that direction.

I agree with Karin Rågsjö, and she certainly agrees with what I said in my speech as well, that we need to do something here. We really need to review what it is that makes children feel so bad, why the bad feeling is increasing and, above all, also why the medication is increasing instead of the care that they would really need.

One suggestion is that we clarify the doctor's role in the care chain. It is part of the Tidö Agreement. It may also lie in the investigation. We will also have an investigation into principals. There may also be a part in this.

There are thus several measures that cut into this issue. There is no direct paper proposal that will deal with exactly everything. But I think that if we put these different measures together, we will also see an improvement. We will make sure that it ends up among what we plan for.

Ref. 174 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply:

Madam Speaker! I don't think that children and young people will feel better from the cuts in school that we are now seeing around the country. I can also refer to a survey carried out by Friends, which shows that bullying on the basis of ethnicity has increased incredibly. Maybe you should think about that. It can't be anything positive.

Let me go back to this with the dental reform. This SD-dependent government has spit out investigations of various kinds. There is, for example, an ongoing investigation into whistleblowing. There are lots of investigations. But this is in some sort of chest of drawers.

If you then have to carry out the major reform that this is anyway - I mean that it is not only about the elderly, but poor dental health may have more to do with class than with age - it may still happen that nothing will come of it. It will again be something that comes very close to the next election, and then we know that it is not something that anyone will raise in the next government. But we will fight for it, I can say.

I am concerned about the investigation. When you go out and say things before an election, it is very good to make sure that you then act on what you have said. In all matters that have to do with immigration, crime and so on, you have followed what is to be done to the letter, but just this with the dental care investigation and general support, which should be equated with what we have for the body, there is nothing off right now.

Ref. 175 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you, Karin Rågsjö, for the question! Again, I can only say that this is something we would like to enforce. It is a question that has come from us. It is a question that we have used in the election campaign and will implement in the Tidö agreement. There it says.

The fact that it has not started yet may be because we have prioritized other things at the moment. I dare not answer that. I cannot give a date for when exactly this will happen, but it is an important issue. Karin Rågsjö can be absolutely sure that we think it is. We will not let this go by any means. That's how it is.

As far as investments are concerned, I agree with Karin Rågsjö: You have to start somewhere. I also said that in my speech, and I have said it before as well. What do we need to do to reduce, for example, the medication of children and young people, and what do we need to do to make them feel better and not have to come to the BUP? School health care is one of the things I know the current government is investing in.

I also know from my own experience that school health care is among the first things people look at in the municipalities when it comes to things that can be reduced a little in schools. It's easy money to collect. The member must monitor this just like me and make sure that this does not happen, because it is incredibly important that we have a functioning school health service.

This is included in the total bet on the 28 points. We will monitor this. We will strengthen Swedish healthcare and care for children and young people. This is what I can say.

Ref. 176 LINA NORDQUIST (L):

Madam Speaker! In this area, I was very happy with the government's declaration and the government's priorities. As a pharmacist I was happy, as a resident I was happy and as a liberal I was very happy. We get a pharmacy reform and a dental care reform. It feels very good.

Regarding the pharmacies, I would like to say that it is high time to develop their role in the care chain. During this mandate period, the government must ensure that certain services can be offered, for example health examinations. We will also introduce a pharmaceutical range, an intermediate position between over-the-counter and prescription.

On the drug front, there is also a lot of crucial work going on, I would say, for all people who need drugs in one way or another. It is about updates and a new drug strategy. We are finally getting a national strategy regarding rare conditions – in a broad sense, but which of course includes medicines.

It is also about work to ensure that medicines are where they are needed when they are needed. There must be fewer drugs listed as remaining. We are also working to introduce an environmental premium in the benefits system and weigh environmental aspects when it comes to over-the-counter medicines. It is something that the Liberals have worked for for a very long time.

So there is a lot going on. It will be very fun to see this.

Then we have this with the dental care reform, where an inquiry is added to strengthen dental care's high-cost protection. Those with the worst oral health must be prioritized. It is incredibly important. Today, it is expensive for those with poor oral health. In addition, fragile oral health often goes hand in hand with fragile finances.

We must all have knowledge to be able to prevent. We should all be able to afford prevention and treatment. Those with the greatest risk must be given the highest priority.

I am very happy that the government has tasked the National Board of Health and Welfare with the task of producing data for a national risk assessment. It is important.

The work for equal dental care for children and adults throughout the country is now underway. The work for better drug supply and smarter drug legislation is ongoing. I am really looking forward to the finished proposals.

Ref. 177 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! The discussion on the pharmaceutical side is very much about increasing access so that all people can have access to medicines. But what you then forget is that there is another side of the sword, namely incorrectly used medicines. Perhaps the most upsetting are the people who suffer from addiction diseases due to incorrect prescription of narcotic

preparations. This can happen out of pure ignorance, but there are a number of doctors in Sweden who make very serious money from prescribing narcotic preparations to people who have addiction diseases.

Here the teeth are far too weak. It is very difficult for Ivo to find these individuals, depending on the fact that Ivo must first get a suspicion that there is an individual who engages in this, shall we say, criminal behavior. You can then request information about that particular individual.

One could quite easily catch these ugly fish by simply changing the legislation so that the E-health authority periodically reports in prescribing patterns with regard to narcotic preparations. Who prescribe more than five times more than the other doctors in the country? Then you could quite easily pick out those who work in oncology clinics and so on. It would be a surefire way to actually oversee and put an end to this.

We have submitted that proposal. The Liberals will vote no to that. They will also vote no to something else, and I don't understand that. Today, it is permitted for a doctor to prescribe narcotic preparations for himself. It should be stopped.

My question to Lina Nordquist, who has a commitment to these issues, is: Why don't the Liberals contribute to curbing the damage that is actually caused by rogue doctors in this country?

Ref. 178 LINA NORDQUIST (L) reply:

Madam Speaker! Thank you, Member, for the question! I am glad that this topic is being discussed, because it is a very important area. There we also see that HSAN has had much too thin muscles. During the last term of office, the Liberals pushed through, together with the Center Party, among others, that when you are suspected of serious offences, you should not be able to work as a doctor. You should not be able to continue with the mistakes that you have engaged in when they actually pose risks to other people's lives and health.

We have also worked for a long time precisely to make it easier to detect when a doctor prescribes medicine so that it becomes directly dangerous for the patient. It can certainly also be several doctors together doing it, without them actually knowing what the other is doing, so to speak.

In the past, there has been extremely strong resistance from the medical profession itself, which has not wanted anyone to get involved in what they prescribe. But now finally, with the new infrastructure, it will be possible in a completely different way.

I am happy for the member's commitment. I am happy about the exercises. Then it is that the Liberals are now a government party. Then you don't raise motions, but you prepare things in the Government Office. But I completely agree with the member that the work of getting information out about which healthcare professionals can be a direct risk to patients and who overturn rather than help is very, very important. And I can assure you that it is ongoing.

Ref. 179 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Madam Speaker! It is simply a matter of Ivo not having the opportunity to find these individuals today. Ivo must get a report that there is a single doctor in a doctor's surgery who makes money doing this and who has a completely incorrect prescription.

If these individuals are to be found, a change in the law is required. It is required that Ivo be given the opportunity to request these statistics from the E-health authority once a month.

It is incomprehensible to me that you do not proceed with these proposals. They are rejected from the side of the majority, the Tidö parties, and refer to SOU 2022:72. But I have read it forwards and backwards. There is not a word about this. It is about the sales statistics, which must be reported to the National Board of Health and Welfare and other things.

I am still happy that the representative of the Liberals is now positive about this, and I hope that it is raised from the Liberals' side in the discussions at the Ministry of Social Affairs. This is a big problem in Sweden, and it is something that could actually be fixed.

The second part of this is completely absurd. As a doctor, you should not treat yourself in a situation where you have serious illnesses. It goes without saying. One should not treat one's family either. But here we have a loophole that allows a doctor who has a drug addiction to sit and prescribe, not with his pen but with his phone, unlimited amounts of narcotics for himself, and no one stops it.

I take what Lina Nordquist has said here as income for these two concrete proposals to come up on the agenda - let alone that they are rejected tomorrow by the Tidö parties. This cannot be allowed to continue any longer. It hurts a lot of people, and there are simple methods that could stop it.

Ref. 180 LINA NORDQUIST (L) replica:

Madam Speaker! Of course, I cannot promise that the government will choose to implement exactly the Center Party's proposal in a motion. But I can absolutely promise something when it comes to safe care. The big work needs to be about keeping your healthcare close to you. It must be knowledgeable people, who have the right to continuing education and who receive that continuing education. It must be the responsibility of the person who employs the healthcare professionals to provide continuing education. And as the member is aware of: Once rotten eggs appear, those people must be discovered. They will be nailed, and some of them will no longer be in care. You shouldn't be able to put a patient at risk either through ignorance or on purpose - it's that simple. We can definitely shake hands on that,

Ref. 181 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V):

Madam Speaker! This is the last health care debate of the year, so to speak. There have been quite a few debates, and what has colored this year and will color next year is what is written in a newspaper headline: Inflation devours healthcare money.

I think we will get to read more articles like this. We are facing a welfare crisis, and municipalities and regions will have to cut back. You are already doing that now. This will obviously affect patients. It will also affect preventive efforts.

Many children are mentally ill - we have discussed this before. It is about a lot: home conditions, school and free time. But it is also about very clear signals. If you have roots in another country, you are a burden - that is what many children feel today in various places around Sweden. For example, reporting is on the agenda. It is perhaps not so fortunate for a child who lives in an environment dense with immigrants. That's scary. The family can be evicted and so on.

Now I'm going to talk about antidepressants for children and young people. The increase in the prescription of antidepressants in recent years is most evident for children. The percentage of girls aged 10–14 who were prescribed antidepressants increased by almost 60 percent between 2014 and 2018 and by a further 9 percent between 2019 and 2020. For boys of the same age, the increase was just over 40 percent between 2014 and 2018. This is unprecedented numbers. The prescription of drugs for ADHD has also increased. In 2017, 5.6 and 2.6 percent, respectively, of all boys and girls aged 10–17 picked up at least one ADHD medication on prescription. These are high numbers and something that we need to think about.

According to the National Board of Health and Welfare, the large regional differences in the prescription are very worrying. The differences may be due to overtreatment in some high-prescribing regions and to underdiagnosis and underprescribing in other regions. The research in the field, when it comes to this type of treatment, is very uncertain regarding the effect and the long-term consequences of children and adolescents' use. This should be investigated.

We have submitted a proposal. We want the government to carry out a national review of the prescription of antidepressants and ADHD medication for children and young people and for the government to initiate a review of guidelines for the medication of children and young people. I lift reservation number 5.

Then we move on to the pharmacies - there are very widespread debates today. The purpose of pharmacies is to alleviate and, so to speak, cure illness through approved medicines. I think that perhaps they could have given good directives to Apoteket AB instead of selling out. After the Alliance sold out the pharmacies, new business models have been developed. There are different clusters. It's chains. These are grocery stores that are close to pharmacies - you get a bonus if you shop in that pharmacy. You come together, so to speak. These are not cute little family pharmacies, as was talked about when this reform was carried out, but large clusters.

The public health work itself regarding the pharmacies has been pushed into the background. It is also because they are competing entities. It's a market, quite simply.

It is not news that the Left Party wants to review nationalization. We are not alone in that. When Novus conducted a survey in 2020, six out of ten Swedes wanted to renationalize pharmacies.

Access to medicines must also be secured in rural areas. We have also talked about that. To believe that market forces should take responsibility for rural areas and sparser rural areas to have access to medicine is to close one's eyes to reality and not take one's political responsibility.

According to an establishment analysis in 2022, the number of pharmacies that were located more than six kilometers from another existing pharmacy will decrease at the same time. Simply put, the number of pharmacies is decreasing in rural areas, where access is already scarce, and increasing in cities.

It has been a huge increase for us who live in the big cities. We have no problem getting medicine at any time on Saturdays, Sundays and evenings. That's great. But if you live elsewhere in Sweden, it is more problematic.

Now we leave the pharmacy and go on to the teeth. We believe that the teeth are a matter of class. In the Tidö agreement it says on page 8: Dental care reform. An investigation is added to strengthen dental care's high-cost protection to more closely mimic what exists in other care. Elderly people with the worst oral health must be prioritized.

That was not exactly what was said during the election campaign from the Sweden Democrats. We have already talked about that. One can think about when the investigation will come and if it will come at all. It is a huge equality reform.

It is also not unknown that the Left Party wants real high-cost protection in dental care like in healthcare. In recent decades, welfare has been eroded. We see downsizing and passivity, and a naive faith in the market has been allowed to rule. We want to turn that around.

It is time to build welfare. A dental care reform would be very welcome for many people. It costs a lot to go to the dentist today. I can attest to that.

It is always those with low incomes, regardless of age, who do not go to the dentist. They have no use for today's high-cost protection because it only applies to costs over SEK 3,000, and only half the cost is reimbursed. Good teeth have always been a matter of class.

We have reform plans for dental care in Sweden. We aim for increased equality, improved accessibility and better general dental health in the population. It also prevents serious diseases, which we have also touched upon here.

Through this reform, dental health would become part of the universal Swedish welfare model and would undoubtedly mean a progressive achievement. But we get it. We do not believe that the SD-dependent government will take what is written on page 8 of the Tidö agreement further.

Ref. 182 ANDERS W JONSSON (C):

Madam Speaker! It's an interesting debate we've had today. It concerns two very important questions. It is pharmaceutical management in Sweden and also dental care. There has been a lot of detail in the discussion. I would like to highlight two areas where there are significantly bigger problems.

Let's look at the pharmaceutical field. Sweden is one of the world's richest countries. We are by no means the best even in Europe when it comes to introducing new medicines. It takes far too long before a new drug reaches an entire patient group in this country.

It depends on the fact that it is far too much freely chosen work for the individual doctor which medicines to prescribe. That's the only part.

The second part is that we have a number of medicines where it is already known that they have no effect. But they are still prescribed, and they are paid and paid for by the tax collective.

It is at least as important that the introduction of new drugs takes place in an efficient manner and equally throughout the country as that we model the drug therapies that are no longer current and should not occur. It is about prescribing antidepressants for the elderly and so on. There are a number of examples of that.

This leads to unequal health care where it depends a lot on where you were born in the country, if you were born in another country, what level of education you have, what your parents look like and so on. That makes it vary. It shouldn't be like that.

In the field of pharmaceuticals, unlike other areas of healthcare, we have incredibly good statistics. In principle, we can follow instantaneously which drugs are prescribed and also to which patient groups.

The problem is that we do not have strong enough national control instruments. It is not possible for Ivo to supervise it and be able to see that a drug is being used that should not be used in that patient group at all.

For me, it is such a clear example that what we need much more of in Swedish healthcare is national governance. The social committee visited Intermountain Health in Utah in the USA a number of years ago. It is one of the world's absolute best functioning healthcare systems.

There, in Salt Lake City, you could basically instantly see if the prescribing pattern changed and if you followed the existing recommendations or not. That is where we have to get to, Mr. Speaker.

I had wished that the Tidö government, instead of now appointing an inquiry to look at the nationalization of the Swedish healthcare system, had chosen to appoint an inquiry that would look more precisely at which areas much more national governance is needed.

There it can no longer be freely chosen work and it is up to the individual doctor or clinic how to act. That problem exists in all areas of healthcare. But when it comes to pharmaceuticals, we actually have the tools. What is missing is both the whip and the carrot and the ability to sharply intervene on the part of the supervisory authority.

The other area that we have discussed in the motion report, where there are a number of proposals from individuals and parties, is dental care. The discussion here has been somewhat about high-cost protection.

Member Karin Rågsjö highlighted that it is a class issue what dental health looks like. We can probably all agree on that. You can look in the mouth. We got it described well for us when the committee was on Ekerö and visited a Sis home. In principle, all the young people who came there had deplorable dental health.

But it's not as simple as if you just make the dental care free, you solve it or keep the costs down. We see that depending on the fact that children's dental care in Sweden is free. Despite that, there are extremely large class differences in the dental health of children in vulnerable socio-economic environments in relation to others.

I would say that the financial conditions of dental care may not be the most pressing problem we have. The big problem now is that we don't have staff in Swedish dental care and above all in public dental care. This means that you don't even have time to complete your basic task.

There, the state has a responsibility depending on the fact that it is the state that regulates the volume of education. We can only hope that another dental school in Sweden will soon be established. It is Jönköping's turn to be able to offer that education. The state has a responsibility here, and we must take that responsibility.

What is sad about that is, of course, that what the Tidö parties and the moderate-led government are doing in that area is to ensure that personnel from other countries are kept away. It will affect both healthcare and dental care.

They raise the income requirement and say: You are not welcome here if you do not have a monthly salary of more than SEK 33,000–34,000. That will make it significantly more difficult to recruit, Mr. Speaker, for both dental care and health and medical care.

Someone may object and say that there is no dentist who earns less than SEK 33,000–34,000 or, for that matter, a doctor. But when you recruit staff from countries outside the EU, it never starts at a full dentist's salary or a full head doctor's salary, but starts significantly lower.

If you then limit the possibility of labor immigration, it will not be a positive force for Swedish dental health and not least Swedish public dental care.

I stand behind all the reservations that the Center Party has in the report, but for the sake of time, I only ask for approval of reservation 12.

Ref. 183 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! I thank Member Jonsson for his very engaging speech.

Just like member Jonsson, I see that Swedish healthcare needs to develop, and if it is to develop, you need to do something different. One of the lessons I took with me after the corona pandemic when I was a regional councilor on Gotland was that more things should be elevated to a state responsibility. The state needs to take greater responsibility for the management of care. I understand that Anders W Jonsson agrees with that, at least in parts.

It therefore becomes strange when member Jonsson says that the government should just draw a line and then all healthcare will suddenly be state-owned. In the assignments that have been given to the committee for the inquiry into state care, it is stated that they must analyze and highlight the pros and cons of full or partial state ownership of health care. Proposals must be submitted that ensure a more efficient healthcare system that starts from patients and takes into account the needs of employees.

Isn't this really exactly what Anders W Jonsson and myself are calling for? One must unconditionally look at how it could work better with increased government control. It is certainly open to the fact that it can be fully or partially state-owned.

Ref. 184 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thank you for a very interesting question.

I think that there is a big argument in Sweden that there is a need for increased national governance in a number of areas. But simply achieving increased national governance is an incredibly extensive task. It requires changes in a large number of laws. You also have to look at which parts of the healthcare infrastructure should be state owned, that is, have state leadership. That alone is an incredibly large reform effort. I think there can be a broad line-up among the various parties, which we have heard in the discussion for many years. However, the issue of state leadership is something else entirely.

I assume that Jesper Skalberg Karlsson closely follows what happens at Ratio, which is a Swedish research institute. For several years, they have put a lot of work into going through the research on whether it is more efficient to have the entire Swedish healthcare system under a single leader, led by a director general who would be sitting on Kungsholmen. It would be the most devastating thing that could be done for Swedish healthcare.

In Sweden, we have two such processes fresh in our memory.

One is the nationalization of Försäkringskassan, which led to Försäkringskassan not functioning for ten years. It was in and of itself justified to do so with a business that is governed by legislation where it must be exactly the same decision in Vittangi as it is in Ystad. There, it is reasonable to have a single organization under a director general. But healthcare is incredibly complex.

The other example in Sweden is the nationalization of the police. We went from a number of different police agencies to one. Even for that there were incredibly heavy reasons.

Creating an NHS in Sweden with 455,000 employees and a budget of roughly the same amount in billions is a dead end. It would have been better to focus on what brings results.

Ref. 185 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply:
Mr Speaker! I thank Member Jonsson for the answer.

I look forward to the committee's work, where they will look at how to partially or fully take on greater governmental responsibility, move forward and solve real problems. Then you get many tools in the toolbox that you can use.

Mr Speaker! My follow-up question is not about this. We have heard in the debate that we have an SD-led government. Just as the Sweden Democrats are a support party for the current government, the Center Party was a support party for the previous government.

They talk here that things should go much faster and that everything should happen at once. It does not matter that the Tidö Agreement regulates a term of office; everything must be completed in the first year. Then it is interesting to hear more about how fast things really went during the previous term.

One issue that the member touched on in his speech was the national drug list. I wonder why it took so long if everything went so fast when the Center Party was the support party. Why wasn't it finished when the Moderates entered Rosenbad last fall?

Ref. 186 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply:
Mr Speaker! The national drug list was not part of the January agreement. However, we had learned how government cooperation works. The agreement we had was therefore extremely carefully specified with which investigations were to be appointed, which dates applied, when the investigations were to be delivered and so on.

When you see how your collaboration is arranged, it is so obvious that it is not the same way. This is what means that the Sweden Democrats' important demand for a high-cost protection will likely not be able to become a reality during the period because it is a low priority in a drawer far down and because the Sweden Democrats have not kept up and received sufficiently sharp commitments in these areas.

If you want to achieve something, you must first appoint an investigation, and that takes time. It takes time to change Sweden, and you have to realize that.

The fact that the national drug list has taken time is due to the fact that what was initially an initiative from the coalition government, as member Skalberg Karlsson knows about, time and again ran into obstacles because it was not easy to implement. The final stop for the process during the last term came when SKR, which was then controlled by the Alliance, said a unanimous no to forcing the process. Otherwise, we would have risked patient safety. This caused the then government to slow down the pace of the timetable for the introduction of the national drug list, which the current government has also done.

This shows that things take time. Therefore, one must be well prepared and use the investigative resources for things that really make a difference.

With regard to national governance, there is as much to do as possible in terms of legislative work. But spending time on finding out whether a nationalization of the entire Swedish health care system is possible is a false track.

Ref. 187 ULRIKA WESTERLUND (MP):

Mr Speaker! The problem of incorrect drug use has been the subject of several debates. I want to take us back to something that happened quite a while ago, but still deserves attention.

The elderly are often particularly vulnerable. About 15 years ago, the problem received a lot of attention through a case involving a woman named Gulli Johansson. It was thought that she was dying, and when in her condition she could no longer take the medicines she was prescribed, she unexpectedly began to perk up. It was revealed that for many years she had been completely overmedicated and barely aware of the combined effects and side effects of the drugs. When she died a few years later, her situation was described as having lost eleven years of her life due to incorrect medication.

The Green Party proposed in connection with the case the establishment of a lex Gulli. The idea was to introduce a notification obligation if the staff suspects medication neglect by someone suffering serious medication-related problems as a result of incorrect prescribing.

No lex Gulli was ever introduced, but a number of other measures that improve the situation of elderly people connected to medicines have been taken. According to the Patient Safety Act, which came in 2011, mix-ups, incorrect prescriptions and wrong dosages of medicines must be reported. It is intended that the next of kin should have the opportunity to participate in patient safety work. Complaints can be reported to the National Board of Health and Welfare.

The National Board of Health and Welfare has also come up with regulations that require that people who are 75 years of age or older and who have more than five drugs prescribed at least once a year must be offered regular drug reviews. How this works in practice is difficult to say,

and clearly there are many older people who do not know that this is a right and something that should happen. The work to ensure that this works must therefore be improved.

The Green Party also believes that the restriction regarding age and number of medicines should be reviewed with regard to the right to a simplified medicine review. Physicians' responsibilities should also be made clear with regard to the question of carrying out a simple medication review with each prescription of medication and in other treatment situations where it is deemed appropriate. Finally, in-depth medication reviews should be carried out when the elderly move into a nursing home and annually thereafter. The government should review all these issues. Maybe it's time for a lex Gulli after all.

Mr Speaker! As has also been mentioned by colleagues here before, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child has recently reviewed Sweden regarding how well we live up to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The review was published in March, and the committee noted with concern the level of depression, anxiety and self-harm among children, as well as the long waiting times for psychiatric care. According to an article in DN, which covered this, the number of children up to the age of 17 who take antidepressant medication has increased by 190 percent in ten years, which is much higher than in our neighboring countries.

It is extremely important that all children and young people who have problems with mental illness get the help they need. The queues must be shortened and the right help deployed in time. The right help can be medication, but there can also be other measures and interventions that can help. Resources to shorten the queues and ensure that all young people get the right help in time must therefore be ensured. The cooperation between different healthcare efforts must work, and there must be clear guidelines and demarcations between bup and other agencies in connection with drug prescription. Therefore, the government should initiate a review of current guidelines for medication of children and young people.

Mr Speaker! We seem to be raising about the same issues in this debate. Now I wanted to say something about dental care. Sweden should have a coherent health care system. No one should have to forego preventive or necessary dental care for financial reasons. Today we live longer and longer, and more and more elderly people still have more of their own teeth. This increases the need for regular dental care. The work to create equal dental care that is available to all must continue.

The government has announced that it intends to review dental care's high-cost protection during the mandate period so that it more closely resembles the high-cost protection that exists in other care. It has also been said that the elderly who have the worst oral health should be prioritized. We think it is very positive that the government makes it clear that it wants to do something about the high cost levels affecting individuals and that it raises the issue of high-cost protection. The Green Party's goal is that dental care should be included in the same high-cost protection as care in general for everyone in the way that is possible without threatening dental care's current opportunities to, for example, be at the forefront of technology and provide health

care. It is urgent to get the promised investigation in place, where all these challenges can be taken into account.

Mr Speaker! Finally, I would like to say something about the environmental impact of medicines. There is much to be done to see how this can be reduced. The government should take measures for the EU to impose stricter environmental requirements on pharmaceutical manufacturing with the aim of eliminating more harmful substances than today. The government should also work for the EU to allow the member states to decide that medicines that are directly harmful to the environment should not be sold without a prescription.

The drug diclofenac has often been mentioned here. The government should investigate how the sale of products containing diclofenac can be more tightly regulated. Now I have seen several times at the pharmacy that they themselves have labeled the shelves and pointed out that this is a very environmentally dangerous drug, but there is more to do here. It is in everyone's interest to counteract harmful environmental impacts in all areas. Drug production and use of drugs must not make people sick.

I request approval for reservation 6, but of course stand behind all of the Green Party's reservations.

Ref. 188 ANNA VIKSTRÖM (S):

Mr Speaker! Good dental health is an important part of people's well-being and health. Poor dental health can not only be experienced as stigmatizing but also lead to serious sequelae. Thanks to free child and youth dental care and dental insurance, dental health has become increasingly better compared to previous generations.

While dental health at the population level continues to improve, however, differences in dental health between different socio-economic groups remain. The frequency of visits differs greatly between different groups in the population. People with a high level of education and those with a high income visit dental care more often than people with a lower level of education and low income. Very recently, there have been two new authority reports that show quite serious shortcomings in the information about prices to patients, which may also contribute.

There is a shortage of dentists and dental hygienists. In 2022, 17 and 19 regions, respectively, reported having such a shortage. There are still large regional differences. Dental care has recruitment problems that show up throughout the country, but especially in the northern parts of Sweden. The government likes to refer to the National Health Care Skills Council when they receive questions about the supply of skills in dental care, but as far as I can see, the council has not been given a special government mandate to work on this issue. One of these may be needed.

We social democrats think that the investigation that our previous government appointed and that presented its very detailed proposal in 2021 should be a basis for developing a new high-cost protection. But the government and SD instead want to set up a new investigation to

review dental care's high-cost protection, according to the Tidö agreement. We think it is unnecessary and that the government should take the work further based on the already submitted proposal and consultation responses.

Mr Speaker! There are also various statements by the Sweden Democrats and the government about the introduction of a new high-cost protection. In the Tidö agreement, as I mentioned, there is only one point about a new investigation. But during the spring, representatives of the Sweden Democrats stated in the media that the introduction of the high-cost protection has already been negotiated and that 99 percent of it should be introduced during the mandate period. The same was said here in the rostrum by the representative of the Sweden Democrats. If the government and the Sweden Democrats agree on it, why is it not in the Tidö Agreement? It becomes very unclear what actually applies. If it were to be the case that an introduction will be relevant during the mandate period, the question also becomes why a new investigation should be appointed when there is already a very detailed investigation.

Against the background of the public health policy goal of closing the influenceable health gaps within a generation, it is important to also include dental health in the work. An important way to increase access to good dental care for everyone and thereby contribute to improved dental health in the population is to lower the financial thresholds for dental care. That is why the previous government appointed the dental care inquiry, whose proposals are forwarded, ready to be used.

We stand by all of our reservations but request approval only for reservation 20.

(Applause)

The discussion was hereby concluded.

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 15 Social services' responsibility for victims of violence, etc
The Social Committee's report 2022/23:SoU18

Social services' responsibility for victims of violence, etc

was preferred.

Ref. 189 CHRISTIAN CARLSSON (KD):

Mr Speaker! In a family, the most important task is to support each other with love and responsible demands. In the functioning family, the security and the values that make it possible for us to grow and develop our potential are founded. There we learn what is right and wrong and to treat others with respect.

Unfortunately, it happens that the home, which should be a place of safety, instead turns into a crime scene. Too many women are beaten by their husbands. Not infrequently it happens in front of the eyes of small children. The violence, threats and fear cause the self-esteem of those who are exposed to disappear and their insecurity and anxiety to increase.

When adults are no longer able to take responsibility and do not offer the security that the rest of the family needs, when threats and violence instead characterize everyday life, then it is the responsibility of the rest of society to step in to defend the vulnerable family members. There needs to be sheltered accommodation available all over the country - safe accommodation where the vulnerable are sure that they can feel safe.

This is why the government is now preparing proposals aimed at strengthening the quality of our sheltered accommodation and improving the protection of people with protected personal data. We also intend to strengthen the individual rights and also the support for the children who are forced to be uprooted from their existence to accompany their mother to a sheltered accommodation.

Mr Speaker! The consequences of the violence run the risk of being particularly serious when it is not just one person but the entire family or kin who practices the violence and oppression. Islamism and the culture of honor have spread in Sweden in recent years, and in some areas women can no longer move freely. In Rinkeby, 20 minutes from here, there has been an alarm about how the square has been emptied of women because it is said that it is not part of the culture for women to have coffee on their own. Other girls testify of how they are spat on out in town because they refuse to wear a veil.

Thousands of young girls are forced to live under the oppression of the culture of honor in our country. Girls are lured abroad to be married off and never return to school after the summer holidays. Others are beaten or murdered in the name of honor.

Madam Speaker! Values matter. The fight against a culture of honor and honor-related violence is about being clear about which values Sweden must continue to build on. It is about standing up for Swedish values of freedom and equality. It's about standing up for Western culture. Above all, it is about defending the freedom of individuals and standing up for some of society's most vulnerable. Therefore, we need to do more to combat honor culture and honor violence.

A special criminal classification for honor suppression finally came into place last year, and the government has now announced that it will further tighten the penalties for this type of crime. I think it is very positive that the County Administrative Board in Östergötland has been given a strengthened mission to support the development of regional resource centers to combat honor-related violence and oppression. There are successful examples already, but it needs to spread to more parts of the country. I also believe that the social service needs a clearer mission and better conditions to counteract the type of radicalization and extremism that paves the way for Islamism and a culture of honor in Sweden.

I would also like to say a few words about prostitution and human trafficking in Sweden. Some become prostitutes because they don't know how else to support their children or finance drugs. Others may have been born into a family where they were sold by their parents as children. Another person has been tricked here by a man who maybe said he loved her, but now she is forced to sell her body here in Sweden instead.

Unfortunately, at the same time, there are far too many men in Sweden who are prepared to take advantage of other people's vulnerability by buying sex. It's about everything from young guys to parents of small children and the elderly. Sex buyers exist in all walks of life, and I think we need to talk more about the values that make some men willing to take that right instead of treating others with respect.

It is the case that most people who become prostitutes do so out of compulsion or because they are in a very difficult and vulnerable situation. Many have previously been subjected to sexual abuse and rape. The vast majority state that they would leave prostitution if they could. In the worst case, it is about someone who has fallen victim to trafficking and human trafficking.

The decision to commit the crime of buying sex is wrong because you risk exploiting an extremely vulnerable person when what you should be doing instead is helping her or him away from vulnerability. We need to offer better support to prostitutes and harsher punishments for those who buy sex and perpetuate human trafficking.

Therefore, I would like to take the opportunity to highlight the government's ongoing work with the action plan against prostitution and human trafficking, which is part of the government's broader effort to prevent and counteract men's violence against women. I will also say that I look forward to the results of the investigation in terms of developing an exit program for people who are exposed to prostitution.

Countering prostitution and human trafficking is, for us Christian Democrats, about taking social responsibility. It is about standing up for some of society's most vulnerable, and we are happy to contribute to strengthen that work.

In conclusion, I will ask for approval of the committee's proposal in the report, but I also want to take the opportunity to thank the Speaker, the Bureau, the committee office and my colleagues in the committee for the work during the National Assembly.

First of all, I want to wish everyone a happy midsummer and then also a continued pleasant summer! I look forward to continued good cooperation this autumn.

Ref. 190 GUSTAF LANTZ (S):

Mr Speaker! I have worked as a student assistant and in home care. I have worked in court and in correctional services. I have also been a legal representative. In various roles, I have met crime victims who have struggled with their lives. Sometimes I've guessed what they've been

through. Sometimes I've known. Sometimes I have given support to the victim, and sometimes I have been involved in judging the perpetrator.

I've seen photographs of bruises, cuts and torn locks of hair. I have seen children go through recorded interrogations, where they talk about abuse. I have seen how women are broken down after years of terror.

I have many times seriously reflected on how brutal and unfair this world can be and how there is so much suffering even in a country of peace and prosperity. I think many of you have too.

But if there is any country that has the opportunity to prevent crime and help crime victims, it is Sweden. Our community is strong. Our resources are great. We have to believe in it, and we have to bet on it. Politics is about wanting and choosing. In the end, it is not the knowledge and commitment of politicians that is decisive, but the ability of politics to ensure that society takes advantage of the knowledge and commitment that exists in society.

Mr Speaker! All committed people who literally save lives in the country's women's shelters deserve the right conditions for their work. Above all, vulnerable women deserve long-term and stable solutions for them to get the help they need. The government must therefore work to ensure that women's shelters are financed long-term through state support.

Today, no permit is required to provide the intervention sheltered accommodation. Requirements for order and order should be a matter of course in such an important business. Proposals exist, but legislation is delayed. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that the investigated proposals on strengthened rights for children and adults in sheltered accommodation are quickly implemented. According to the proposal, the sheltered accommodation initiative must be subject to both special quality requirements and a permit requirement. This is important. This is urgent.

Mr Speaker! It is sometimes said that diamonds are a woman's best friend. What sexist nonsense! It is not diamond rings from wooing men that have given women the right to vote, social security outside of marriage, or the opportunity to work and earn a living. Female emancipation has taken place with the rise of healthcare, child care and other welfare. These are demands that have not least been made by a strong women's movement. If there is something that is a woman's best friend, it is in that case the welfare state, which the women's movement has helped to build in this country.

But what happens when we enter an economic crisis and the government stands by and watches? What happens when jobs disappear from care, when housing queues grow and when social services lack resources? What happens when, in practical terms, it becomes more difficult to leave a harmful relationship and when the colleagues are suddenly not there?

We Social Democrats prioritize welfare in our budget. Billions in tax cuts could have been billions for welfare if we had decided. We added NOK 12 billion in general state grants to municipalities and regions in our budget. The government put 6 billion. We put half a billion in

special investment for social services. The government put in 10 million kroner. We set aside 50 times more. But it is the government that runs this country and has been entrusted with the tax money. It is their will and their choice that we all have to live with.

Mr Speaker! The housing market creates major obstacles for women who are forced to live with protected personal information and women who have to move to another location. We know too little about their situation. But we know we need to know more to be able to do more. The municipalities' efforts to help people exposed to violence to arrange permanent housing after a stay in sheltered accommodation must be carefully mapped.

Mr Speaker! Fadime Sahindal has his own place in Uppsala - both in the minds of those of us who live there and physically on Bangårdsgatan, where Fadime's place is located. Thanks to her fight and because of her death, we know so much more about honor violence in general in this country. This knowledge must constantly be transformed into better efforts from social services. The government has a special responsibility to push this work forward – for Fadime's sake and for every single one who, long after her death, is affected by the abominations of honor violence.

Mr Speaker! For that reason, and for many others, Sweden needs a new social services law - one that gives social services better tools in our time. Sociologists are best on their toes, but the law often forces them to stand on their heels. Unleash their power and let's have a social service that can responsively and quickly prevent disasters instead of only being forced to deal with them once they happen!

Proposals exist, but legislation is delayed. The government has postponed the new law. Time is ticking, and we in the opposition are counting every day that passes before we have a new social services law in place. The plan was that we would decide on a new law this year, but the government has announced that it will not happen. I hope that next year we will be given the opportunity to decide on a new social services law here in the Riksdag. No more lost years!

Mr Speaker! As this is my last post for this year, I would like to take the opportunity to wish everyone a happy summer. For my part, there are hard unexpected blocks under my feet, vomit on my shoulders and the brusque awakening of a foot in my face in the middle of the night, but also endless love. Soon I will be on parental leave.

With that, I request approval of reservation 27.

(Applause)

Ref. 191 MALIN HÖGLUND (M):

Mr Speaker! Today we are debating the Social Committee's report 18 regarding social services' responsibility for victims of violence. I begin by asking for approval of the committee's proposal.

Mr Speaker! Social services have an important role when it comes to helping and protecting people exposed to violence. It is important that social services are accessible and responsive in order to provide support and protection to those who need it.

In our Sweden, no girl or boy should feel afraid of their parents, afraid to go home in the evening when they have been to training or with a friend or afraid to go on summer vacation. In our Sweden, no parents should feel unsafe in their parenting.

Mr Speaker! In the budget bill for 2023, the government states that parents or, as the case may be, other guardians have the primary responsibility for children's upbringing. It also states that it is important that parents gain knowledge about the child's rights and support in parenting. Furthermore, it is written: The government intends to strengthen parenting support and to increase the number of parenting support programs. The government proposes an investment in enhanced parenting support. The grant is proposed to be increased by a total of SEK 400 million from 2023.

Support for parents is one of the best efforts a municipality can make for its residents. Through safe parents, we also get safe children.

Mr Speaker! One of the main tasks of social services is to protect and support vulnerable people, including victims of violence. Early interventions are some of the most important interventions we can do for children and young people.

There has been criticism of social services for not doing enough to help victims of violence. It is important to take this criticism seriously and review how the social services can be better at helping those who need it. It is not only about providing emergency help, but also about providing support and protection in the long term. It is important that social services have sufficient knowledge about different forms of violence and how to help those who are exposed to it.

Mr Speaker! It is also important that the social service cooperates with other authorities and organizations in order to be able to provide the help that is needed. It is about collaborating with the police, healthcare and various non-profit organizations to be able to provide the best possible support to people exposed to violence.

There are several investigations underway, which we have become aware of. For example, there will be a new social services law, which several of you have touched on. The investigation will be completed next year and will then be sent out for referral. There will be a national strategy to prevent and combat violence against children. There is also an investigation into exit programs for people exposed to prostitution.

Mr Speaker! Almost every day we hear on the radio and television or read in various media about new shootings. Justice Minister Gunnar Strömmer said in an interview that "it will get worse before it gets better".

The government must review the penalty scales, the penalties and the sentencing system. The punishment for violent crimes and sexual crimes - where life imprisonment must be considered for the most serious crimes - and the punishment for attacks on the police and other crimes that threaten the foundations of the rule of law and society must be further tightened in relation to other types of crime.

Mr Speaker! There is a lot of ongoing work in the area, which we have taken note of.

In the Tidö Agreement, it is stated that the investigation must review various possibilities to strengthen parental responsibility and enable early interventions for children who commit crimes or are in the risk zone. This involves, among other things, reviewing the possibilities for additional support for children.

The investment in parental support programs is being expanded, and the goal is for it to be available in all municipalities in the country. The Social Services Act is amended with the aim of giving social services extended powers to decide on early and mandatory interventions for the children or their guardians.

Finally: When a child is placed, we must secure a functioning schooling. We could all take part in this when we visited the Sis home Rebecka last week. Going to school is incredibly important if life as a young adult is to function. We also learned that two girls had graduated, which was pleasing to hear.

Before I conclude, I would like to take the opportunity to wish the Presidium and Mr. Speaker a happy Midsummer and thank the Chancellery and the Social Committee for the two semesters we have had together.

Ref. 192 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thank you, Member, for an introductory speech! I agree with a great deal of what the member highlights about the responsibility of the social service and that you must support the social service and give it the tools to develop in order to be able to embrace its entire mission, which is enormous. I am very distressed by the campaign being waged against social services.

The member mentioned a lot: working methods, cooperation, new exit programs and penalty scales. I have certain opinions about the content of some of the positions, but what we can state - especially this year - is that we have failed. Social services have failed, the police have failed and all of us have failed because the number of murders against women is so extremely high this year.

That is why the Center Party has proposed a national leave program. The report says emancipation support, but we have continued to work with a national leave program. In fact, the

only thing that we know saves lives, or prevents more murders, is women being able to walk away from an abusive relationship with all the support that is actually needed.

We know that several different businesses must be involved and that several different authorities must cooperate. There are various businesses that work with this around the country. The municipalities are included in the vast majority. The police are involved in many but not all. The important thing, however, is that key actors are involved.

This is not something that is done by itself. We need to create a program and structure that is consistent across the country that supports women, regardless of where they live, and gives them the protection and support they need, both before and after they break up, as well as a long-term financial support.

I do not think that the committee's text touches on this. It's a little too fluffy. How does the member view this?

Ref. 193 MALIN HÖGLUND (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thank you, member Helena Vilhelmsson, for important questions!

It shouldn't be a postcode lottery, as we said when we talked about aid issues, which municipality you live in when you should get help. It must be equivalent in the country. However, it doesn't look like that. We have 290 different municipalities in the country. Some are very small, some are larger and some are on the median. It is perhaps these that are more functional, when you have approximately 20,000 inhabitants and it is easy to see each other.

Social services have a great responsibility in this to be available, perhaps not only during office hours but also at other times. But it must also be evidence-based when taking care of the women so that we do not do things in different ways. It should be equivalent in our municipalities, I think anyway.

So we have some work to do here. We also have a new social services law that will come next year and before then will be out for consultation. We'll see what comes with it.

Ref. 194 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! Again, I agree with the points made. But, again, this is nothing that will end the killing of women in the short term. The only way to achieve that is to form at once a leave program, similar across the country, with the necessary protection and support.

It's a bit strange. After all, there are exit programs for men who want to leave criminal environments with three and a half years of structured support in the form of therapy, employment, leisure time, care, treatment and financial support. Women who leave violent relationships basically get none of this. At best, they get sheltered accommodation. In the worst case, they get a protected identity that they have to live with for a long time of their lives. It's

absolutely horrible how differently we see men and women and how differently we take for granted who should get what kind of support.

I have raised this issue with the Minister for Gender Equality. I have raised it with the Minister of Justice. That is why I direct the question to the member from the Moderates. Now it's not about social services, but the Moderates sit in the Ministry of Justice.

So my questions are again: Does the member not think this is remarkable? What proposals can the member consider passing on to the government to achieve a national leave program, similar throughout the country, to save women's lives and to ensure that no more women are murdered?

Ref. 195 MALIN HÖGLUND (M) reply:

Mr Speaker! I have been chairman of the social committee in Mora in Dalarna for eight years. I have met several of these women. The Social Committee was responsible for social services and care for the elderly. I have met several women at different accommodations. Several women wanted to have a secret identity, only to reveal it a few weeks or months later.

I agree that this is problematic. We now have many different investigations going on, and we will see what they lead to. But I still feel great hope with the government and the Tidö agreement we now have. I haven't given up hope.

Ref. 196 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD):

Mr Speaker! Tonight we are debating the social committee's report number 18 Social services' responsibility for victims of violence. I want to start by saying that we in the Sweden Democrats stand behind all our reservations, but to save time, I only ask for approval of reservation number 13.

Mr Speaker! No one should have to be subjected to violence, not in any form. But violence affects both women, men, children, young and old. Violence occurs not only in the streets and squares, in public places, but also in private homes and relationships. Violence in the home and violence in close relationships is a serious problem that affects people in their own safe environments, in their homes, where one should both feel and actually be safe and secure. Both physical, psychological, sexual and economic violence occurs.

But there is also another type of violence in close relationships that was not previously part of Sweden but has emerged in recent years due to governments' undemanding policies. Due to large immigration from culturally distant countries, honor-related violence and oppression has gained an ever stronger foothold in our country and is a large and growing social problem. Often there are also several perpetrators, from both family and relatives and more.

Violence and control are used to maintain the honor of the family or clan. Mainly, it is girls and women who are controlled and exposed. In addition to physical and psychological abuse and threats, it can also include child marriage, forced marriage and genital mutilation of girls and

women. Girls or women have "fallen" from balconies or been killed in other terrible and tragic ways in the name of so-called honor. The National Board of Health and Welfare estimates that 68,000 women and girls in our country may have been exposed to female genital mutilation and that 13,000–23,000 girls are at risk of being exposed.

Herr talman! Sverigedemokraterna är tydliga: Alla former av våld och förtryck ska med kraft motverkas och bekämpas! Vi måste ha en nolltolerans mot våld och arbeta för att säkerställa att rättssystemet fungerar både effektivt och rättvist för att skydda offren och förhindra ytterligare övergrepp.

Jag är därför glad att Sverigedemokraterna tillsammans med regeringspartierna i Tidöavtalet har kommit överens om en rad viktiga åtgärder, reformer och satsningar för att komma till rätta med de stora problemen som är en del av många kvinnors och mäns vardag. Hit hör en ny socialtjänstlag där det brottsförebyggande arbetet särskilt prioriteras, där brottsoffer och potentiella brottsoffer ska få kännedom om sina rättigheter och där deras möjligheter till hjälp och stöd ska öka.

Targeted interventions must be given to people in particularly vulnerable situations, such as children, young people, the elderly and people who are exposed to honour-related oppression.

Parental responsibility is strengthened, and legislation against honor-related oppression is tightened. It will be possible to introduce a stay ban. A broad reform must strengthen student health and there must be an opportunity to protect vulnerable children to a greater extent.

It is primarily parents or guardians who are responsible for the children's upbringing. I have repeatedly pointed out here in the rostrum the importance of early and preventive interventions and the importance of safe families. That cannot be emphasized enough. Society therefore needs to offer support and resources for parenting and family life.

There must be an action plan or action plan in each municipality to identify and stop honor-related oppression. There must be annual national statistics on the number of children living in honor-related conditions, expanded mapping and more surveys to counter child marriage.

The consequences of intimate partner violence are extensive and long-lasting. Sometimes it ends tragically even with death. It affects not only those who are directly affected, but also their families and friends, not least children who grow up in a violent environment and who witness or themselves are directly exposed to violence.

Mr Speaker! We in the Sweden Democrats believe that it is extremely important that the work to prevent violence in close relationships is strengthened. Today there are major shortcomings, and society at large needs to gain increased understanding and knowledge about violence in intimate relationships in all forms and about honor-related violence and oppression. It needs to be ensured within more professional groups.

Social services have, among other things, an important role to play when it comes to handling and supporting those who are exposed to violence in close relationships and to honor-related violence and oppression. It also applies to identify those who are in sexual vulnerability and prostitution. This involves, among other things, offering protection, support, housing options, counselling, therapy and legal support.

To combat intimate partner violence, we also need to work together across sectors, including the judiciary, health and medical care, schools and voluntary organisations. Society needs to offer support and ensure that victims get the help they need to leave a violent situation and rebuild their lives.

The country's women's emergency services are an important resource and an important part of the support given to victims of violence. In their work, they receive some of society's most vulnerable people who need protection. That is why we in the Sweden Democrats highlight in this report, among other things, that a review of society's support for women's shelters and assisted living facilities should be carried out and that they should be certified, to ensure that the operations maintain good quality and that there is competence. Furthermore, the children's perspective should be strengthened, and children who are placed should be covered by their own decision.

The conditions are now also improved for women's organizations to conduct more long-term activities by the fact that part of the grant is distributed as an organization grant and may refer to a period of two grant years.

Furthermore, we have proposed that municipalities' studies and evaluations of violence in close relationships should also include care for the elderly. Tragically, the elderly are also subjected to violence in close relationships, both by relatives and by others in the environment. The Equality Authority has now also been tasked with surveying the knowledge and identifying knowledge gaps in, among other things, municipalities about abused elderly people over the age of 65.

Mr Speaker! Finally, I want to point out carefully that we must put an end to violence in intimate relationships. I am pleased that we in this House and in this committee are in agreement, perhaps not always on the approach but on the common goals of a zero vision on intimate partner violence.

Mr Speaker! There is much more to add, but I will stop here.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Speaker, the Bureau and the committee members for this past year. I wish you a nice midsummer and a really nice summer.

Ref. 197 CHRISTOFER BERGENBLOCK (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thank you, Carita Boulwén, for an engaging speech!

Not least what the member brought up at the end, that there must be an end to violence in close relationships, I think everyone in this assembly can sign on to. It is extremely important, Mr. Speaker.

Men's violence against women knows no bounds. It occurs everywhere in the world, in all countries and in all parts of Sweden. It occurs both among young people and among the elderly, which was also indicated in the speech. It occurs in all social groups and among all different backgrounds. It is not a problem linked to a particular group, place or economy. It is a problem associated with men who cannot control their behavior but have a strong need to control the behavior of others and to put other people down. It must, just as the member says, be stopped.

This is not a debate about harsher punishments. But there is something we agree with - tougher punishments, increased police efforts and restrictions on the perpetrators. What we are debating here is essentially the social efforts.

When you look at the Tidö Agreement and its content, you can see that not much has been expected of the social efforts. There is talk of harsher punishments, not linked specifically to men's violence against women, but in general. There is talk of camera surveillance and various repressive measures.

Mr Speaker! My question to the member is how it looks with the Sweden Democrats and the Tidöparties when it comes to preventive work. We haven't received any real answers there.

Ref. 198 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thanks for your question, Christofer Bergenblock!

The preventive work, which I highlighted in my speech and constantly highlight, is extremely important. I also highlight the need to ensure that the family is well. It is about offering parental support, having functioning schools and that there are adults present around the child and the young person. It is important.

As far as social services are concerned, we have a number of proposals. To begin with, we look forward to a new social services law. Measures to reduce children's vulnerability must also be developed. We also have the leisure card which should enable more people to participate in activities.

The Act on the care of young people must be used more often, specifically to protect vulnerable children and young people, among other things. And a national social action force is to be established. It must conduct environmental analyzes and convey proven methods for crime prevention.

We also have the 24-hour rule. Parents must be called to social services within 24 hours of their child having committed a crime or when it is considered that there is a risk of the child being exposed to something.

Ref. 199 CHRISTOFER BERGENBLOCK (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! It is, of course, that a number of proposals are presented here with regard to preventive work. What is particularly important in preventive work is precisely targeting boys and men who need to learn early in life and understand how to behave towards other people.

We know that men's violence against women is one of our biggest social problems today. When we look at lethal violence in society today, we can state that gang shootings up to June 15 this year have caused 20 deaths in Sweden. Murder in close relationships has caused 22 deaths in Sweden. Nevertheless, the great debate is held about gang crime and gang violence.

The Sweden Democrats have been seen flanking the government parties at press conferences about gang violence, but not at press conferences about men's violence against women. It can make one think about what the priority looks like. It is not in that way that the work against the gangs should be prioritized down. It is very important work. But the work against men's violence against women and counteracting that violence is equally important. But not as much has been seen and heard about those issues.

For a woman to be able to leave a destructive relationship where she is exposed to violence, efforts are required. My colleague Helena Vilhelmsson just presented the proposal for a leave program from us in the Center Party. How do the Sweden Democrats approach that proposal, to build a concrete exit program also for women who need to leave a destructive relationship behind?

Ref. 200 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) replica:

Mr Speaker! What the member highlights is extremely important, and I agree that one does not exclude the other. We must be able to hold two thoughts in our heads at the same time.

All violence must be opposed with full force, regardless of who is the perpetrator and regardless of who it is against. I agree with the honorable member that we need to find ways for those women - and also men, although they are not as many - who suffer violence in an intimate relationship to have somewhere to go. It is completely reasonable and something we must of course work towards.

We must strengthen the family. It is about preventive work to ensure safe families. There we have, among other things, proposals for, for example, parenting support programs. These can be digital tools to use in the event of, for example, separation, precisely so that the parents can have somewhere to turn to get advice, tips and support regarding how they should act and operate in order for it to be as good as possible and to counteract broken families. There you have the biggest work to do. It is usually in broken families that violence is born.

Very often we see boys and men who, in the absence of a father figure, practice a lot of violence and end up in a crooked way in life. We have to work much more there.

Ref. 201 JUNO FLOWER (L):

Mr Speaker! Today's debate is about people exposed to violence and the responsibility of social services. The current trend of violence in Sweden has not escaped anyone. News reporting is characterized by crime victims who are subjected to violence, shootings and explosions. But the violence we are talking about today is that which men perpetrate and which usually takes place within the four walls of the home. It is violence without outside witnesses. Women and children are threatened and abused by partners and fathers who should offer love and security.

We discuss honor-related violence and oppression and sexual abuse of children. There is no reason to pit different types of vulnerability against each other, but it is easy to state that this violence is at least as serious and as alarming and ever-present but never receives as much attention. It is about victims of crime who often do not dare to tell about their vulnerability and who lack support. It is crime victims who suffer in their loneliness and vulnerability. The dark figure is enormous.

Every tenth child in Sweden has experienced domestic violence. The proportion of children who are taken out of the country to be married off or have genital mutilation is increasing. Aftonbladet's review shows that between 2000 and 2020, 325 women were killed by a man they had or had had a relationship with. 596 children lost their mother.

The violence continues. The suffering of abused girls and women continues. The children's vulnerability continues. Children are forced to associate with a violent father. Girls who are already vulnerable are placed in the state's locked accommodation and risk being exposed to violence and sexual abuse by staff.

A shift in perspective is required so that the best interests of the crime victims and the child are always put first. Today, such a shift in perspective is underway. Recently, the government decided that violence prevention work should be written into law. It is an important political decision. The natural question then becomes to find out what the preventive work should contain by identifying risk factors. Early and clear interventions are crucial.

In order for violence prevention work to be effective, we must increase knowledge of what the risk factors are in order to be able to put in place effective measures to prevent young boys and men from resorting to violence as a means of power. Despite the fact that today we see an enormous increase in violence, it is important to remember that the vast majority of boys and young men do not expose their partner or their children to violence. Most young guys don't take to firearms and cross all lines, no matter what area they live in.

The debate concerning young criminals has been marked by a focus on socio-economic factors. The fear of talking about norms and values has led us to choose to label all families in certain residential areas, which has devastating consequences. We have to see and take in more perspectives. One of these is to see and understand what exposure to violence during childhood risks leading to. Violence begets violence, and violence causes deep wounds. Norms

and values influence the child from birth. The betrayal when no one sees, understands or takes action affects abused children.

Abused mothers are forced into difficult goal conflicts when they are exposed to violence. Should I leave a violent man to escape the violence myself, but with the risk that the violent man will continue to have custody of the child?

When it comes to the norms and values of the honor culture, sons are raised early to take responsibility for the behavior of their sisters and close relatives. There, the right to use threats and violence is sanctioned by the family and relatives so that someone can exercise control over the behavior of sisters and other related girls.

What does a childhood characterized by violence lead to? Violence becomes the right and means of the strong. The norms and values children are surrounded by from birth become important. The betrayal that those who saw chose to look away and chose not to act affects children. I am sometimes amazed that there are so many children who do well despite a childhood marked by violence.

"I have so much repressed anger and powerlessness in my body that it feels like I could explode at any moment," explained a young man whose upbringing was marked by a father who subjected the whole family to violence. We must see the connections between being exposed to violence yourself and the increased risk that it leads to exposing others to violence.

To change we must understand. To be able to understand must see reality. We have to be able to have several perspectives on the table at the same time. Those who practice violence have their own responsibility and must face strong consequences, but we as politicians have a responsibility to see and protect the children who are exposed to violence, to prevent children exposed to violence from growing up and choosing to practice violence as a means to gain power and for abused children to be given the right to process the consequences of the violence.

The Liberals welcome that the Social Services Act is now to be reformed. Today's social services law was written in a different time when the challenges were completely different. We must give social workers the right conditions to make efforts that are effective and make a difference.

Reports of concerns to the social services must also be searchable. There must be a social service data register so that you know where children are placed and what efforts have been made so that you can better see what works and what measures do not have the desired effect.

The Liberals are proud to have finally got the former government to produce the basis for a national strategy against violence against children. It is now out for referral.

Children's lives cannot be repeated. We liberals will continue to fight for all children's right to a safe and good upbringing and for all abused women to know that there is support and protection. A life free from all forms of violence and oppression is a matter of rights.

Ref. 202 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thank you, Juno Blom, for the speech! It's always inspiring to listen.

I would like to highlight the same issue as in a previous reply: The problem we face is that society has failed so miserably to protect women. The number of murders is extremely high.

I had an interpellation debate with the Minister for Gender Equality last week about leave programs to hear how the Minister and the government view that issue. I don't know if you listened or took part in the answer, but there was mentioned a lot of what Juno Blom brings up, for example a ten-year national strategy, action program until 2023 and after that a new action program that will come into being. They described social services and the importance of authorities working together and that no one should fall through the cracks. The National Board of Health and Welfare's mission and the municipalities' work with permanent housing is being strengthened, which is great. It is also about the coordination function of the county administrations and so on.

However, there are few operational measures, efforts or activities that are mentioned. The question was how do we prevent more women from being murdered, and I think we need to be more hands-on to succeed.

Social services have a responsibility for, and we have a responsibility to create the conditions for, both preventive work, operative work and financial support once the woman manages to get out of there. Parts of leave programs, which occur in some parts of the country, can be implemented quickly in the form of financial support, fuck off capital, support for accommodation and so on.

I would like to know how the Member reasons. Do the Liberals think that the work is good enough to prevent more women from being murdered in the short term?

Ref. 203 JUNO BLOM (L) replica:

Mr Speaker! Surely there is no one who can think that the order we have in our society today is enough.

Then comes the question of what to do. I have pondered this a lot for many years. When I worked more concretely with these questions, I was in Norway a lot and looked at their work. It would be very interesting – something I also run – to look at their shelter. Many years ago, they entered with government funding initially. Then the municipalities were connected. This has meant that women in Norway do not need a decision to gain access to sheltered accommodation.

If we are really looking for abused women and their children to get quick and safe protection, I personally think that would be the most effective model. Then, of course, the women and children must be allowed to process the exposure to violence. The accommodation is built in a fantastic way.

Here are women's emergency services that have worked with these issues for a long time. So there is something to build on, which is important and good.

While I was investigating the national strategy, there were proposals. In the same vein, the previous government during its first term of office presented the support. I think much clearer government funding is needed to have a long-term perspective. At the Östergötland County Administrative Board, we built the Kompotten. When I left there, 67 municipalities were included in Kompotten. They could exchange abused women and children between the municipalities. But there was no interest on the part of the government to follow this up. It was something we did on the side.

I share Vilhelmsson's view that more must be done. Good things are being done, but the basics must be approached in a better way than today.

Ref. 204 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! I remember the discussion about the Compote. I imagine that we were involved, and both the Liberals and the Center Party pushed the government. It was a disaster that it was not formalized.

Time and time again I bring up leave programs. There are functioning activities in the form of cooperation between the police, municipal authorities and all actors needed in the country. But they are project operations – not ordinary operations. Parts of them can be implemented quickly, while other forms of collaboration take a long time to come about. It is not something where you press a button to drive out on the line in various businesses. It is so extremely important not to lose any experiences.

It is again strange that there are leave programs with all that it means for men but not for women. I will reproduce a bit from the Equality Authority's report.

A person who wants to leave the criminal life is offered an 18-month treatment program commissioned and funded by social services. This is followed by two years of aftercare and follow-up, which is free of charge for the municipality. In the first year, support is available around the clock and includes efforts regarding housing, therapy, drug addiction, employment, debt settlement and leisure activities. This is followed by a six-month elimination program for the client to become more independent.

The Equality Authority can state that the difference in efforts and resources compared to abused women and children who live with protected personal data is palpable. Not least, the importance

of a coordinated actor becomes clear so that people who live with protected personal data will receive the best possible support and protection.

I think it is absolutely horrifying to see the structured and serious efforts that take place against men who want to leave criminal environments compared to women who want to leave violent environments that they themselves have not chosen. I really hope that the Liberals and the member can push the government so that it is possible to have a coordinated operation throughout the country.

Ref. 205 JUNO BLOM (L) replica:

Mr Speaker! Member Vilhelmsson does not need to convince me that it is absolutely horrible. There has been an incredibly strong perpetrator perspective, unlike all the women who have to run from their homes. The man is allowed to stay, and it is difficult to arrange a restraining order. The violent man can largely move freely throughout the country. I have had cases where you have been able to stay in a part of Gothenburg. I totally agree with the notes.

Then the question is what exactly should be done and how accommodation should be arranged. Vulnerable women contact me even now that I am sitting in the Riksdag. They have exactly this kind of problem. They turn to the municipality and can plead for the right to a contribution, despite the fact that there is sufficiently clear legislation that it should be a matter of course. Just as the member says, the differences are huge. An important issue to address is the right of women exposed to violence to turn to sheltered accommodation based on their own assessment of their vulnerability. It should not be about financial financing. It is precisely in connection with break-ups that the risk of deadly violence increases significantly. If a woman subjected to violence has made the decision, the risk increases.

I spend my time doing what I can to make an impact. I also know that there is interest and the desire to find ways to ensure that women who have been subjected to violence do not have to stand with their hats in hand while violent men have access to dropout activities. No one can accept that arrangement in this country.

Ref. 206 MAJ KARLSSON (V):

Mr Speaker! Nobody listens to a whore. So reads a sentence on the Instagram account Inte Din Hora.

The text begins by stating that the purchase of sex has been going on for an extremely long time and was carried out by men from all walks of life - yes, even among members of parliament. During all these years, men have taken advantage of both children and adults and assumed that no one would know, because no one would listen to a prostitute anyway.

However, the text goes on to declare that nothing lasts forever; the trend is about to reverse. Today, the sex-buying men do not meet a person no one sees, but today they meet the opinion makers, writers and leaders of the future. There are people who now refuse to be silent.

This is an amazing revolution that I don't hesitate for a second to embrace. Today, you in the chamber will also get to listen to those who are subjected to sexual exploitation. And I can already say that I will exceed my set speaking time.

In 1999, Sweden became the first country in the world to ban the purchase of sexual services without criminalizing the person who sells sex. It is a strong stance on Sweden's part. We know that this exposure to commercial sexual exploitation is one of the most extreme forms of violence against women. With our legislation, we are not only obliged to prevent violence and convict perpetrators, but we also have an obligation to offer care and support to those who are victims of crime. A person who has been subjected to sexual violence because society has not done its part should never be left alone, should never themselves bear either responsibility or guilt.

But unfortunately, help is very hard to get, and guilt is exactly what the person who sells sex often has to bear, Mr. Speaker.

In 2021, zero people were sentenced to prison for child exploitation, but at least 17 girls were sentenced to confinement in Sis after being subjected to that very crime. In March of this year, Sveriges Radio released an audit which showed that sexual abuse is brought up in judgments about compulsory care for girls significantly more often than for boys. For every third girl, but only for every sixteenth boy, sexual behaviour, relationships or abuse are stated as reasons for LVU.

In the judgments, we can also clearly see that the girls are not only judged based on the abuses they were subjected to, but also have to bear the blame for them. No one can have forgotten the macabre sentence that can be read in one of the sentences about a girl who was taken into care: "Through her behavior she has allowed herself to be exposed to sexual abuse." A crime victim of only 14 years had to bear the blame for the crime she was subjected to.

Perhaps no words can more clearly describe the challenges we have before we can claim that society regards the victim as a victim of crime and that we thereby provide the support that the victim is entitled to. There is no talk of society and politics needing to step up for us to live up to what is actually our obligation.

Mr Speaker! The testimonies of those who survived the hard battle it is to leave the life where they sell sex, those who are survivors, are a hard blow to society and a brutal understatement of politics. Often it is young girls who tell about the terrible abuse they have been subjected to, the trauma it has created and the ruthless perpetrators who inflicted it on them. As if that wasn't enough, it is more the rule than the exception that society has failed them badly when they needed it the most.

To me, it is completely unforgivable that these people were not listened to, not seen and definitely not helped, even when they asked for it. Instead, they have often been distrusted. Sometimes, as we know, they are even convicted.

Therefore, it is high time that we listen now and that we act. Sex for compensation is not a free choice, as many seem to want to believe, but it is a disgusting result of society not doing enough to stop it or provide any alternatives and legitimate support efforts that provide a way out for the victim.

We in the Left Party have therefore put forward a comprehensive motion to both prevent and provide the right help in time. In this report, we have eight reservations, all of which are based on the knowledge that those who sell sex have been forced to experience. Here are some of them.

Firstly, it is highlighted in the report No one heard the cries for help that more than one in two victims state that they did not receive professional help to process their experiences. Instead, people have been sent around the system, where the various problems the person has been treated individually without regard to the whole. The situation is so bad that the Istanbul Convention's expert group has directed harsh criticism at Sweden's lack of care adapted to the needs of victims of sexual crimes. Therefore, we want the range of treatments to be developed and for specialized trauma treatment to be offered.

Second, support and protection for these people needs to be improved, especially as needs can generally be difficult to detect. There is a particular need for support that is adapted to complex problems because it is a risk factor for exposure to sexual violence and exploitation. Social services have a major responsibility in identifying sexual vulnerability and prostitution and offering support. In order to ensure that the social efforts to help and support people who have sex for compensation exist and are equivalent across the country, the municipalities' responsibilities should be clarified. The range of support efforts needs to be evaluated and developed. The municipalities' responsibility for outreach must also be clarified.

Thirdly, it is important for the Left Party that people who want to leave prostitution should be given the opportunity to do so and that they receive equal treatment and the best possible treatment throughout the country. The government should take the initiative to draw up a national exit program for people who want to leave prostitution.

Fourth, the Left Party has for a long time stated that concerted forceful measures are needed to reduce prostitution and human trafficking. In the evaluation of the Sex Purchase Act, it is stated that there are several good examples of cooperation between authorities, but that there is a lack of structures for cooperation and knowledge transfer. According to the inquiry's proposal, a national center tasked with leading the work against prostitution and human trafficking for sexual purposes should therefore be established.

Fifth, we want the government to take the initiative for a national action plan against sexualized violence where a comprehensive approach is taken to sexual violence at all levels. It is not possible to stop the violence only through legislation, but the problem needs to be attacked on a broad front across society. One in ten men has at some point been guilty of the crime of buying

sexual services. Then it will obviously take much more than what we are doing today to stop the violence.

Sixth, the only concrete effort specified by the social service for a young person who is vulnerable to receive help is care according to the LVU. This is based on the definition that sexual exploitation is "socially degrading behaviour". For the Left Party, it is completely unreasonable that the only intervention that is recommended for the target group is aimed at conscripting the young people when in fact they have been exposed to violence and abuse. Therefore, we want the National Board of Health and Welfare to be tasked with establishing national guidelines for children and adults who are exposed to commercial sexual exploitation. All children and young people who have been exposed must receive dignified care and treatment, not be placed in an institution.

Mr Speaker! Some of the Instagram accounts I follow quote what sex buyers have said to those they victimize during the actual crime. Many of these statements are so gross that I cannot read them here without the Speaker having to ban me for my vile language. The violence that the victims testify that they are subjected to is so brutal and ruthless that sometimes I almost lose hope in humanity.

I was particularly badly affected by a post that police officer Simon Häggström wrote about a month or so ago. It was a terrible case that unusually led to prosecution. The 37 charges related to 16 men who exploited a 16-year-old girl, i.e. 16 men on one child.

That we could not stop these perpetrators is a huge betrayal that is hardly mitigated by the fact that we cannot even guarantee that this girl will receive the best possible help and support. That the violence should be able to continue without us acting, without society being there when needed, must be completely unthinkable.

The legislation we have is very good. It clearly shows our position. But as we see, it alone is not sufficient to stop the violence. It is therefore high time, to say the least, that we take the next step in terms of preventive work but also support efforts.

We of course stand behind all our reservations, but today we only request approval for reservation 1.

I also want to take the opportunity to wish the speaker, the bureau and the committee a nice summer.

(FIRST VICE SPEAKER: We thank you for the summer greeting.)

Then, for the sake of form, I must point out that the speaking time was exceeded by more than 50 percent, but that was not entirely unexpected.)

Ref. 207 CHRISTOFER BERGENBLOCK (C):

Mr Speaker! First, I would like to request approval of the Center Party's reservation 14 under point 7 on violence in close relationships.

Until June 15 this year, the Swedish Police Agency states that 20 people have been killed in shootings in Sweden. The violence from the criminal networks is also expressed in explosions and other acts of violence, but what most sticks on the retina is, of course, the indiscriminate shootings where innocents are hit. All boundaries have been crossed.

But society gathers strength to face the violence. Politicians take it seriously. The police authority takes it seriously. The media takes it seriously. Everyone agrees that gang violence must be stopped by all available means.

Until June 15 this year, 22 women have been murdered by a close relative. The violence from the men takes the form of mental and physical abuse, sexual violence and honour-related violence. But the fact that it happens in one's own home, and often with children present, is probably what sticks the most on the retina. These men have crossed all boundaries.

Yet society does not rally to face the violence. Politicians do not take it seriously enough. The police authority does not take it seriously enough. The media doesn't take it seriously enough. If everyone actually agreed on how bad this is, society would rally against violence against women in the same way that it does against gang violence and state that it must be stopped by any means available.

Mr Speaker! The Center Party calls for a social debate about men's violence against women, with the same dignity, outrage and frenzy as the debate about the violence from the criminal gangs. The similarities are many. In both cases, it is almost exclusively men who are responsible for the violence. In both cases, it is about spreading horror and fear to those around you. In both cases, the perpetrators are almost always known to the police before they commit murder.

The escalating gang violence must in no way be reduced, but we must not reduce violence against women in close relationships either. The biggest difference between gang violence and violence against women is that, while it was previously a relatively new problem in Swedish society, violence against women has existed for all time and, unfortunately, has never been taken seriously enough. It is high time to reverse that trend now and seriously mobilize to stop men's violence against women and protect the children, who are also affected by this violence.

The Center Party has a number of proposals on police measures, intervention measures against the perpetrators and harsher punishments, but in this report from the social committee we highlight proposals in the social area. I'm going to point to four of them.

Firstly, Mr Speaker, society must become significantly better at detecting violence in close relationships and following up suspicions of violence. The Center Party believes that competence development is needed in healthcare, police, schools and social services, partly to

become better at detecting ongoing violence, partly to become better at following up when you know that violence is occurring. We also want to see an outreach activity to support the vulnerable in leaving a destructive and violent relationship in time.

Secondly, women who are subjected to violence must be given significantly better opportunities to leave their relationship. The Center Party therefore wants to introduce a national leave program. Well-organized exit programs are a matter of course for those who want to leave the gang criminal world, but have not existed for women who want to leave a destructive and dangerous relationship behind - this despite the knowledge that the absolute most dangerous time in a woman's life is when she has decided to leave a relationship.

Our proposal is about giving the women the right to a coordinator who keeps the contacts with the authorities together, the right to a leaving allowance that makes it financially possible to leave and access to a national housing queue for victims of violence.

Thirdly, Mr Speaker, the public sector must take responsibility for ensuring that there are safe accommodation available for those fleeing from a violent relationship, alone or with children. The center party wants to see that sheltered housing becomes an intervention regulated by law, just as proposed in the investigation A window of opportunity from 2018. By legislating the intervention, an individual assessment of the accompanying child and its protection needs will also have to be made, which strengthens the child's rights in the resulting situation. It will also provide the opportunity to set quality and licensing requirements for the protected housing. It is now high time that the investigation results in a bill from the government.

Fourth, children also need stronger protection than today when it comes to exposure to violence. It is estimated that around 200,000 children each year are forced to witness violence in the home and that many of them are also subjected to violence themselves. This must have a big impact on a later assessment about custody and access. The center party believes that anyone who has abused their partner, not infrequently in front of a child, has clearly proven to be unsuitable as a parent and guardian. The center party believes that whoever has murdered their partner, not infrequently in front of a child, has forfeited their right to ever again be considered as a guardian.

Mr Speaker! In a typical year, around 75,000 women are abused by a man with whom they have or have had a close relationship. About twenty of these women are murdered - every year, year after year. In 2023, 22 women have already been murdered despite half the year remaining.

This should be headline news on radio, television and newspapers. It should be a given topic in a party leader debate. It should lead to a national crisis commission. But that doesn't happen because men's violence against women has not been taken seriously for too long.

Now we have the chance to announce the Riksdag's view on this to the government on a number of points. Let's take that chance! Men's violence against women must end.

With this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish everyone a nice summer!

Ref. 208 ULRIKA WESTERLUND (MP):

Mr Speaker and dear colleagues, who endure this late hour! It is very gratifying that many measures have been taken to strengthen the work against honor-related violence and oppression. But more needs to be done to help the acutely vulnerable and to prevent children from being taken out of the country to be married off, have genital mutilation or be subjected to other forms of violence and coercion, including so-called educational trips which, among other things, may involve conversion attempts directed at LGBTQ people. More also needs to be done to make it easier for abducted children to return home. A permanent coordination center should be established that can help children and young people who have been taken abroad to return home to Sweden.

It also needs to be ensured that social services do not release information about the child to the guardian if it could mean an acute risk of the child being exposed to crime. In order to discover and help more children who are exposed to or schooled in practicing honor oppression, regional and municipal work should be improved, as well as support to civil society organizations. Cooperation between authorities needs to be improved, and early interventions must be ensured. A resource center should also be established in each county to increase access to help for the vulnerable.

All actors need to have the skills to identify honor oppression and act as early as possible to discover and help more children and young people who are exposed to or schooled in practicing honor oppression. It is central to the work that all vulnerable people are reached. All actors must ensure that all young people are reached, regardless of gender, gender identity or gender expression or sexual orientation. The government needs to take measures accordingly.

Mr Speaker! Violence against women and other violence in intimate relationships is a very serious social problem. It is completely unacceptable that we are not doing better in stopping violence that, in the worst case scenario, ends up being deadly.

In Aftonbladet's ongoing investigation into fatal violence against women, it was stated in May this year that 350 women in Sweden were killed between 2000 and 2022 by a man they had a relationship with. This must end.

Support for victims of violence must also be improved in many areas. I want to mention some of these.

Women can be subjected to lethal violence after they signal that they want to leave the abuser, as has also been pointed out by previous speakers. At that stage, a contact should be enough to quickly get the protection needed. The government should therefore work to ensure that a woman who leaves a violent relationship has a unified approach to society's support.

It is also important that victims of violence receive support in the aftermath of violence. Men's violence against women does not end when the victim of violence leaves the relationship, but can instead turn into what is now commonly referred to as after-violence. The subsequent violence can consist of physical, psychological, financial, material or legal violence.

The government should set up a broad inquiry that maps the expression of the aftermath of the violence and submits concrete proposals for solutions. The investigation should cover the most common forms of after-violence, with a particular focus on economic after-violence. The investigation should also include making it possible for victims of violence to find a safe solution for their pets. As more and more actors have emphasized in recent years, it is common for animals to be subjected to violence by the same perpetrators.

Women exposed to violence who live with protected personal data should be offered a contact person by the municipality. The contact person must contribute with support and guidance both when dealing with authorities and in practical everyday matters. Currently, it is often civil society organizations that are responsible for this support, often on a completely non-profit basis. I suspect there are several of us in here who have met many of these civil society organizations and seen how they struggle to help people who have fallen completely outside society and don't know what to do next to get the best support.

A contact person could also be responsible for helping the woman find safe and permanent accommodation. The contact person must be present as long as the need for protection remains.

The support from municipalities and authorities looks different depending on where abused women and children with protected personal data live. In order to guarantee the same high level of protection and support throughout the country and reduce the risk of mistakes, national guidelines for how authorities and other actors can work with the target group need to be drawn up.

Living with protected personal data often has negative financial consequences for victims of violence. Many receive extra costs due to, for example, double accommodation and the fact that they may have to resign from their jobs in connection with fleeing. A special support should therefore be established for people living with protected personal data that should be searchable by the individual. It is also important that no fee is charged for sheltered accommodation. That fee should be removed throughout the country.

Mr Speaker! The grants that women's emergency rooms receive today are not sufficient. Permanent and state support is needed to ensure competence and achieve stable operations that can give abused women and children the opportunity for good quality help and support regardless of where in the country they live. The government should therefore work to ensure that women's shelters are financed long-term through state support. There should also be support for emergency services that have other target groups, for example violent LGBTQI people.

Today, no permit is required to provide the intervention sheltered accommodation. The lack of uniform requirements entails obvious risks for the children and adults concerned and also complicates development work in the businesses. In the memorandum A window of opportunity - strengthened rights for children and adults in sheltered housing, it is proposed, among other things, that the sheltered housing initiative should be covered by special quality requirements and permit requirements. We think this proposal is good, and it should be implemented urgently.

I also want to mention something about the vulnerability of a particular group. Authorities' and principals' awareness of violence against the elderly needs to increase. The measures to counteract violence in close relationships among the elderly should therefore be included as an important part of a national elderly healthcare programme. Preventive efforts to prevent violence and abuse in the case of older people should also be covered by the program. The government should review how a national elderly healthcare program that includes this can most appropriately be established.

I request approval for reservation 15, but of course stand behind all reservations from the Green Party. Of course, I also want to wish everyone a happy summer and so on and hope that the midsummer celebration will be pleasant.

Ref. 209 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C):

Mr Speaker! This report deals with many different subject areas that are very interesting, and there is a lot to say. But I will, as before, focus on the deadly violence against women.

Woman found dead in freezer - man arrested. Woman in Halmstad deceased, police investigating suspected murder. Pregnant Soliana died after falling from a balcony. Woman dead in Örebro - man arrested for murder. Woman found dead in Luleå, man arrested on suspicion of murder. Man arrested for murder and attempted murder of mother and daughter.

These are some headlines in the newspapers during the first three months of the year. With about as many more as I have left out, that made about twelve women murdered in twelve weeks. All are suspected relationship crimes, i.e. women murdered by men with whom they had or had had a relationship. All of them had a name, a family and an everyday life, and all that remains is a broken everyday life around these women.

And if twelve women in twelve weeks wasn't enough, we can continue into the thirteenth week:

Woman found dead in apartment in Falkenberg - preliminary investigation into murder. Woman found dead in caravan in Dalsland, suspected murder. Suspected murder of a woman in Fagersta. A man is suspected of having murdered his wife in Falkenberg. Woman found dead in the forest outside Filipstad, suspected murder. Elderly man is suspected of murdering a woman in Ljusdal.

This was a documentation of six murdered women in seven days. As we have heard, already in April we were up to almost 20 women, that is, the average figure for the last few years for the number of suspected murders in a couple relationship only four months into the year.

Mr Speaker! I also wonder what the big headlines are about this issue. I also wonder what the government's crisis plan is, because of course this is a crisis. When will the invitation to crisis talks with all parties in the Riksdag arrive? What is the government's proposal to remedy this in the short term?

That the priorities are different, we have been told a lot about here this evening. Corresponding developments in gang criminal circles, which we have recently experienced, are followed by press conferences from the government with information on measures. That's good, but it's a disaster that they don't show up because women are murdered.

The center party has called ministers to the committees to get information about the government's work against men's violence against women and what needs to be done to stop the murders. We have heard about preventive measures, and we have read debate articles in newspapers. I don't know if we got that much wiser.

We hear about preventive measures. We hear about repressive measures, which is somewhat symptomatic of the Tidö Agreement. It is good. We need tougher penalties too, but that doesn't save any lives.

If we are to put an end to murders of women this year, the work on new action programs, which we have also heard about, will not help. In that case, tougher punishments do not help, because when we impose punishments, the violence and murders have already taken place.

The only thing that saves lives is getting women to leave the violent relationship early, and for them to be able to do that, society needs to be there with a collective, structured support that does not depend on whether there are zealots in the workplace, in the police, in social services or in non-profit organizations. It must be support that works throughout the country, regardless of whether you live in Nordmaling, Trelleborg or Stockholm.

There needs to be a contact person who follows the woman. The woman should not have to apply for any kind of allowance. She must be compensated for the suffering and disaster she is exposed to. It is about registration, sheltered housing, school, work, housing and financial support. This is exactly what is being worked on in, for example, the Igor project in southern Stockholm, which has received quite a bit of attention recently. There are other project activities that work in a similar way, but they are precisely project activities. How good is it?

Leaving an abusive relationship is the most dangerous thing. It's not something you do lightly. We have talked about children, pets, accommodation and school. The most dangerous period is exactly when she leaves. Yet there is no structured and uniform support across the country for this, even though it is there for men leaving violent environments they have chosen to enter.

I think the comparison that the Equality Authority established is striking. I can't quite find the right words to describe the bias that we actually accept. We have to do something about this.

We are actually voting on this in this chamber tomorrow. It's a tip. You can think about it overnight.

Finally, I want to say a few words about this shift in focus. We often hear that from both the Tidö parties and the rest of the opposition, and that's good. Of course, it is not the woman who should have her life and her freedom limited, but the man who hits should have his freedom limited. But it's hard to get there, I know, but we have to try to rethink in our brains.

One tip is to think about who has to pay for what a perpetrator does: Is it the perpetrator himself or is it the woman, the child and the rest of society who has to pay? One thought might be to let the perpetrator actually pay for his crimes eventually. Imagine if the perpetrator received an invoice from the municipality for each instance of violence, instead of women and children and society having to pay for the violence.

Think this way: He breaks her arm and puts her into a wall. She flees with the children to an accommodation. Imagine if an invoice comes to the man:

Trauma therapy, tens of thousands of kroner.

Emergency care, SEK 1,200.

Medicines for pain, SEK 500.

Occupational therapist when the arm is healed, SEK 1,400 per hour times ten.

Lost income, sick leave, lost pension provision.

Police call with two police officers, tens of thousands of kroner.

14 days for the woman and their child in sheltered accommodation pending a contact ban.

Processing of contact bans. Again, we are up to tens of thousands of kroner just there.

Security alarm, SEK 5,000, the woman has to pay herself.

New phone, because hers broke during the assault. The woman has to pay that herself, SEK 10,000.

Food and emergency clothing for the children.

Transferred to and from healthcare and school during 14 days of sheltered accommodation.

We are up to hundreds of thousands of kroner, which society has to pay when the man, or the perpetrator, practices violence. These calculation examples can of course be used for all forms of crime.

When you think about the costs of violence, specifically men's violence against women, it seems a bit silly, I think, that it is the men who get support in an exit program but not women. Then I don't think it works to propose, as in this report, that social services should investigate crime victim support, that women should be allowed to apply for benefits or that we should improve the statistics. We need to get a unified program that looks the same across the country to prevent more women from dying.

With that, I want to thank you for today and wish everyone a nice evening and a nice summer. Thank you, chamber staff, for a job very well done!

Ref. 210 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thank you, Helena Vilhelmsson, for your speech! There was much in it that I can agree with. As I mentioned earlier, precisely the preventive work is extremely important, and it is something that I highlight in almost every speech I have here regarding the work of social services.

You talk a lot about women and about them having the opportunity to go somewhere when they have been subjected to violence, which should be a matter of course. But I also think that violence begets violence. Many who expose others to violence in close relationships have themselves witnessed or been exposed to violence. What suggestions does the Center have for preventive measures to prevent this from happening? It is not only about measures when it has already happened, but it is also about measures to prevent it from happening.

Ref. 211 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! Thank you for a very important question. I want to underline that we naturally think, as I think I mentioned in some exchange, that that work is just as important. It is about the prevention, about the operational and about the financial support afterwards to get out of this. Everything is equally important. What I have chosen to focus on right now is the deadly violence, as it is extremely prevalent this year.

I think you have to start early to be able to prevent violence. We have a fantastic business called ungarelationer.se. In the beginning, this government was actually a little floating with its support. [Ungarelationer.se](http://ungarelationer.se) has existed for a couple of years. Young people can call. They have a fantastic business that meets a lot of guys but also young girls.

I remember what struck me the most when I read their report. The most common question they were asked was: Do you have to have strangulation sex?

So it took.

It is very important that everyone is given the opportunity to talk about this. We also think that we have come a long way in that we have new sex education in school. I think you have to start talking about norms and values already in preschool. Above all, we must train everyone who works with children and young people, because that is where we have to start. You don't start hitting when you enter a relationship when you are 25 or 30 years old, but it is exactly as the member says: You have seen this before.

It is a matter of powerful and ongoing training and education for staff who meet children and young people so that they see the signals and to put an end to stale norms and language. Language is incredibly important.

Ref. 212 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) reply:

Mr Speaker! Digitization in all its glory, but it is also the case that everything becomes very accessible. Today, we meet young people who say themselves that they are a generation damaged by porn. It's violent sex - you mentioned this with strangulation. It is violence that comes to children early. They are reached by it in digital forums.

I think that all adults have a responsibility for how they behave, how they behave, how they talk to each other and what they themselves do for something.

I think of radio and television. We've talked about gangster rap, glorifying violence, and so on. There is a lot that affects children and young people and that we need to deal with.

In the investigative report Breaking violent behavior, the possibility of introducing a voluntary form of supported housing for potential perpetrators of violence is mentioned in order for them to get help to break their behavior. How does the Center Party view it?

Ref. 213 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply:

Mr Speaker! I'll start by mentioning something that I actually forgot before. I did not count it, but the member and many others from the government parties did. This applies to support for the parents, which is of course extremely important. We cannot say that all responsibility lies with the officials who meet children and young people. It is, of course, also about the parents. They need all the support they can get, not least when it comes to digitalisation.

I am glad that the Member is raising the issue of violent pornography. The young generation today can be considered an experimental generation. I am happy that we have made our party take step by step towards displacement. Nowadays we talk about web filters. We are even talking about a kind of bank ID or verification so that you can actually look at material. You have that in other countries. We can look at this as well.

I have personally, together with members from the old alliance parties, had extremely fruitful conversations with the telecom operators, who also have a responsibility. One should not forget

the responsibility of business here. We put them against the wall and asked: Do you market your web filters in the phones when parents buy phones for their kids? Is it free of charge? It's not a big sum for them. It was a great conversation.

In conclusion, the member raises the incredibly important question of how we can ensure that the perpetrators of violence never actually strike again. Yes, I obviously think that you should look at different forms of treatment. To the extent that we believe it is valuable, it must of course also cost society's resources, because it is worth everything that the perpetrators never strike again. I welcome all forms of activity for this. There are also municipalities that have tested this by allowing the perpetrator to move. It is also interesting to look at it and to raise it further.

The discussion was hereby concluded.

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 16 Scheduling and decision on extended exercise time

The following documents were reported and tabled:

Propositions

2022/23:131 Welfare technology in elderly care

2022/23:133 Sustainable media support for the entire country

Letter

2022/23:140 2023 annual report for companies with state ownership

The House approved the Speaker's proposal that the motion period for the above bills and letter should be extended until Wednesday, September 20.

Exercises

due to prop. 2022/23:126 Covert means of coercion – effective tools to prevent and investigate serious crimes

2022/23:2402 by Rasmus Ling et al. (MP)

2022/23:2403 by Gudrun Nordborg et al. (V)

2022/23:2404 by Ulrika Liljeberg et al. (C)

§ 17 Notification of questions for written answers

The following questions for written answers had been prepared:

on June 19

2022/23:799 Community college studies in sparsely populated areas

by Åsa Eriksson (S)

to Minister of Education Mats Persson (L)

2022/23:800 Access to pharmacies throughout Sweden

by Malin Larsson (S)

to Prime Minister Acko Ankarberg Johansson (KD)

2022/23:801 Countries in the inquiry into international adoptions

by Martina Johansson (C)

to Prime Minister Camilla Waltersson Grönvall (M)

§ 18 The Chamber adjourned at 21.58.

The meeting was chaired

of the third deputy speaker from its beginning up to and including § 5 anf. 38 (in part),

by the second deputy speaker thereafter up to and including § 5 anf. 51 (in part),

by the first deputy speaker thereafter up to and including § 5 anf. 76 (in part),

by the second deputy speaker thereafter up to and including § 6 anf. 108 (in part),

by the third deputy speaker then until the adjournment at 16.48,

by the second deputy speaker thereafter up to and including § 14 anf. 182 (in part) and

by the first deputy speaker thereafter until its end.

Table of Contents

§ 1 Adjustment of protocol

§ 2 Notification of delayed response to interpellation

§ 3 Matters for referral to committee

§ 4 Matters for table setting

§ 5 Guidelines for economic policy

The Finance Committee's report 2022/23: FiU20

Ref. 1 EDWARD RIEDL (M)

Ref. 2 ALI ESBATI (V) reply

Ref. 3 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply

Ref. 4 ALI ESBATI (V) reply

Ref. 5 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply

Ref. 6 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S)

Ref. 7 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply

Ref. 8 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply

Ref. 9 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply

Ref. 10 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply

Ref. 11 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD)

Ref. 12 ALI ESBATI (V) reply

Ref. 13 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 14 ALI ESBATI (V) reply

Ref. 15 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 16 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply

Ref. 17 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 18 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply

Ref. 19 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 20 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply

Ref. 21 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 22 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply

Ref. 23 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 24 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 25 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 26 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 27 OSCAR SJÖSTEDT (SD) replica

Ref. 28 ALI ESBATI (F)

Ref. 29 HANS EKLIND (KD)

Ref. 30 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 31 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply

Ref. 32 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 33 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply

Ref. 34 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply

Ref. 35 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply

Ref. 36 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply

Ref. 37 HANS EKLIND (KD) reply

Ref. 38 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C)

Ref. 39 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply

Ref. 40 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 41 EDWARD RIEDL (M) reply

Ref. 42 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 43 CARL B HAMILTON (L)

Ref. 44 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP)

Ref. 45 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M)

Ref. 46 ALI ESBATI (V) reply

Ref. 47 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 48 ALI ESBATI (V) reply

Ref. 49 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 50 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 51 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 52 MARTIN ÅDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 53 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 54 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply

Ref. 55 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 56 MIKAEL DAMBERG (S) reply

Ref. 57 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 58 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply

Ref. 59 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 60 JANINE ALM ERICSON (MP) reply

Ref. 61 Minister of Finance ELISABETH SVANTESSON (M) reply

Ref. 62 BORIANA ÅBERG (M)

Ref. 63 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply

Ref. 64 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply

Ref. 65 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply

Ref. 66 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply

Ref. 67 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S)

Ref. 68 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply

Ref. 69 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply

Ref. 70 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply

Ref. 71 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply

Ref. 72 CECILIA RÖNN (L) reply

Ref. 73 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply

Ref. 74 CECILIA RÖNN (L) reply

Ref. 75 NIKLAS KARLSSON (S) reply

Ref. 76 PER SÖDERLUND (SD)

Ref. 77 ILONA SZATMÁRI WALDAU (V)

Ref. 78 CECILIA ENGSTRÖM (KD)

Ref. 79 HELENA LINDAHL (C)

Ref. 80 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply

Ref. 81 HELENA LINDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 82 BORIANA ÅBERG (M) reply

Ref. 83 HELENA LINDAHL (C) reply

Ref. 84 CECILIA RÖNN (L)

Ref. 85 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP)

(Decisions were made under § 9.)

§ 6 Spring amendment budget for 2023

The Finance Committee's report 2022/23:FiU21

Ref. 86 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD)

Ref. 87 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply

Ref. 88 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 89 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply

Ref. 90 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 91 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply

Ref. 92 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 93 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply

Ref. 94 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 95 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S)

Ref. 96 CAMILLA BRODIN (KD) replica

Ref. 97 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply

Ref. 98 CAMILLA BRODIN (KD) replica

Ref. 99 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply

Ref. 100 MATS GREEN (M) replica

Ref. 101 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply

Ref. 102 MATS GREEN (M) reply

Ref. 103 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply

Ref. 104 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 105 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply

Ref. 106 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 107 FREDRIK OLOVSSON (S) reply

Ref. 108 MATS GREEN (M)

Ref. 109 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply

Ref. 110 MATS GREEN (M) replica

Ref. 111 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply

Ref. 112 MATS GREEN (M) reply

Ref. 113 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply

Ref. 114 MATS GREEN (M) reply

Ref. 115 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP) reply

Ref. 116 MATS GREEN (M) reply

Ref. 117 BIRGER LAHTI (V)

Ref. 118 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 119 BIRGER LAHTI (V) reply

Ref. 120 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) replica

Ref. 121 BIRGER LAHTI (V) reply

Ref. 122 CAMILLA BRODIN (KD)

Ref. 123 RICKARD NORDIN (C)

Ref. 124 BIRGER LAHTI (V) reply

Ref. 125 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply

Ref. 126 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 127 THIRD DEPUTY SPEAKER

Ref. 128 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply

Ref. 129 JESSICA STEGRUD (SD) reply

Ref. 130 RICKARD NORDIN (C) reply

Ref. 131 LOUISE EKLUND (L)

Ref. 132 MARIELLE LAHTI (MP)

(Decisions were made under § 9.)

Adjournment

Resumed meeting

§ 7 Decision on matter that was finally debated on 15 June

MJU18 Food policy

§ 8 Decision on matters that were finally debated on 19 June

UU10 Operations in the European Union in 2022

JuU26 Extended police powers in border areas

JuU27 Sharpened view of crimes against journalists and certain other socially useful functions

JuU29 Account of the activities within the joint parliamentary control group for Europol and the work of the Riksdag delegation in 2022

JuU30 Secrecy at the Courts Agency for individuals' contact details

TU13 Traffic safety

TU14 Railway matters

§ 9 Decisions on matters that have been debated at the end of today's meeting

FiU20 Guidelines for economic policy

FiU21 Spring amendment budget for 2023

Adjournment

Resumed meeting

§ 10 Annual report for the state 2022

The Finance Committee's report 2022/23:FiU30

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 11 Subsidiarity review of the Commission's proposal for a directive on combating corruption

The Justice Committee's report 2022/23:JuU33

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 12 Changed transparency rules in energy taxation

The Tax Committee's report 2022/23:SkU21

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 13 The Swedish Tax Agency as competent law enforcement authority for simplified data exchange within the EU

The Tax Committee's report 2022/23:SkU22

Ref. 133 HANNA WESTERÉN (S)

Ref. 134 ILONA SZATMÁRI WALDAU (V)

Ref. 135 MARIE NICHOLSON (M)

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 14 Medicines and dental care

The Social Committee's report 2022/23:SoU15

Ref. 136 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M)

Ref. 137 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 138 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 139 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 140 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 141 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply

Ref. 142 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 143 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply

Ref. 144 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 145 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply

Ref. 146 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 147 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply

Ref. 148 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 149 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S)

Ref. 150 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD)

Ref. 151 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 152 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) replica

Ref. 153 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 154 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) reply

Ref. 155 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply

Ref. 156 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) reply

Ref. 157 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply

Ref. 158 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) replica

Ref. 159 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply

Ref. 160 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) replica

Ref. 161 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply

Ref. 162 DAN HOVSKÄR (KD) replica

Ref. 163 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD)

Ref. 164 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 165 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply

Ref. 166 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 167 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply

Ref. 168 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply

Ref. 169 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply

Ref. 170 MIKAEL DAHLQVIST (S) reply

Ref. 171 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply

Ref. 172 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply

Ref. 173 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply

Ref. 174 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V) reply

Ref. 175 JOHNNY SVEDIN (SD) reply

Ref. 176 LINA NORDQUIST (L)

Ref. 177 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 178 LINA NORDQUIST (L) reply

Ref. 179 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 180 LINA NORDQUIST (L) replica

Ref. 181 KARIN RÅGSJÖ (V)

Ref. 182 ANDERS W JONSSON (C)

Ref. 183 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 184 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 185 JESPER SKALBERG KARLSSON (M) reply

Ref. 186 ANDERS W JONSSON (C) reply

Ref. 187 ULRIKA WESTERLUND (MP)

Ref. 188 ANNA VIKSTRÖM (S)

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 15 Social services' responsibility for victims of violence, etc

The Social Committee's report 2022/23:SoU18

Ref. 189 CHRISTIAN CARLSSON (KD)

Ref. 190 GUSTAF LANTZ (S)

Ref. 191 MALIN HÖGLUND (M)

Ref. 192 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply

Ref. 193 MALIN HÖGLUND (M) reply

Ref. 194 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply

Ref. 195 MALIN HÖGLUND (M) reply

Ref. 196 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD)

Ref. 197 CHRISTOFER BERGENBLOCK (C) reply

Ref. 198 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) reply

Ref. 199 CHRISTOFER BERGENBLOCK (C) reply

Ref. 200 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) replica

Ref. 201 JUNO FLOWER (L)

Ref. 202 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply

Ref. 203 JUNO FLOWER (L) replica

Ref. 204 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply

Ref. 205 JUNO FLOWER (L) replica

Ref. 206 MAJ KARLSSON (V)

Ref. 207 CHRISTOPHER BERGENBLOCK (C)

Ref. 208 ULRIKA WESTERLUND (MP)

Ref. 209 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C)

Ref. 210 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) reply

Ref. 211 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply

Ref. 212 CARITA BOULWÉN (SD) reply

Ref. 213 HELENA VILHELMSSON (C) reply

(A decision would be made on June 21.)

§ 16 Scheduling and decision on extended exercise time

§ 17 Notification of questions for written answers

§ 18 The Chamber adjourned at 21.58.