

**Question for written answer E-005438/2021  
to the Commission**  
Rule 138  
**Laura Huhtasaari (ID)**

Subject: Treatment of the defence industry in the social taxonomy.

The Commission's publication on social taxonomy (see the enclosed documents) states that if the sale of weapons accounts for more than 5% of a company's turnover, that company would not be able to achieve Ecolabel criteria for its own bonds. It also states that the arms industry could not be socially sustainable in any circumstances.

Weapons production in Finland is very important for purposes of national defence, creating jobs and at the same time ensuring that we are adequately self-sufficient in this area. For example, Patria is a Finnish State-owned company that is very important. Why, and based on what facts, does the Commission want to weaken the position of the defence industry in Europe and in Finland? What scientific evidence is there that this is a sensible approach, given the overall need for security?