



C/2024/5694

26.9.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 MARCA 2022 R.

(C/2024/5694)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2022-2023

Posiedzenia od 8 do 10 marca 2022 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
2. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania	4
3. Przejrzystość i normy administracyjne – rozpatrywanie wniosków o udzielenie publicznego dostępu na podstawie rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1049/2001 (debata)	4
4. Pierwsza część głosowania	11
5. Przejrzystość i normy administracyjne – rozpatrywanie wniosków o udzielenie publicznego dostępu na podstawie rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1049/2001 (ciąg dalszy debaty)	12
6. Potrzeba ambitnej strategii UE na rzecz zrównoważonych wyrobów włókienniczych (debata)	14
7. Debata na temat przypadków naruszania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (debata)	26
7.1. Sytuacja dziennikarzy i obrońców praw człowieka w Meksyku	26
7.2. Mjanma/Birma – rok po zamachu stanu	33
7.3. Zniszczenie dziedzictwa kulturowego w Górskim Karabachu	39

Spis treści	Strona
8. Kalendarz sesji miesięcznych Parlamentu - 2023	47
9. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania	47
10. Wznowienie posiedzenia	48
11. Skład komisji i delegacji	48
12. Druga część głosowania	48
13. Wznowienie posiedzenia	48
14. Systemowe podejście UE do przewlekłej choroby nerek (debata)	48
15. Wznowienie posiedzenia	55
16. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania	55
17. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące stanowiska zajętego w głosowaniu: patrz protokół	55
18. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół	55
19. Petycje: patrz protokół	55
20. Decyzje w sprawie sporządzenia sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy: patrz protokół	55
21. Zmiany w przekazaniu spraw komisjom (art. 56 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	55
22. Zaangażowane komisje (art. 57 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	55
23. Decyzja o zastosowaniu procedury obejmującej wspólne posiedzenia komisji (art. 58 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	55
24. Zmiany tytułów sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy: patrz protokół	55
25. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	56
26. Zatwierdzenie protokołów posiedzeń bieżącej sesji i przekazanie przyjętych tekstów	56

Spis treści	Strona
27. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół	56
28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	56
29. Odroczenie sesji	56

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 MARCA 2022 R.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Sēde tika atklāta plkst. 9.00.)

2. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania

Sēdes vadītājs. – Sākšu ar vakardienas otrās balsošanas rezultātu paziņošanu.

(sēdes vadītājs nolasa balsošanas rezultātus)*

*Sīkāku informāciju skatīt protokolā.

Pirms pāriesim pie debatēm, saskaņā ar Reglamenta 59. panta 4. punktu vēlos dot vārdu A. Moretti sakarā ar to, ka komitejai iestāžu sarunām tiek nodots atpakaļ S. Bonafē ziņojums par baterijām un bateriju atkritumiem.

Alessandra Moretti, deputising for the rapporteur. – Mr President, following the vote on the amendments, on behalf of the rapporteur Ms Bonafè, I would like to request referral back to committee pursuant to Rule 59(4), in order to start interinstitutional negotiations.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Par šo pieprasījumu tiks balsots pēc balsošanas par Komisijas priekšlikumu šodienas pirmajā balsošanā.

3. Przejrzystość i normy administracyjne – rozpatrywanie wniosków o udzielenie publicznego dostępu na podstawie rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1049/2001 (debata)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības jautājums: Komisijas paziņojums — Pārredzamība un administratīvie standarti — pamatojoties uz Regulu (EK) Nr. 1049/2001 iesniegtu publiskas piekļuves pieprasījumu apstrāde (2022/0578(RSP)).

Vēlos atgādināt deputātiem, ka nevienās šīs sesijas debatēs nebūs brīvā mikroфона procedūras un netiks pieņemtas zilās kartītes.

Turklāt tāpat kā nesējās sesijās ir paredzēts organizēt attālinātas uzstāšanās no Parlamenta vietējiem birojiem dalībvalstīs.

Vēlos arī atgādināt, ka sēžu zālē arī turpmāk būs jāuzstājas no centrālās tribīnes. Tāpēc aicinu jūs sekot līdz runātāju sarakstam un doties pie centrālās tribīnes, kad tuvojas jūsu uzstāšanās laiks.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you for the possibility to speak on transparency and administrative standards. As you know, transparency is one of the underlying principles of this Commission.

The transparency obligation embraces several areas. One is public access to documents, but there is also legislative transparency and transparency of relations of the Commissioners, members of Cabinets and Directors General with interest representatives. The interinstitutional agreement on a mandatory transparency register ensures greater transparency of the relations of institutions with interest representatives. The Commission proactively publishes a wide variety of legal, policy, administrative and other documents on different websites and registers. Many are available on the register of Commission documents, the register of delegated and implementing acts, and other corporate registers on EUR-Lex.

Last year, the Commission released a new version of the register of Commission documents featuring additional search functionalities, an improved user interface and the proactive publication of new document types. In the second phase of this project, the Commission will integrate the register of Commission documents with other Commission registers, thus gradually transforming it into a single entry point for Commission documents. The regulation concerning public access to documents lays down the general principles and limits to the right to public access to documents, and provides the means of redress available against the final decision of the institution, a complaint to the European Ombudsman or an action before the Court.

I would like to draw your attention to the two legislative proposals for recast of this regulation tabled by the Commission and which have been pending for a long period. The Commission does not see, for the moment, a willingness on the part of the co-legislators to engage in a revision process on the basis of these proposals, and we remain fully ready to support further legislative and political discussions. If there is no prospect for any further progress on these files, the Commission is also ready to propose their withdrawal again and come with a new, updated and holistic proposal adapted to the developing realities of the 21st century, also considering the case law and the Ombudsman's recommendations.

In the meantime, the Commission is regularly analysing its administrative practice. For example, currently we are working to develop a new portal and new IT tools. With this new portal and IT systems for submitting and handling requests for access to Commission documents – Electronic Access to European Commission Documents, that's the name of the system – citizens will be able to submit their initial and confirmatory requests, see their ongoing and closed requests, receive replies electronically with no need for notification, search for documents disclosed to other applicants, manage their personal data, and so on. The system is expected to go live by mid-2022 — so, very soon.

The statistical data for access to documents show a high level of transparency, as full or partial access is granted to a vast majority of the requested documents. The Commission receives a high number of requests for access to documents. Concretely, 8 001 initial and 309 confirmatory applications were received in 2020, more than for any other institution. Transparency is thus part of the daily business of all Commission departments.

The statistics from 2020 show that requests for documents by citizens were fully or partially granted in 81% of the initial cases. Wider, or even full, access was further granted in more than 37% of the cases reviewed at the confirmatory stage. This proves that the Commission takes transparency very seriously.

The preliminary data from 2021 that will be presented in the forthcoming Commission Annual Report on Public Access to Documents confirm this positive trend, as well as the high interest on the part of the general public to obtain access to documents held by the Commission in the areas related to the pandemic and the Recovery and Resilience programmes. This data shows the commitment of the Commission to the right of access to documents as part of its overall transparency policy, including in the unprecedented pandemic situation. With regard to the transparency of the purchase of the vaccines against COVID-19, the Commission proactively published the advance purchase agreements with pharmaceutical companies. We are also preparing a response to the European Ombudsman recommendation on the European Commission's refusal to grant public access to the text messages exchanged between the Commission President and the CEO of a pharmaceutical company on the purchase of a COVID-19 vaccine. The Commission will provide a response by the deadline of 26 April 2022.

Tomislav Sokol, *u ime kluba PPE*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, transparentnost demokratskog sustava od ključnog je značaja jer omogućuje građanima sudjelovanje u donošenju odluka. Transparentnost čini okosnicu svih europskih politika, a među njezinim najvažnijim elementima je pravo građana da zatraže i dobiju pristup dokumentima kojima raspolažu europske institucije.

U načelu, svi dokumenti institucija trebali bi biti dostupni javnosti. No s druge strane, s određenim dokumentima bi zbog njihova veoma osjetljivog sadržaja trebalo postupati na poseban način. U tom kontekstu, određene javne i privatne interese treba posebno zaštititi putem izuzeća, što je i predviđeno u sklopu Uredbe o javnom pristupu dokumentima institucija EU-a.

Institucije imaju pravo, kad je to potrebno, zaštititi svoja savjetovanja i konzultacije da bi osigurale provođenje svojih zadaća. Trenutni pravni okvir Uredbe o javnom pristupu dokumentima institucija je generalno zadovoljavajući, ali moramo se dodatno pobrinuti da se odluke donose na što otvoreniji način i na razini što je moguće bližoj građanima.

Otvorenost omogućuje da građani još aktivnije sudjeluju u procesu odlučivanja i jamči da administracija uzima veću legitimnost te da je učinkovitija i odgovornija prema građanima EU-a. U tom smislu mislim da treba pohvaliti Komisiju generalno za transparentnost nakon svih ovih brojki koje smo čuli danas.

Naravno, kad je riječ o transparentnosti, puno se govorilo o zajedničkoj nabavi cjepiva. Istaknuo bih da se tim postupkom ubrzao proces razvoja i dostupnosti cjepiva, a Unija je ostvarila bolji pregovarački položaj te smo dobili više cjepiva pod boljim uvjetima i za bolju cijenu. Također, zajedničkom nabavom izbjegnuto je nadmetanje među državama članicama čime je manjim i slabije razvijenim državama omogućen jednak pristup cjepivu i mislim da se doista taj cijeli postupak može okarakterizirati kao uspjeh.

Naravno, u slučaju bilo kakvih nejasnoća i sumnji – sve što postoji treba razjasniti, ali bez dovođenja u pitanje cijelog postupka i ja doista željno iščekujem da Komisija pruži odgovor na ove dileme vezane uz SMEs-ove.

Na kraju, istaknuo bih da je Europska unija na čelu s Komisijom napravila ono najvažnije: uspješno odgovorila na ovu pandemiju. Osiguran je jednak pristup cjepivu svim europskim građanima te je time poslana snažna poruka zajedništva i solidarnosti na razini Europe.

Evin Incir, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, at the heart of democracy lies transparency, because without transparency, there is no accountability. Let me quote the President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, herself, back in 2019: 'If Europeans are to have faith in our Union, its institutions should be open and beyond reproach on ethics, transparency and integrity'. Yet in 2020, the words seem to still be just words, because if the true will would have been there, we wouldn't have needed to call for a debate to demand access to what should have been an obvious thing to do. Be open with the Commission President's conversation with Pfizer's Chief Executive, regardless of if they are done via text message, email, letter or even pigeons.

The Commission President could have transformed her words from 2019 into actions in 2020 in order to pave the way for all our Union's institutions and constituted a role model for the Member States, but instead, she chose the opposite.

Being an advocate for rule of law and democracy means understanding the importance of public access to documents. This is because in a functioning democracy, the public power requires the trust of the people. Public access enables the citizens to exercise control over the administration. Public access allows for civil society and journalists to exercise their fully-fledged scrutiny over society and its functions.

By allowing transparency, we build citizens' trust and confidence, and we combat undemocratic ideas and powers. There is a clear link between a high degree of transparency and a low level of corruption. This is because transparency allows us to detect corrupt practices and prevent it.

Public access to information means preventing corruption and creating trust. To achieve trust is truly a challenge for a Union with approximately 450 million citizens in 27 Member States. This is important and something we must be mindful of because transparency is only resisted when governments see it as a threat and transparency is only a threat when we have something to hide.

The Lisbon Treaty clearly demands more transparency in the EU, and especially so in legislative procedures. Transparency is what citizens have the right to demand and what the EU has a duty to deliver.

The time is now to update the Union's legislation on access to documents. The current legislation is two decades old and needs a thorough makeover to provide our citizens with their fundamental rights.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, transparency is essential for accountability, and accountability is the cornerstone of democracy.

Now, the Commission pledges allegiance to transparency and indeed we have laws in place, but we all know that the practice is an entirely different one. And I happen to be a veteran of access to document requests, and I can tell you the Commission and the Council are actually not practicing a culture of transparency. They go out of their way to avoid transparency.

And it's not only the Commission and the Council. If you look at Frontex, which is not only refusing access to documents but then making applicants pay for expensive external lawyers that they've hired. And then we also see that the European Council is taking over more and more of the legislative work of the Council so that a growing chunk of decision-making is moving back into the black box.

Now, let's get to the case at hand here. The European Commission has its own wrong interpretation of the transparency regulation, and this is not me considering that, this is considered maladministration by the European Ombudsman, and the European Ombudsman knows a thing or two about transparency. Yesterday, a Dutch newspaper called *Follow the Money* disclosed internal papers from the Commission Legal Service and other services that show that the Legal Service had already warned against the Commission interpretation of the transparency regulation, saying that the definitions were insufficiently precise. So the Commission knew, but it chose to ignore those warnings. If we cannot trust the guardian of the treaties to be open to scrutiny, if the guardian of the treaties is deliberately, knowingly misinterpreting the transparency rules, how can we trust them?

There's been the case of the text messages exchanged between President von der Leyen and Mr Bourla. And I think it is high time that President von der Leyen confirms if they have been deleted, yes or no. And to those who start to hyperventilate about the confidentiality of commercial negotiations, you should know the Transparency Regulation, OK? I recommend everybody reads it because the fact that those messages are considered a document officially, doesn't mean that they will automatically have to be published, but they must be open to requests for access.

If the President doesn't feel that she is accountable to the public and to this House, I would like to know how we can trust the Commission to manage the spending of EUR 450 million on weapons in the near future. I'm all in favour of the military support to Ukraine, but I also think that strict scrutiny is in order. President von der Leyen also happens to have a past as Defence Minister, where she ran into the same trouble with an exchange of messages that she deleted, so she should have known better.

Incidentally, I think President von der Leyen should have been here. There seems to be a pattern of avoiding debates where awkward questions may be asked. I think that is a contempt for democracy, it's a contempt for Parliament.

But one last remark. We should do also more as a Parliament. We cannot outsource parliamentary scrutiny to the European Court of Justice or to the Ombudsman or the Court of Auditors. We have to hold the Commission to account.

Daniel Freund, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin Jourová, ich sehe, Sie haben Ihr Handy griffbereit und wahrscheinlich heute schon Dutzende Nachrichten geschrieben. Wie bei uns allen ist das Handy 24 Stunden mit dabei. Ich hoffe, es ist auch bei der Kommissionspräsidentin 24 Stunden am Tag griffbereit, denn schließlich muss sie ja erreichbar sein.

Wie wir alle hier im Haus, jeder Einzelne von uns, nutzt die Kommissionspräsidentin ihr Handy, um ihr Team zu kontaktieren, wichtige Gedanken auszutauschen, um Politik zu machen. Und wir wissen ja schon, dass sie es auch benutzt hat, um den Kauf von Impfstoffen für 450 Millionen Europäerinnen und Europäer zu organisieren und damit deren Leben zu verbessern.

Das, was auf dem Telefon von Frau von der Leyen passiert, ist Politik, und gleichzeitig behauptet jetzt der Juristische Dienst der Kommission, dass Kurznachrichten „prinzipiell keine wichtigen Informationen über die Politik, die Aktivitäten oder Entscheidungen der Kommission“ enthalten. Dann kann ich also nur davon ausgehen, dass das Handy ausschließlich für *Candy Crush* benutzt wird.

Ich glaube das nicht. Der Zugang zu Dokumenten ist eines der zentralen Grundrechte jedes demokratischen Systems. Es kann nicht sein, dass Journalistinnen und Journalisten fadenscheinige Begründungen bekommen und abgewimmelt werden. Es kann nicht sein, dass die Kommission selbst die Empfehlung der Bürgerbeauftragten ignoriert. Und es kann nicht sein, dass der Zugang zu zentralen Dokumenten schon wieder dadurch verhindert wird, dass Ursula von der Leyen SMS löscht.

Lassen Sie uns endlich Transparenz schaffen darüber, was auf den Telefonen der Kommissare passiert.

Alessandro Panza, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, signora Presidente della Commissione europea, onorevoli colleghi, la trasparenza per chi ricopre un ruolo istituzionale di così alto livello non solo è un dovere amministrativo e soprattutto etico, ma anche la garanzia del proprio buon operato, che può essere così sgombro da illazioni, dubbi o fraintendimenti. Se poi l'oggetto di questa scarsa trasparenza fosse la più grossa crisi che l'Europa e le sue istituzioni si sono trovate ad affrontare, la chiarezza diventa un imperativo irrinunciabile. Forse è proprio questo lo spirito con cui il Mediatore europeo che, interpellata sull'accesso al testo di alcuni SMS che lei avrebbe scambiato con il CEO di Pfizer, ha ribadito, cito: «l'accesso ai documenti UE è un diritto fondamentale».

Purtroppo dall'inizio dell'emergenza Covid ci sono stati diversi momenti in cui la Commissione ha mancato di trasparenza e ogni volta che ciò accade la sua credibilità viene incrinata. Pensiamo a quando si scoprì per caso, grazie a Wikileaks, che la Commissione finanziava il laboratorio di Wuhan e solo grazie a un'interrogazione del nostro gruppo la stessa Commissione ha dovuto ammettere che quel laboratorio non era ottemperante alla documentazione richiesta, oppure quando quest'Aula ha chiesto fortemente di poter vedere i contratti di acquisto dei vaccini anti-Covid con le principali case farmaceutiche mondiali, salvo poi vedersi consegnare dei documenti in larga parte censurati.

Presidente, noi siamo convinti della sua buona fede nell'affrontare una crisi politica e sociale mai vista e che ha richiesto uno sforzo politico incredibile, ma non possiamo lasciare spazio a dubbi, ed è per questo che la questione dei cosiddetti SMS non è solo per sapere se ci sono o cosa contengono, ma devono essere lo strumento per dimostrare che la Commissione è al di sopra di ogni sospetto, affinché nessuno possa speculare, travisare sulla mancanza di trasparenza oppure, peggio, pensare che qualcuno anteponga gli interessi commerciali, magari con la Cina, agli interessi dei cittadini europei.

Signora Presidente, lo dobbiamo alle vittime del Covid, lo dobbiamo alle famiglie che hanno subito e stanno subendo le conseguenze sanitarie ed economiche della pandemia, lo dobbiamo a tutti i cittadini europei.

Concludo, Presidente: si dice sempre che questa è la casa dei cittadini europei, ebbene, allora che sia una casa di vetro e inondata di luce, dove non ci sia mai spazio per nessuna ombra.

Marc Botenga, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, nous avons tous entendu la médiatrice parler de mauvaise gouvernance. Et nous avons découvert autre chose: non seulement pendant les négociations entre «Big Pharma», Pfizer et la Commission européenne, la présidente de la Commission européenne envoyait des petits SMS au PDG de Pfizer, mais en plus, plus elle envoyait des SMS, plus le prix augmentait. En effet, on paye maintenant plus cher la troisième dose que la première dose. Ça, c'est quand même louche. Vous envoyez des SMS pendant les négociations et le prix augmente. L'objectif devrait quand même être le contraire.

On s'est donc demandé est-ce que, potentiellement, la Commission européenne n'était pas en train de nous arnaquer, est-ce qu'elle n'était pas en train d'organiser un hold-up sur la sécurité sociale en filant ses sous à des amis de Big Pharma, de Pfizer, etc. Des citoyens se sont alors souvenus – effectivement, cela a été dit –, de ce règlement qui permet de demander l'accès public aux documents (c'est-à-dire que chacun des citoyens que vous êtes censés représenter peut demander l'accès à des documents, quel qu'en soit le support, qu'ils soient sur papier ou stockés sous forme électronique), et c'est ce que des citoyens ont fait. Et vous, vous avez répondu. Et vous avez répondu quoi? Non, désolé, on a effacé peut-être, parce que cet accès du public ne vaut pas pour des messages qui sont éphémères ou de courte durée.

Je le concède, c'est bien trouvé. C'est cyniquement brillant: en effaçant une information, elle devient éphémère, et puisqu'elle est éphémère, vous avez le droit de l'effacer. Écoutez, c'est bien trouvé. C'est, quelque part, une master class de mauvaise foi que vous avez donnée. Nous ne saurons probablement jamais ce qu'il y a dedans. Nous devons revoir les règles, bien sûr, mais les meilleures règles ne servent à rien si vous n'avez pas l'intention de les appliquer, d'en respecter l'âme et la finalité.

En fait, ce que vous dites aux gens – et je trouve que c'est grave –, c'est qu'on ne peut peut-être pas vous faire confiance et que les institutions européennes vont finalement trouver l'entourloupe pour éviter toute transparence. Et ça, ça va se payer cash.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Mr President, transparency and public access to documents is at a low level in Europe. The Corona crisis, unfortunately, showed us that very clearly. It failed with regard to the purchase agreements for COVID vaccines.

Why cannot we, as MEPs, have access to the purchase agreements? First, it was in a committee: we in the ENVI Committee had a chance to see the agreements but were not allowed to scan, copy, take a photo or tell anybody about it. This is ridiculous and was a humiliation of Members of the European Parliament.

Then it was really published, but it was published in a redacted version, leaving everything important covered in black ink. At the end there were text messages between the CEO of Pfizer and the President of the Commission, and even the European Ombudsman had to take action on this.

One could get the impression, from the media, that they are more in a friendly relationship than in a professional one. Instead of being a role model, the Commission is clearly mocking the citizens.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, dovoluji mi několik slov k tomuto tématu. Od obecné debaty o transparentnosti dokumentů Evropské komise jsme přešli ke konkrétní kauze. Já chci nejprve poděkovat paní místopředsedkyni za úvod, kdy jasně popsala snahu Komise o to, aby některé procesy byly transparentní, zavedení a posílení veřejného portálu atd. Ale to téma nakonec stejně sklouzlo k dojednávání smluv o vakcínách proti COVID-19 a o případných SMS zprávách zástupce Komise s výrobcí. Za mě to není tak o transparentnosti tento problém, ale vůbec o politické kultuře. Já si myslím, že debata nemá být o tom, jestli SMS zprávy vysokého politika, který dojednává kontrakt s nějakým výrobcem, mají či nemají být veřejné. Já si myslím, že takové SMS zprávy vůbec nemají být, pokud tedy byly. Takové kontrakty se mají dojednat transparentně v jasných dokumentech při oficiálních jednáních a ne skrze nějaké SMS zprávy.

Osobně si nemyslím, že je nutné uvažovat o nějaké změně právní úpravy, to nařízení z roku 2001 i s vymezením výjimek je podle mě dostatečné. Otázka je opět v aplikaci. Já si myslím, že pokud jsou výjimky z transparentnosti, pak je Komise má vykládat restriktivně, nikoliv extenzivně. V tom vidím možná ten rozdílný přístup. Vedle kauzy, která zde byla zmiňována, mě jako zástupce České republiky se týká kauza našeho bývalého premiéra, kde probíhal audit, který právě nebyl zveřejněn s odkazem na tyto výjimky, byť část odborníků si myslela, že ten audit má být právě ve veřejném zájmu zveřejněn. Takže opět je zde otázka oné restriktive výkladu výjimek. Myslím si, že v kauze českého premiéra právě byl extenzivní výklad výjimek a že to zkrátka nebylo správně využito. Říkám to takhle obecně, nechci z toho dělat politiku, ale bavíme se o tom, jak je v praxi nařízení z roku 2001 aplikováno.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Voorzitter, commissaris, laat me eerst zeggen dat het halverwege dit debat duidelijk mag zijn dat een grote meerderheid in het Parlement de interpretatie van de Commissie over de toepassing van de transparantie niet volgt, dat we er op een heel andere manier naar kijken en dat het duidelijk moet zijn dat we daar verandering in willen zien. En ik wil de *case* die voor ons ligt toch nog even duiden, omdat die heel erg goed aantoont waar het hier over gaat.

We weten – in de pandemie – dat er voor de Commissie geen bevoegdheid is op het gebied van publieke gezondheid, en tóch heeft zij gehandeld. En dat heeft de volle steun van dit Parlement gekregen. Als zij niet had opgetreden rond de vaccinaankopen, dan hadden we vaccinongelijkheid binnen de Europese Unie gezien, en dat zou bijzonder slecht geweest zijn.

Het nadeel van het feit dat we die bevoegdheid niet hebben, is dat er te weinig parlementaire controle geweest is op het onderhandelen van die contracten. En dan – en dat maakt het extra pijnlijk – is er iets gebeurd, met name dat het beleid verpersoonlijkt is. Er waren heel erg veel persoonlijke contacten, onder meer met Commissievoorzitter Von der Leyen en de CEO van Pfizer.

En ik heb al heel lang een heel ongemakkelijk gevoel, want we hebben dan wel geen vaccinongelijkheid gehad binnen de Europese Unie, maar we hebben immens grote vaccinongelijkheid in de wereld gehad. En de *Pfizers* van Europa en de grote big pharma, ook in de Verenigde Staten, hebben zich echt achter die brede rug van de Europese Commissie kunnen verschuilen in de patentdiscussie. Ik heb het ongemakkelijke gevoel dat er daar dingen beloofd zijn die de buitenwereld niet mag weten. Maar misschien vergis ik mij. Misschien vergis ik mij, en daarom is het zo ontzettend belangrijk dat alle documenten, inclusief het sms-verkeer, worden blootgegeven.

En u weet, deze week is er ook een speciale commissie goedgekeurd om te evalueren wat er tijdens het coronabeleid gebeurd is: de goede dingen, de minder goede dingen. En we gaan – ik beloof u dat – als Parlement tot op de bodem van dit verhaal. Wat is er daar afgesproken tijdens die onderhandeling?

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, voilà plus de 20 ans que le règlement sur la transparence est entré en vigueur. Deux décennies plus tard, la pratique de garantir l'accès du public à des documents est désormais, certes, a priori établie, mais ce règlement doit être révisé et adapté à la réalité d'aujourd'hui, où la communication se fait à travers des canaux multiples, sans nécessairement laisser de trace.

Ainsi, il convient de responsabiliser l'administration européenne en ce qui concerne ces nouveaux supports, afin de garantir des pratiques et des procédures transparentes, élément clé de la démocratie. Ce règlement doit s'appliquer sans exception à tous les organes de l'Union européenne. Aussi aura-t-on besoin d'une nouvelle définition, beaucoup plus large, de ce qu'est un «document», pour s'adapter à l'air du temps.

Il s'agit ici d'une question de gouvernance et de confiance, surtout quand l'argent du contribuable est en jeu. Et cette pratique ne doit pas être négligée en temps de crise, lorsque la Commission signe des contrats avec des entreprises pharmaceutiques où l'intérêt supérieur des citoyens et des citoyennes doit prévaloir sur des intérêts purement commerciaux.

Virginie Joron (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Madame la Présidente de la Commission, je regrette tout d'abord l'absence de la présidente von der Leyen. Mais je suis heureuse de pouvoir vous transmettre, de la part de mes concitoyens français, des questions autour de la transparence, ou plutôt de l'opacité, qui entoure vos actions.

La COVID-19 a créé un univers hors droits sous couvert d'urgence. La transparence, surtout quand on touche à la santé de nos enfants, c'est fondamental. Et jusqu'à présent, on ne peut pas dire que cela soit la vertu de la Commission. Des milliards d'euros pour des milliards de doses de vaccins commandées aux «Big Pharma» alors qu'ils sont encore au stade de l'étude clinique et que leur efficacité est remise en question. Le scandale de l'achat du médicament remdesivir – que je n'oublie pas – par votre Commission, aurait pourtant dû vous alerter. Un milliard d'euros pour le laboratoire Gilead, pour 500 000 doses de ce traitement, alors qu'en même temps des résultats négatifs étaient publiés pour celui-ci. Dans votre stratégie de vaccination mondiale, vous avez envoyé des vaccins AstraZeneca rejetés ou périmés, dont des milliers de doses ont dû être détruites par le Nigeria.

Ferez-vous toute la lumière sur ces échecs? Pourquoi des pages entières de ces contrats d'achat de vaccins sont-elles cachées? Ces clauses grisées portent notamment sur l'absence de responsabilité des labos en cas d'effets secondaires indésirables. Pourquoi de telles clauses d'irresponsabilité? Pourquoi avoir caché le prix des doses? Qui va payer les effets secondaires indésirables? Pourquoi la Commission européenne s'entête à ne pas transmettre au médiateur européen les échanges de SMS entre le PDG de Pfizer et la présidente de la Commission européenne?

À M^{me} la présidente von der Leyen, qui est absente: ne demandez pas aujourd'hui aux États membres de réfléchir à une obligation vaccinale, quand on est incapable de répondre à toutes ces questions.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Mr President, we are discussing today a very important topic that concerns a very fundamental general principle of the EU institutions, namely transparency.

Trust between citizens and the institutions depends on transparency and how it's practiced. It is central that all institutions function in a transparent manner, according to the regulation that embodies the rules on public access to the documents of the institutions. That ruling is called Regulation (EC) 1049/2001.

Of course, means of communications have changed since then. There is an urgent call to look if that is still unclear, and I think the strong message from the Ombudsman, who accused the Commission of maladministration, is a need to change the situation. So, important content can be a text message and can be something else.

But of course, in real life, there are situations when information cannot be disclosed, but even then, these situations need to be well justified and based on EU law, not wrong predictions.

Eleonora Evi (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quando si parla di soldi pubblici la trasparenza è un dovere, eppure siamo nel 2022 e abbiamo un regolamento vecchio di vent'anni, a causa soprattutto del blocco opposto dai governi europei in Consiglio, e ancora in UE persistono casi di grave mancanza di trasparenza.

Io parlo del progetto ferroviario ad alta velocità Torino-Lione e degli 813 milioni di euro di soldi pubblici per finanziarlo. CINEA, che è l'agenzia incaricata, continua a negare l'accesso alle informazioni sul finanziamento, richiamando l'eccezione prevista dal regolamento sulla sicurezza pubblica, senza dare però valide motivazioni. Oltre al danno quindi la beffa, perché oltre al devastante impatto ambientale di un progetto scellerato, ai cittadini viene negato il legittimo diritto a verificare che i beneficiari dei soldi pubblici li impieghino rispettando gli obblighi previsti.

Io, quindi, chiedo alla Commissione di far luce su questa inaccettabile situazione, perché il diritto all'accesso ai documenti costituisce uno dei pilastri fondanti dell'assetto democratico della nostra società.

(Debates tika pārtrauktas.)

4. Pierwsza część głosowania

Sēdes vadītājs. – Pirms turpināt debates, tātad atklāšu šodienas pirmo balsošanu.

Balsosim par darba kārtībā norādītajiem dokumentiem.

Balsošana notiks no plkst. 9.45 līdz plkst. 11.00.

Tiks izmantota tāda pati balsošanas metode kā iepriekšējā balsošanā.

Visi balsojumi notiks pēc saraksta.

Paziņojū, ka pirmā balsošana ir atklāta.

Jūs varat balsot līdz plkst. 11.00.

Un pirmās balsošanas rezultāti tiks paziņoti plkst. 13.00.

5. **Przejrzystość i normy administracyjne – rozpatrywanie wniosków o udzielenie publicznego dostępu na podstawie rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1049/2001 (ciąg dalszy debaty)**

Sēdes vadītājs. – Turpinām debates par Komisijas paziņojumu — Pārredzamība un administratīvie standarti — pamatojoties uz Regulu (EK) Nr. 1049/2001 iesniegtu publiskas piekļuves pieprasījumu apstrāde (2022/0578(RSP)).

Joachim Kuhs (ID). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kollegen! Wir reden heute über ein zentrales und wichtiges Thema: die Transparenz allen Verwaltungshandeln innerhalb der EU-Institutionen. Da finde ich es wirklich beschämend, dass Ihre Chefin, Frau von der Leyen, nicht anwesend ist.

Denn der Elefant im Raum sind nicht die Transparenzregeln, über die wir uns sicher einigen könnten. Der Elefant im Raum ist das Verhalten von Frau von der Leyen im Rahmen ihrer Pflichten bei der Impfstoffbeschaffung, und da möchte ich doch darum bitten, dass Sie ihr ausrichten, dass es wirklich nicht so gehen kann. Wir brauchen hier die absolute Transparenz über dieses Verhalten und über das, was tatsächlich passiert ist.

Denn es geht nicht nur um die Impfstoffbeschaffung. Es geht darum, was sie über die gefährlichen Impfstoffe wusste, über die Gefährlichkeit, über die Impf-Nebenwirkungen, die schon in den Versuchen bei der Erprobung von Pfizer selbst festgestellt worden sind. Es gibt dort zigtausende Impfschäden, und deshalb muss das auf den Tisch.

Hier brauchen wir absolute Transparenz, und es ist meine Bitte, dass Sie Frau von der Leyen einen Brief, den ich ihr vorhin übergeben wollte, mitgeben und ihr dann sagen, dass es mir leidtut, dass sie heute nicht hier war.

Milan Brglez (S&D). – Gospod predsednik! Predsedujoči, hvala za besedo, spoštovana komisarka, kolegice in kolegi. Transparentnost ali preglednost je temelj evropske demokracije. Iz tega načela izhaja pravica evropskih državljank in državljanov do dostopa do dokumentov evropskih institucij, ki je utemeljena tako v Pogodbi o delovanju Evropske unije kot v listini temeljnih pravic.

Znotraj tega bi izpostavil zlasti dostop do okoljskih migracij. Ker je Evropska unija dolžna po mednarodnem pravu to zagotavljati, ker je pogodbenica Aarhuške konvencije. Tudi zaradi vojne v Ukrajini danes bistvena elementa človekove varnosti predstavljata okoljska in podnebna varnost, zato je krepitev demokratizacije in preglednosti v okoljskih zadevah tudi naš prispevek k spoštovanju človekovih pravic.

Zato močno podpiram revizijo uredbe o dostopu javnosti in s tem tudi priporočilo evropske varuhinje človekovih pravic, ker nam to predstavlja možno zapolnitev vrzeli v naši demokratični ureditvi in vladavini prava. Če se je kdaj, se je tukaj in zdaj potrebno boriti za naše vrednote znotraj in navzven. Če z njimi, bomo kot Evropska unija skupaj obstali, ali pa nas več ne bo.

Gerolf Annemans (ID). – Voorzitter, collega's, u zal zich herinneren hoe Hillary Clinton destijds met haar e-mailwan-beheer serieus in de problemen kwam. Wat toen als conclusie naar voren kwam, is het volgende: iedereen met grote verantwoordelijkheden – zeker politieke verantwoordelijkheden met belastinggeld – is verplicht zorgvuldig en zonder geheimdoenerij te handelen.

De Europese Commissie beseft te weinig wat voor diepgaand effect is uitgegaan van de coronacrisis op de burgers. Een van de vele als schandaal aanvoelde effecten is – naast de laattijdige en daarna nutteloze vrijheidsbeperkingen – dat de vaccincontracten eens ze openbaar werden, onleesbaar bleken te zijn gemaakt omwille van een zogenaamde geheimhoudingsplicht.

Gelukkig, door een vergissing van een Belgische staatssecretaris die de prijzen van de vaccins in een Twitterberichtje plaatste, kennen we de prijsverhoudingen tussen de vaccins. Pfizer, waarmee de voorzitter van de Commissie naar een verklaring van Pfizerbaas Bourla zelf “een diepe vertrouwensband had gecreëerd”, blijkt de op een na hoogste prijs te hebben.

Dat de persoonlijke berichtjes tussen die beiden, zoals de Commissie nu als verweer aanvoert, slechts “efemeer” van aard zijn, overtuigt natuurlijk niet. In uw hooggeplaatste bubbel en in uw elektrische limousines beseft u de woede niet van de mensen die nog het liefst van al zouden willen dat de Europese Commissie zélf efemeer, van voorbijgaande aard, zou blijken te zijn.

Annalisa Tardino (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo qui oggi per un motivo semplice quanto importante: i cittadini meritano di conoscere la verità sull'ingente trattativa che pare essere avvenuta tramite uno scambio di messaggi tra la Presidente von der Leyen e l'amministratore delegato della Pfizer, relativa alla fornitura all'UE del vaccino anti-Covid.

La risposta delle istituzioni all'indomani del diffondersi del virus è stata forte nella lotta allo stesso e oggi possiamo parlare di un quasi ritorno alla normalità, nonostante siano stati commessi molti errori a tutti i livelli.

Ma una cosa è certa, l'emergenza non può giustificare zone d'ombra né il mancato rispetto delle regole. Non può nemmeno giustificare il dubbio. Il dubbio che il diniego della Commissione dinanzi alla richiesta di accesso agli atti possa nascondere altro. Siamo quindi qui per fare luce su quanto accaduto, seguendo anche le indicazioni del Mediatore europeo, che ha deciso di aprire un'indagine.

Vedete, non c'è potere senza responsabilità e non ci può essere responsabilità senza potere.

Oggi non si parla solo di uno scambio di messaggi, ma della violazione di un principio, quello della trasparenza dell'azione della Commissione. E la replica della Commissione, secondo cui questo tipo di comunicazione non sarebbe rilevante, è tanto debole quanto sospetta. Come ha ricordato il Mediatore, è il contenuto che conta e non la forma utilizzata.

Per questo chiediamo alla Commissione di rispondere del proprio operato: lo deve a noi ma lo deve *in primis* ai cittadini che hanno affrontato questa pandemia con sacrifici e il loro rispetto delle regole.

Věra Jourová, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I am sure that President von der Leyen is following this debate, but on the other hand, I think I am the right person to address it here today because I am paid to work on the transparency of the Commission. So that's why I am glad to be here and to be allowed to listen to your debate and also to be able to answer, which I want to do now.

I agree with Ms Incir, who said that without transparency there is no accountability. I myself used this sentence so many times when we were discussing and negotiating the transparency register. And, believe me, the Commission was the one that was pushing for as strong transparency as possible because, from what I heard, it was the other two institutions that were saying how we should be more careful, not be so open, that we have to be operational, not publish documents during trilogues, and so on. So I don't agree with Sophia in 't Veld when she says that the Commission is not trustworthy enough. I have been working in this institution for many years now, and I can see that there is a high level of support for the maximum possible transparency. So we will work with the Parliament and the Council to do better, because I agree with those of you who said that there is a lot of room for improvement. I will come to this because this is the debate about one case, and also systemic matters relating to the way in which we communicate and enable access to documents.

On the ad-hoc case, the text messages, I have to say that in times of crisis, indeed, when you are an executive body and you have the burden of responsibility on your shoulders, you have to be operational; you sometimes have to engage in personal communication; you have to be fast. As for the burden of responsibility, well, we can discuss it, whether we should have done what we did: we invested in vaccine research; we invested a lot in having common procurement and, as you said, the EU has very little competence in the field of health care. In spite of that, President von der Leyen took the risks and she engaged heavily, days and nights, in guaranteeing the early delivery of the vaccines to the European people, and I admire her for this work. I think that in this case, she is the role model, not the other way around. You may not see her as a role model of transparency but I see her as a role model for taking her responsibility seriously and acting quickly and in an efficient way.

As for what Mr Annemans said, that the Commission acted in an ephemeral way, well if that had been the case we would not have had the people vaccinated in Europe. So I'm sorry but I have to look at this case also in context and the real nature of the situation, and this was at the peak of the COVID-19 crisis. But this case is not closed, and I said before that we are preparing an answer to the Ombudsman with a deadline of 26 April, and we will give all of the information necessary to reply to the Ombudsman's requests.

On the systemic side, so let's make an agreement to increase the system, or improve the system, of access to documents in all three institutions – in the Commission, Parliament and Council. You know well that we have the legislation from 2001 and you said it here many times that the rules need to be modernised. I agree 100%. When we started in COVID times with purely online communication, not face to face, and with a lot of telephone diplomacy, I felt myself that this was a new way of communicating and was something which should be reflected also in how transparent we are. So I agree that we need to reflect in new rules that there are modern channels and modern ways of communication, and that should be our new interpretation of the exemptions which Mr Pospíšil called for. There should be a new, precise definition of what constitutes a document. I agree with all that.

So, my question to you is whether you will unblock the situation around the directives, which were prepared to update the rules from 2001, and whether we will be able to withdraw the legislation which is pending and prepare new rules. We are working on them. And if this will not be possible for all the institutions, we are determined to come with new internal rules for the Commission. And as I said many times before, I don't want to wait because I am really convinced that we have to modernise the rules and reflect also the new technological reality.

So this is my call for cooperation with the Parliament to push things forward where they should be pushed, in the interest of higher transparency and better access to documents.

So I wanted to be concrete in my answer, also to confirm that I am aware that we should do better, and I am ready to cooperate.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

6. Potrzeba ambitnej strategii UE na rzecz zrównoważonych wyrobów włókienniczych (debata)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības jautājums: Komisijas paziņojums — Nepieciešamība pieņemt ES ilgtspējīgu tekstilizstrādājumu stratēģiju (2022/2539(RSP)).

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the textiles sector has major effects on our climate and our environment and, in fact, textiles consumption is one of the top four supply-chain pressures on resource use, land use, water and greenhouse gas emissions. As a value chain, it places huge pressure on biodiversity. Many hazardous chemicals are still used in textile products and a considerable share of the microplastics released into the environment can be traced back to the source. The sector also plays a crucial role to ensure the labour rights of workers in Europe and abroad.

Worst of all, the trends are moving in the wrong direction. We throw away clothes faster than ever before, and we use them for ever shorter periods of time. Most of them end up in landfill or incineration. Around the world, less than one percent of all textiles are now recycled into new textiles. We need to encourage and support the sector to do better.

In the EU, it employs 1.5 million people in more than 160 000 companies, most of which are SMEs. In 2019, the annual turnover was EUR 162 billion. When we talk about textiles, we are talking about everything from the automotive and agriculture sectors to home furnishings, clothing and medical equipment. The largest share of our textiles consumption is fashion. We are a major destination for textiles and garments. In 2019, the EU was the second largest global importer of clothing and, in the first 15 years of this century, world production of textiles more or less doubled. The consumption of clothing, footwear and household textiles happening in Europe creates the most impact in other regions of the world, where the majority of production takes place. For textile supply chains, the pandemic brought considerable disruption and many citizens realize that the sector needs radical change.

As all other sectors, textiles needs to build back better. We need to help the sector to do that. We need to build in more circularity and sustainability, and that's vital to address climate change, to help win the fight against pollution and to reduce the pressure on nature and reverse biodiversity loss. We need to do it while preserving and creating growth and decent jobs, respecting human rights.

At the end of this month, as announced in the circular economy action plan, the Commission will adopt an EU strategy for sustainable and circular textiles. It will be a strategy to strengthen innovation and reduce the environmental footprint, a strategy to boost the market for sustainable and circular textiles, a strategy for increasing textile reuse and repair, boosting circular business models and addressing fast fashion, and a strategy that can also boost the competitiveness of sustainable textiles industries. Social aspects, including working conditions, will also be considered.

The strategy builds on extensive consultations and input from stakeholders, who supported its development through thematic workshops and online public consultation. At its heart is a new approach to design. We want textiles to be more durable, recyclable and easier to reuse, repair and upgrade. That way, we reduce the consumption of resources, we extend the lifespan of textile products and we boost the recovery of valuable materials and components at the end-of-life stage. It means better material efficiency, a reduced environmental footprint and a longer textile-usage life. Acting at the design phase makes it easier to choose materials free of hazardous substances and made of recycled fibres. It also means that microplastics can be designed out of the process.

For all these reasons, textiles will also be a key value chain in the upcoming sustainable product initiative. As promised in the European Green Deal, we are acting to ensure that sustainable products become the norm. It is part of our drive for a climate-neutral Europe by 2050, but more sustainable and circular design alone will not be enough. We need to reduce consumption altogether, in particular in the fashion sector.

That's why we find it especially important to boost the uptake of new business models. These include, for example, more circular models like reuse, resale, repair on demand, manufacturing and product as service. In our sustainable product initiative, we will propose another powerful tool, which will be useful for textiles, the digital product passport, which will improve access to information about product characteristics. That way, all economic actors can make decisions that are better informed. It will enable better transparency and traceability for the value chain, which is particularly important for textiles. Action on the supply chain needs to be coupled with initiatives to empower consumers, and that's why the Commission is also preparing a legislative proposal on green claims in order to fight greenwashing and to ensure that claims are based on reliable, verifiable and comparable information. We aim to present that later this year.

We also need to take into account the international dimension. What we do internally also has an impact on operators in partner countries, and that's why our strategy ambition is, together with our partner countries, to tie sustainable and circular textile value chains globally. Also important for the textile value chain is the legislative proposal on corporate sustainability due diligence recently adopted by the Commission. It comes with a corporate sustainability due diligence obligation to prevent and mitigate actual adverse impacts for sustainability.

When it comes to achieving our social, environmental and climate goals, the textile sector plays a pivotal role. But to play that pivotal role, the sector needs to change. The strategy we are presenting will help drive that change. It means new ways of doing business, different patterns of production and consumption, products that are durable and repairable, and citizens who care, refashioning and sharing the textiles they wear.

It's time to redefine the textile economy in Europe and with our partner countries. We are counting on the support of the European Parliament and we look forward to your views on the strategy we propose. With citizens, youth and stakeholders working together, it's time to rethink the structure of textiles. It's time to refashion fashion.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO*Vicepresidente*

Christian Ehler, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, to be honest, I don't believe a word. We have been announcing that for years. It had been this Parliament strengthening the research programme, doubling the challenge for the creative industries, for innovation. We are facing a transitional phase where clothing is not just about sustainability and new textiles. We are going to a world where fibres will change the consistence of textiles. It will be related to health, to information, to the digital world, to a lot of other things. But we hear announcements. We hear announcements. We hear announcements.

There's still no transition pathway which had been announced by the Commission as part of the 14 ecosystems, where you described the textile industry as one of the 14. There is no transition pathway. There is no strategy. There are just an announcements. And yet another referred that what we share to sustainability. But it is just another administrative nightmare you're describing. This industry is hit. We have been losing one million jobs before the pandemic, another 500 million within the pandemic, and the Commission is waiting. For two and half years you could have done calls in the research programme. We have EUR 2.3 billion for the creative industry. We have a new powerhouse and you are announcing, and you're announcing, and you're announcing. And this sector, yes, has to change. And this sector is up for potential for the future. That's one of the European USPs. That is what Europe can do where fashion is leading, where a young generation is interested, but instead, announcement, and another administrative nightmare.

So go to action, not announce, you would have had two and a half years, tons of money in the research programme to start innovation products. Not a single one.

César Luena, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, vaya de entrada que yo sí me he creído las palabras del comisario.

El consumo de ropa, calzado y textiles para el hogar en la Unión Europea supone el uso, señorías, de 675 millones de toneladas de materias primas cada año, es decir, una media de 1,3 toneladas por cada ciudadano de la Unión Europea al año. El sector textil ejerce la segunda mayor presión sobre el uso de la tierra y es el quinto sector en emisiones de carbono procedentes del consumo doméstico. Y un dato más: la industria textil usa 53 000 millones de metros cúbicos de agua cada año. Y, ¿saben dónde acabarán al final el 73 % de todos los textiles? Pues en vertederos o incinerados.

Por tanto, necesitamos una estrategia ambiciosa que contribuya a la sostenibilidad y circularidad del sector y a crear las condiciones e incentivos necesarios para la resiliencia, para la competitividad, más aún, sobre todo, tras la crisis de la COVID.

Necesitamos una estrategia que aumente la esperanza de vida útil de los productos textiles, que garantice que estos puedan ser fácilmente reutilizados o al menos reparados, que aborde también la prevención, la divulgación y la trazabilidad de la utilización de sustancias químicas peligrosas en las cadenas de valor del sector textil.

Y, por último, necesitamos una estrategia que impulse el consumo de textiles reciclados, que deje atrás ese modelo empresarial lineal. Podría ser también una oportunidad para gravar el uso de recursos vírgenes por parte del sector textil. Una estrategia que haga que la industria textil de la Unión sea responsable de su papel en el mundo, pues gran parte de las presiones derivadas de nuestro consumo de textil se dan fuera de nuestras fronteras.

Por tanto, el sector textil debe ser circular. No basta con que las marcas promuevan algunas colecciones hechas con materias sostenibles. Es insuficiente mientras siguen vendiendo miles de productos baratos con un enorme impacto medioambiental y climático.

Por tanto, la circularidad debe significar una reducción radical del impacto ambiental de la industria. El objetivo principal de la nueva estrategia debe ser finalmente contribuir a la reducción de la producción de productos textiles, que es lo que decía el comisario. Necesitamos mejores materiales que sean menos tóxicos y que duren más, señorías. Es decir, ropa reutilizable, reciclable. Pero esto debe ir acompañado de una reducción general de la producción.

Esta es una estrategia deseada, necesaria. Yo lo que le pido a la Comisión es que sea ambiciosa, que incluya todas las medidas legislativas necesarias que permitan la transformación del sector, porque creo que todos compartimos que no podemos dejar pasar esta oportunidad.

Ulrike Müller, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Textilien sind einer der größten Treiber unseres Rohstoffverbrauchs. Die globale Textilindustrie steht an fünfter Stelle bei den CO₂-Emissionen, in etwa auf Augenhöhe mit der Automobilwirtschaft.

Auf dem Weg in eine klimaneutrale Kreislaufwirtschaft ist es deshalb notwendig, dass wir uns mit einer nachhaltigeren Textilwirtschaft beschäftigen. Allerdings zentrieren sich die Ankündigungen bisher hauptsächlich auf Wiederverwendung, Recycling und Reparierbarkeit, Herr Kommissar.

Die Logik ist klar. Die Reduzierung des Ressourcenverbrauchs ist ein großer Hebel für effizientere Nutzung. Dabei wird aber der zweite große Hebel bisher weitgehend außer Acht gelassen – die Förderung nachhaltiger Materialien. Die gängigen Textilien haben große negative Auswirkungen auf Landnutzung und Umwelt. Baumwolle, die für 43 % aller Textilien steht, braucht viel Land und Wasser, Dünger und Pflanzenschutzmittel. Die Produktion findet größtenteils in Ländern statt, in denen mit deutlich niedrigeren Nachhaltigkeitsstandards produziert wird als in der EU. Polyester wird aus fossilen Rohstoffen gewonnen und ist eine Quelle für Mikroplastik, das in Gewässer gelangt.

Ich möchte heute Ihren Blick, Herr Kommissar, auf die Wälder lenken. Sie haben das Potenzial, einen substanziellen Beitrag zu nachhaltigen Textilien zu leisten. Textilien mit aus Holz gewonnener Zellulose haben derzeit einen Anteil von weniger als 10 %. Das *European Forest Institute* rechnete vor, dass eine Erhöhung dieses Anteils auf etwa 50 % realistisch ist. Dank des drei- bis fünfmal geringeren CO₂-Fußabdrucks im Vergleich zu Baumwolle und Polyester können damit Emissionen in einer Größenordnung von mehr als 400 Millionen Tonnen eingespart werden.

Diese Beispielrechnung macht deutlich, dass die Strategie zu kurz greift, wenn sie nicht auch Rohstoffe für Textilien stärker in den Blick nimmt. Ich hoffe sehr, dass die Kommission dieses Potenzial nicht liegen lässt.

Anna Cavazzini, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Viele von uns haben wahrscheinlich Berge an Kleidungsstücken zu Hause liegen, die wir manchmal gar nicht mehr benutzen.

Aber was passiert denn mit dieser Kleidung? Die Zahlen sind wirklich vernichtend. Weltweit wird weniger als 1 % der Kleidung recycelt, aber immer mehr produziert, verkauft, gekauft. Und das ist wirklich interessant: Wir reden inzwischen nicht mehr von *fast fashion*, sondern von *superfast fashion*.

Der ökologische Fußabdruck ist gigantisch. Der textile Sektor – und das wurde gerade schon gesagt – verursacht ein Zehntel der weltweiten CO₂-Emissionen. Alleine für die Herstellung eines T-Shirts brauchen wir 2700 Liter Wasser. Davon würde ein Mensch zwei Jahre seinen Durst stillen können.

Die Textilbranche steht außerdem wie kein anderer Sektor symbolisch für die Wegwerfgesellschaft und die Ungerechtigkeit in der globalen Wirtschaft. Wir kennen doch alle die Bilder von Arbeitern und Arbeiterinnen – ja, vor allem sind es Frauen –, die dicht gedrängt an den Nähmaschinen sitzen. Kein Tageslicht, stattdessen Akkordarbeit. Und solange die Konzerne in letzter Minute schlecht bezahlte Aufträge erteilen oder diese wieder stornieren, bleiben die Arbeitsbedingungen prekär.

Diese Probleme zeigen, dass eine Strategie für nachhaltige Textilien die ökologischen, aber auch die menschenrechtlichen Probleme adressieren muss. Die Textilstrategie – das haben auch viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen heute gesagt – darf eben nicht nur über Ankündigungen und schöne Worte reden, sondern es müssen auch konkrete gesetzliche Regelungen auf den Weg gebracht werden. Wir brauchen auch für die Textilien eine echte Kreislaufwirtschaft auf unserem Binnenmarkt, längere Haltbarkeit, wirksame Reduktionsziele für den Materialverbrauch und für die Emissionen und außerdem hohe Sammelquoten und endlich mehr Wiederverwertung und mehr Recycling!

Es muss für die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher deutlich werden, wie groß der ökologische Fußabdruck der Jeans oder der Jacke ist, die sie kaufen. Und dafür brauchen wir einen elektronischen Produktpass, der genau darüber informiert, und ich bin froh, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie das angekündigt haben.

Ein letzter Punkt: Es gibt bereits eine Richtlinie gegen unlautere Handelspraktiken im Agrar- und im Lebensmittelsektor. Ich finde, solch eine Regel ist unbedingt auch für den Textilektor nötig.

Pietro Fiocchi, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I fully agree with the position of the Commissioner. There are unluckily two major problems regarding the textile sector. They are very technical. Number one is the colouring of the textile, which is on one side strongly regulated by the Workers' Safety Regulation, the Environmental Emissions Regulation and so on, but on the other side is still a problem. We need funds and we need research centres so that we can change 2 000 years of history.

The other problem is the release of micro- and nanoplastics. And for this, we do not have a technical solution to filter and take out this nanoplastic from the water that goes into the sea and then gets eaten by the fish and then we eat them. Now, of course, I would like to see on these funds to find a solution about this. Reduction of artificial textiles is a solution but it is not the only solution. I would like to see a full economic, social and technical assessment of a more stringent regulation on the textile sector, because otherwise we are going to kill a very important economic thing.

On the positive side, we do have all the social media platforms that are trading in used clothing which are reducing the number of clothes going to the landfills.

Last but not least, I really do not understand the politically correct approach in opposition to natural fibres and to natural material like leather and fur. They are natural, they last longer than the artificial stuff, they do not contain microplastic. So are we defending the environment or the animals?

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Kommissar, ich habe Ihnen genau zugehört: Wir wollen, wir müssen, wir brauchen. Seit drei Jahren warten wir darauf, dass die Kommission das Versprechen ihrer Präsidentin umsetzt und eine Strategie – wirklich eine Strategie – für nachhaltige Textilien vorlegt. Diese Industrie beschäftigt weltweit Millionen von Menschen unter zumeist ausbeutenden Bedingungen. Die Produktionsmethoden verbrauchen und verschmutzen Unmengen von Wasser. Die Zahlen sind genannt in der Debatte.

Ein großer Teil dieses Unrechts versorgt nur den Überfluss in den reicheren Staaten der Erde. Neues Zahlenbeispiel: Jede Europäerin und jeder Europäer konsumiert im Schnitt 26 Kilogramm Textilien pro Jahr und wirft davon elf Kilogramm weg. Wenn die Kommission die im Grünen Deal gesteckten Nachhaltigkeitsziele erreichen will, muss nun endlich mal etwas Konkretes kommen.

Wir brauchen ein Recht auf würdige Arbeit entlang der Lieferketten. Wir brauchen eine rechtsverbindliche Verantwortung der Unternehmen in Europa, Umweltverbrechen in der Produktion zu verhindern. Wir brauchen eine Begrenzung der Gesamtmenge an Textilien, die zu vergünstigten Zöllen in die EU importiert werden darf. Wir brauchen eine Förderung von Recycling im Textilektor – konkret, verbindlich.

Hinken Sie deshalb nicht länger dem Wunsch der Bevölkerung, dem Fortschritt hinterher. In den europäischen Städten des fairen und ethischen Handels, Gent und Malmö, boomt besonders die Nachfrage nach – in diesem Sinne – sauberen Textilien. Wenn die EU-Kommission endlich handelte, dann diene das auch dem Schutz von Unternehmen und Beschäftigten, die innerhalb und außerhalb der EU zu besseren und fairen Bedingungen produzieren.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Fru formand! Kære kolleger, kære kommissær. Lige nu forbereder jeg Europa-Parlamentets forslag til en absolut nødvendig revidering af affaldstransportforordningen. Den skal nemlig have cirkulær økonomi ind i sit DNA, og digitalisering skal afløse det gammeldags papirusseri, der spænder ben for et harmoniseret og bæredygtigt indre marked for transport af affald. Også tekstilaffald – som vi har alt, alt for meget af i EU og i verden omkring os. Derfor byder jeg Kommissionens initiativ til en strategi for bæredygtige tekstiler velkommen. Men jeg er også enig med kollega Ehlers og kollega Fiocchis utålmodige kritik. For udfordringen er stor, og den er nødvendig, for kun 1 % af klodens tøj genanvendes til nyt tøj. 1 %! Og undervejs i tekstilernes alt for lineære liv bruges der enorme mængder af vand. Alt for meget vand. Og råvarer. Og energi. Det går simpelt hen ikke længere!

Desuden ligger der faktisk enorme forretningsmuligheder for EU i at løse netop disse problemer, som ingen i verden endnu har fundet løsningen på. Tekstilbranchen er jo i forvejen enorm. 160 000 små og mellemstore virksomheder og 1,5 mio. arbejdspladser alene i EU. Det vil sige, at EU kan – og skal, hvis vi vil – vise resten af verden hvordan. Tekstilbranchen er i den grad global. Det giver gode muligheder for at vise vejen frem og derigennem styrke den europæiske konkurrencedygtighed og teknologiske førerposition. Derfor er det også vigtigt, at vi går systematisk og ambitiøst til opgaven. Vi skal finde nye produktionsmetoder og processer, nye design og nye materialer. Vi skal forske, og vi skal understøtte innovation meget mere. Og så skal vi give det indre marked en rusketur, så hele værdikæden i tekstilbranchen – fra designeren til forbrugeren – sætter klima og miljø i centrum på en reelt bæredygtig måde. Ja – nødvendigheden og mulighederne er enorme. Det er forventningerne også til Kommissionens udspil. Denne gang: skuf os endelig ikke.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il grande cambiamento della sostenibilità sta investendo tutti i settori produttivi, oltre che il nostro modo di vivere, di muoverci e di lavorare. E per questo anche il settore produttivo deve essere accompagnato, il produttivo relativo al tessile deve essere accompagnato in questa trasformazione, e dico volutamente accompagnato, perché qui si tratta di fare insieme delle strategie pubbliche e anche di avere un'iniziativa privata adeguata, insomma, di lavorare insieme per correggere comportamenti e scelte sbagliate e non più sostenibili e, nello stesso tempo, trarre tutte le opportunità che questo settore può offrire.

È un settore... per questo, signor Commissario, lamentiamo veramente la mancata presentazione da parte della Commissione di quella strategia che era stata promessa. Dicevo, è un settore che ha una grandissima valenza, non solo come volume produttivo e come peso nella produzione, ma anche come valorizzazione delle nostre capacità creative, pensiamo a quanti giovani, a quanti giovani talenti della creatività e dell'arte lavorano nella moda, e anche come valore commerciale, perché ci sono volumi di consumi e di distribuzione in tutto il mercato europeo molto molto significativi, oltre che, naturalmente, extraeuropeo.

Allora, conosciamo i punti della sostenibilità relativi alle materie che vengono utilizzate e alle sostanze nocive, è stato detto, e citate dai colleghi precedentemente, che vengono impiegate nei processi produttivi, e poi riguardano tutta la parte relativa allo smaltimento e al riciclo all'insegna dell'economia circolare. Questi temi li conosciamo, io voglio toccare due aspetti però, che spesso stanno un po' sullo sfondo ma che, secondo me, sono altrettanto importanti.

A proposito della fase finale del ciclo di vita, soprattutto nel *fast fashion*, c'è tutto un grande volume, diciamo, di prodotti che vengono mal raccolti e mal smaltiti, ma c'è anche un'esigenza, una grande possibilità di dare uno sbocco a tutto l'ambito delle ONG e del volontariato che questi indumenti recuperano e immettono nel mercato della donazione e della solidarietà. Per l'Europa questo è un capitolo importante, se diciamo che anche la solidarietà sociale è un tratto distintivo della nostra economia; allora qui dobbiamo avere regole che facilitano, invece oggi le regole impediscono una corretta canalizzazione degli indumenti in questo mercato.

Infine, la *due diligence*, che è stata citata. Io penso che, come europei, noi dobbiamo essere responsabili di tutto ciò che consumiamo, anche se non lo produciamo qui, e di ogni prodotto, di ogni merce dovremmo chiederci da dove viene, come è stata estratta o prodotta, che catena c'è di controllo di tutto il processo di diffusione, di arrivo in Europa, e poi anche come ci lavorano: in quel prodotto, parlo proprio del tessile, hanno lavorato bambini, hanno lavorato lavoratrici, donne schiave, per esempio come in Bangladesh, che vivono chiusi in certi capannoni e non possono neanche tornare a casa la sera.

Insomma, io penso che queste domande fanno parte della nostra responsabilità europea; il settore tessile deve diventare un esempio, anche di *due diligence*.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, assurer des chaînes d’approvisionnement justes socialement et responsables écologiquement ne peut rester une exception, et de nombreuses initiatives volontaires ont été pionnières: standards Fairtrade, pacte sur la durabilité, lignes directrices de l’OCDE, principes directeurs de l’ONU. Des actions déterminantes, bienvenues, mais insuffisantes pour installer des changements durables et en profondeur dans les chaînes de production mondiale du secteur du textile.

L’Union européenne reste avant tout une puissance normative. Elle a le devoir de fixer des normes environnementales et sociales élevées pour façonner la mondialisation de demain. Après deux reports et plus d’un an et demi de préparation, la Commission présente sa proposition sur le devoir de vigilance raisonnable des entreprises. C’est un véritable pas pour changer la mondialisation. Nous ne devons plus transiger. Nous devons nous assurer que toutes les entreprises – grandes, moyennes, petites – remplissent leur part du contrat au service du respect des droits fondamentaux, du progrès social, de la protection de l’environnement.

Le secteur du textile mérite une attention particulière. Nous avons besoin d’une stratégie propre pour assurer que les vêtements que nous importons, que nous portons, ne sont pas le fruit du travail forcé, du travail des enfants ou de la destruction de l’environnement. Et cette stratégie, elle doit aller de pair avec la création d’un instrument interdisant l’importation de biens, notamment dans le textile, produits par le travail forcé. C’est une question de crédibilité de la défense de nos valeurs et c’est l’unique moyen pour ne plus cautionner les pratiques chinoises avec la minorité ouïg-houre.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Textilsektorn har en stor påverkan på klimat, miljö och mänskliga rättigheter. Just därför behöver vi regler och riktlinjer för hur vi minskar all den negativa påverkan som i dag är ett faktum.

Vi har försökt påverka kommissionen att presentera ett helhetsgrepp, vilket också är det som branschens aktörer kräver. Vi har gjort allt vi kan för att ni ska komma med bindande förslag, inte fortsatt hålla dörren öppen för godtycklighet. Vi har lagt fram siffror och fakta om diskriminering och brott mot mänskliga rättigheter som finns i industrin och som vi skulle kunna ta steg bort ifrån.

Mina frågor till ansvariga kommissionären är följande: Kommer strategin att innehålla ett bindande klimatmål som inkluderar alla utsläpp från vår konsumtion? Kommer strategin att ta hänsyn till det faktum att vi drastiskt måste minska vår konsumtion och produktion av textilier? Hur då? Sätter ni mål för detta? Hur kommer ni att se till att jämställdhetsperspektivet integreras i alla led i hela värdekedjan?

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a indústria têxtil é um dos ecossistemas mais importantes da Europa. Dezenas de milhares de empresas, na sua grande maioria pequenas e microempresas, dedicam-se a esta atividade que dá emprego a milhões de pessoas. Ao longo da história, a indústria têxtil europeia tem estado na vanguarda da inovação e da competitividade global. É um motivo de orgulho e um importante ativo europeu que a estratégia têxtil deve valorizar e ajudar a crescer ainda mais.

Todos sabemos que o setor terá de se transformar, que deve ficar mais verde, mais circular e sustentável, aproveitar em pleno uma digitalização e impulsionar a reutilização, reciclagem e redução de resíduos. Ao mesmo tempo, a estratégia têxtil deve criar um quadro positivo para o setor, um quadro que dê ênfase às competências, à tecnologia, à inovação, um quadro que reconheça a complexidade dos desafios que este setor enfrenta e enfrentou, nomeadamente no contexto da pandemia, que tenha em conta a complexidade da cadeia de valor, mas também que premeie a resiliência da indústria têxtil e todo o seu contributo ao longo da nossa história e o seu património e o seu legado.

Senhor Comissário, é hora de atuar para bem do setor e da competitividade da indústria europeia.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Voorzitter, *sustainable, green, conscious, recycled polyester* ... Wanneer je door een kledingwinkel loopt, staan deze termen steeds vaker op etiketten en posters. En als je dan de winkel uitloopt met je aankoop in een gerecyclede plastic tas, voelt het bijna als verantwoord. *Bijna*, want die honderden certificaten die beweren groen te zijn, vallen in werkelijkheid eigenlijk bijna altijd tegen. Groen is het bijna nooit en de omstandigheden waarin mensen werken zijn van onbehoorlijk tot levensgevaarlijk zelfs, in sommige gevallen. En als we kijken naar wat mensen verdienen om te werken in zulke omstandigheden, dan zijn het zeker geen leefbare lonen. Niet in Zuidoost-Azië, niet in Europa of aan de randen van ons continent.

En deze uitbuiting achter een façade van nepduurzaamheid moet ten einde komen. Het is hoog tijd een einde te maken aan de wildgroei in de certificering die in de sector plaatsvindt. Het is eigenlijk gewoon valsspelen ten koste van wie wél fatsoenlijk wil doen, en ten koste van mens en milieu. Ik denk dat je niet anders kan zeggen dan dat iedereen hier de dupe van wordt. Zowel de consument die graag goed wil doen als de kleine opkomende fatsoenlijke alternatieven die weggeconcurrerd worden door de grotere merken met hun greenwashing. Ik denk dat het tijd is voor actie, actie tegen greenwashing, actie vóór een *sustainable sector*, waar mens en milieu van profiteren in plaats van er de dupe van te worden.

Svenja Hahn (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Verantwortungsvoller und nachhaltiger Konsum ist vielen Verbrauchern wichtig. Und dennoch hat sehr wahrscheinlich jeder von uns einen Pullover oder ein T-Shirt aus Zwangsarbeit im Kleiderschrank hängen, denn alleine 20 % der weltweiten Baumwolle kommen aus Chinas Zwangsarbeit-Region Xinjiang.

Als Konsumenten haben wir große Macht. Wir können einen Unterschied machen. Wir können aber nicht alle Verantwortung tragen. Dafür braucht es einen gesetzlichen Rahmen: die Textilstrategie.

Die Textilstrategie muss diesen fairen Rahmen setzen. Denn in einer globalisierten Welt ist auch Verantwortung global. Faire Spielregeln in einer sozialen Marktwirtschaft stärken verantwortungsvolles Unternehmertum und sortieren schwarze Schafe aus. Die Textilstrategie muss die weltweite Kreislaufwirtschaft voranbringen. Wir hören: *Reuse, recycle und reduce* ist das Credo. Denn die Textilbranche macht rund 10 % der weltweiten Emissionen aus, mehr als Flug- und Schiffsverkehr zusammen.

Die Textilstrategie und die Textilbranche müssen Menschenrechte endlich stärken. Die Textilstrategie muss ein Baustein im Kampf gegen Kinderarbeit und Zwangsarbeit sein. Die Textilstrategie muss deshalb auch eng mit dem Lieferkettengesetz verknüpft werden. Der Kommissionsvorschlag zum Lieferkettengesetz muss allerdings noch an einigen Stellen nachgebessert werden.

Liebe Kollegen, mit Kleidung verbinden wir vor allem Emotionen. Kleidung ist Wärme und Schutz, Kleidung ist Ausdruck unserer Persönlichkeit. Manche Kleidungsstücke sind besondere Erinnerungsstücke. Kleidung hat aber auch einen ökologischen und sozialen Fußabdruck. Und dem müssen wir mit der Textilstrategie endlich an den Kragen gehen.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous l'avez dit, les impacts sociaux et environnementaux du secteur textile ne sont plus à démontrer. J'ajoute à la longue liste que vous avez déjà établie que les travailleurs y ont 60 % de risques en plus d'être victimes du travail forcé, que les femmes, majoritaires dans la main-d'œuvre de ce secteur, travaillent dans de piètres conditions pour des rémunérations indécentes – sans parler du travail des enfants –, qu'elles manipulent des substances chimiques dangereuses, parfois interdites, et ce sans protection. Et en tant que consommateurs, nous ignorons bien souvent qu'en portant ces vêtements, nous subissons nous aussi les effets des perturbateurs endocriniens et d'autres substances nocives pour la santé et pour l'environnement.

Réguler le secteur textile est donc une des clés de la réalisation du pacte vert européen et des objectifs de développement durable. La stratégie européenne pour le textile durable doit drastiquement réduire l'empreinte écologique et sociale du secteur et, surtout, s'appliquer à toutes les entreprises – toutes, y compris les PME, qui constituent majoritairement ce secteur. Malheureusement, la directive sur le devoir de vigilance des entreprises ne le fait pas, vu qu'elle se limite aux plus grandes multinationales.

Par ailleurs, pour réellement avoir un effet, la stratégie doit être complétée par des outils qui doivent être adoptés pour le secteur textile, comme l'interdiction de l'importation de produits issus du travail forcé, mais aussi l'interdiction de substances chimiques nocives.

La demande citoyenne est forte. Il est grand temps d'y répondre.

Maria Spyraki (PPE). – Madam President, the new strategy for sustainability in the fashion industry should, first of all, address the needs of consumers. Nowadays, consumers are becoming more conscious of the impact of their clothing choices. In this regard, we have to support measures to implement minimum reparability requirements, minimum ecodesign standards for stress resistance and lifetime of products and components, and ban the use of hazardous chemicals and materials in clothing and textile products.

It is time to act now. It is time because textile consumption in Europe helped to leverage the fourth highest impact on the environment and climate change from a global lifecycle perspective in 2020. After food, housing and mobility, the clothing industry has one of the highest impacts on the planet since it represents 11 kilos per citizen in textiles and it produces about 20% of global wastewater and around 10% of global carbon emissions.

In this regard, I insist that it is also important to support actions at EU level in order to increase the effectiveness of extended producer responsibility schemes by establishing an EU level definition for obligated producer and an EU level classification for when textiles become waste. We must ensure that the future will lead from fast fashion to sustainable clothing, meaning that we cannot accept half of working practices, overextraction of raw materials and high energy consumption.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamnă vicepreședintă, domnule comisar, stimate colege, stimați colegi, am asistat în ultimii ani la un adevărat exod al industriei textile din Uniunea Europeană înspre țările din Asia. Știm cu toții motivele, pentru că în multe state din acea zonă costurile de producție sunt mult mai mici, iar relocarea a devenit necesară pentru a avea prețuri competitive. Chiar dacă globalizarea are multe atuuri, aceasta prezintă și neajunsuri pe care le-am observat foarte clar în pandemie, când a trebuit să așteptăm ca echipamente de protecție, cum sunt măștile, halate, să fie trimise din țările din Asia.

Efectele asupra populației Uniunii Europene le vedem însă de multă vreme, prin creșterea șomajului în rândul lucrătorilor din industria textilă, în majoritatea lor femei, atunci când fabricile au fost relocalate în zone din Asia – cum spuneam mai devreme – unde drepturile muncitorilor sau impactul asupra mediului sunt mai puțin reglementate. Chiar în orașul meu, Arad, din România, acest fenomen a lăsat sute de femei fără loc de muncă.

Până acum nimeni nu a luat în calcul costurile acestor relocări asupra mediului, dar odată cu „Green Deal” trebuie să evaluăm impactul poluării produselor pe care le consumăm în UE, chiar dacă acestea sunt produse în alte părți, dacă vrem să vorbim despre concurență loială. Nu în ultimul rând, va trebui să luăm în calcul și condițiile în care sunt produse textilele noastre, din punct de vedere al condițiilor de muncă, al exploatării muncitorilor.

Domnule comisar, industria textilă – dacă vrem să mai vorbim despre o asemenea industrie în Europa – are nevoie urgentă de o abordare și de o strategie la nivel european, pentru că nu mai putem vorbi doar despre competitivitatea prețurilor. Uniunea Europeană nu mai poate să rămână la statutul de consumator. Avem nevoie de autonomie, de industrie proprie și de acțiune, cum a zis domnul Ehler.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je veux vous parler de Barsa. Barsa, qui a péri dans les ruines du Rana Plaza après avoir passé sa vie à produire des vêtements à bas prix pour quelques centimes, en étant exposée à plus de 8 000 substances toxiques – dérivés chlorés, colorants, phtalates ou encore pesticides. Comme Barsa, 60 millions de travailleuses sont quotidiennement exposées aux produits chimiques toxiques et dangereux. Je dis travailleuses parce que 80 % des ouvriers du textile sont des ouvrières et que c'est dans le secteur du textile que se sont tenues les premières grèves des femmes dans nombre de pays.

À l'autre bout du monde, au Chili, je veux vous parler de Rosa. Rosa vit avec sa famille dans le désert d'Atacama, où 39 000 tonnes de déchets de la «fast fashion» en provenance des pays occidentaux y polluent l'air, les sols et les nappes phréatiques. La «fast fashion», c'est 10 % des émissions de carbone, 20 % du gaspillage de l'eau, 500 000 tonnes de microplastiques dans l'océan et plus de 12 kilos de déchets par Européen et par an.

Barsa et Rosa n'existent pas, mais elles auraient pu. Et c'est précisément parce que les drames sont bien réels que l'Union européenne, grande consommatrice de textile, doit enfin mettre en place une stratégie durable basée sur le devoir de vigilance pour l'ensemble de la chaîne de valeur du textile. Une stratégie pour la planète, les droits sociaux et les droits des femmes, pour que plus jamais les hommes et, donc, surtout les femmes qui travaillent pour la «fast fashion» ou écopent les déchets de la surconsommation ne soient ignorés.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolegice i kolege, Europljani, ako je suditi prema podacima, baš vole kupovati tekstil. Godišnje kupujemo oko dvadeset i šest kilograma tekstila, a bacamo ga oko 11, dakle više od 15 milijuna tona tekstilnih proizvoda kupe stanovnici Europske unije na godinu.

Međutim, 90 posto europskog tekstila spaljuje se ili uništava iako se može reciklirati. Naravno, otisak koji se ostavlja golem je, ali propisi u tome ne pomažu jer nisu ujednačeni. Prijedlog je dobar, međutim treba razmišljati i o poticanju onih koji su predvodnici u takozvanoj održivoj modi.

Vjerujem da ste čuli za koncept virtualne odjeće koji je snažno počeo mijenjati uporabu klasičnih odjevnih predmeta. Međutim, za taj dio inovacija i industrije, koja je već ovdje, ne postoje baš nikakve poticajne mjere.

Koncept održivog razvoja javlja se kao značajno globalno rješenje. Naravno da je potrebno osvijestiti građane o važnosti koju modna i tekstilna industrija ima u ostvarenju klimatskih ciljeva Europske unije. Investicijama u istraživanje i razvoj održivih tekstila, koje sam već spomenula, možemo pomoći sektoru da ojača svoju konkurentnost, a istodobno pridonese ekološkim ciljevima Europske unije primjenom principa kružnog gospodarstva na proizvodnju, potrošnju, gospodarenje otpadom i sekundarnim sirovinama.

Moramo poticati proizvode koji su dizajnirani da budu trajniji, višekratni, lakši za popraviti i reciklirati. Promicanjem korištenja održivih vrsta vlakana poduzimamo prvi korak na tom putu. Uz to, jedan od prijedloga potiče jačanje uloge specijaliziranih poduzeća koja prikupljaju i ponovo koriste tekstil te ih je potrebno upoznati sa zakonskim obvezama i ciljevima prikupljanja i gospodarenja otpadom.

Naravno, ne smijemo zaboraviti radnike u tekstilnoj industriji koji najčešće dolaze iz trećih zemalja gdje nema visoke razine zaštite i radnih prava kao što su prisutna u Europskoj uniji. Trgovinski ugovori s trećim zemljama trebaju uvažiti ovu realnost te poticati naše partnere na ekološku i društvenu odgovornost.

I zaključit ću, svatko od nas može doprinijeti široj primjeni održivih tekstila i zato vas pozivam da kupujete odgovorno.

Manuela Ripa (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Modische Kleidung ist doch eigentlich etwas Tolles. Wer mag das leugnen? Doch wie bei so vielem: Schaut man hinter die Kulissen, sieht man, dass unsere *fast fashion* einen zu hohen Preis hat. Die Herstellung erfolgt unter schlechten, teilweise menschenunwürdigen Arbeitsbedingungen, sie belastet sehr stark die Umwelt, wie der hohe Rohstoff-, Energie- und Wasserverbrauch sowie Wasserverschmutzung und die hohen Treibhausgasemissionen zeigen.

Die Kleidung hat oft eine schlechte Qualität. Sie ruft verschwenderisches und unnötiges Käuferverhalten hervor. Daher ist es höchste Zeit, diesen Sektor radikal zu ändern. Wir brauchen Sorgfaltspflichten für Menschenrechte und ökologische Effizienz entlang der gesamten Wertschöpfungskette, echte Kreislaufwirtschaft, die auf Abfallminimierung und Ressourcenschonung setzt und die Prinzipien von Wiederverwendung, Reparatur und Recycling fördert. Schadstoffe müssen radikal eliminiert werden – wie auch Mikroplastik –, und die Verbraucher müssen wissen, was sie kaufen, durch klare Kennzeichnung.

Deshalb, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, ergreifen Sie die Gelegenheit und machen Sie einen ambitionierten Vorschlag, der den Namen Nachhaltigkeit verdient! Unsere Unterstützung haben Sie!

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Madam President, textiles are growing environmental harm, as we have heard many times already today here in the plenary, and it is up to buildings and food on the scale of circular economy and resource efficiency of the material consumption what we have globally. It is championing to be the first or the second in chemicalisation, in water consumption, in waste problems and in CO₂ emissions. Should I continue?

And what is the problem with the textiles is that basically everything goes wrong with the textiles. It is from sourcing to the whole processing of the materials, and we know all the social and chemical and other problems there. And it is up to very short use of the textiles itself and then the very improper discarding of that material. And when you add up that with the extremely increased use of the model fashion and textiles, we can see a blowing catastrophe just in front of our eyes.

So because of that, I would like to thank and congratulate the Commission and Commissioner to coming up with this textile strategy that the Parliament has been calling for several times. And I hope that with this strategy, the Commission would set vital requirements and then the voluntary action. We need them both. And let me describe very briefly a couple of those.

We need to act on the sourcing and to put the regulatory framework what is sustainable sourcing on the quality, durability, and longevity of the materials. We need to set up a proper life-cycle analysis to support it. We need to prolong the use, and there the target should be that the hub of the textiles by 2030 should be served as services. We need to reuse, recycle and then refibre back to the use, so with the target with the tenfold resource efficiency.

And to conclude, there needs to be minimum regulation on social and environmental standards and the neglect should be criminalised. But we need the voluntary actions, that is the Disclosure Regulation, due diligence, taxonomy and CSRD that the textiles should be included in.

Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, lieber Herr Kommissar! Was denken Sie, wie alt diese Jacke ist, die ich hier gerade an habe? Sieht eigentlich aus wie neu, würde ich sagen, haben Sie gestern auch schon gesehen. Aber die Jacke ist tatsächlich älter als ich. Und genau diese Qualität in der Lebensdauer, die kenne ich von neuen Produkten im Modesektor nicht mehr.

Fast fashion ist ein Verbrechen an der Umwelt, an den Menschen, die für uns produzieren, und an allen Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern. Deshalb ist Qualität statt Quantität die politische Vorgabe, die wir verfolgen müssen.

Herr Kommissar, Sie haben es in der Hand. Die EU-Textilstrategie muss den absoluten Ressourcenverbrauch im Textilsektor verbindlich per Gesetz verringern und ein *race to the top* in der Langlebigkeit der Kleidung fördern, weil nur das nachhaltig ist. Also sorgen Sie dafür, dass jedes Kleidungsstück auch ein Erbstück werden kann. Das sind wir den Menschen in unseren Lieferketten und der Umwelt schuldig.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you again for putting the EU strategy for sustainable and circular textiles on today's agenda. Addressing the impacts of this sector is a key part of our response to the environment and climate challenges of our times, and thank you for recalling the various challenges and also opportunities involved.

I can assure you that we are on the same line as regards our ambition to protect the environment and to give our citizens long-lasting and quality textiles. And I fully share your sense of urgency too, and I can assure you we have a good plan. Our vision is that all textile products placed on the EU market should be durable, repairable and recyclable to a great extent made of recycled fibres and free of hazardous substances, that consumers benefit longer from high quality textiles, that fast fashion is out of fashion and economically profitable reuse and repair services are widely available.

In a competitive, resilient and innovative textile sector, producers should take responsibility for their products along the value chain, including when they become waste. In this way, the circular textile ecosystem can thrive with growing capacities for innovative fibre-to-fibre recycling. The incineration and landfilling of textiles has to be reduced to the minimum.

With these goals in view, we expect the upcoming strategy to initiate the transformation of the sector, to foster concerted action across the sectors and across policies, and with everyone on board, policymakers, local authorities, citizens, businesses and entrepreneurs, scientists and researchers, we are intensively working on finalising the strategy. And you will see it very soon as part of the package of the circular economy initiatives.

Now, let me briefly address some of the key points you raised in today's debate. First of all, I'm aware that some of you are very engaged with the textile sector and thus you know your contribution is crucial. The green and digital transition of the textile ecosystem is a key priority for us. The twin transitions will demand the textile industry to reshape their business models, integrate the proper technologies, ensuring a more efficient production process and more sustainable products, and develop the right skills to manage this transition.

And to support the textiles ecosystems in its greening and digitalisation efforts, the Commission is preparing the ground for a transition pathway. The transition pathway aims to identify with stakeholders what specific actions and commitments are needed to accompany the green and digital transitions. The co-creation of the transition pathway will kick-off during the second quarter of 2022.

Speaking about the concrete programmes, there are a number of projects in the textile sectors that the EU has funded and will continue to do so. Under Horizon Europe, there was programme from 2021 to 2022, which set out calls focusing on reality of textile value chains. There is an example of a project to develop nanomaterials, so really going into innovative areas. I cannot list all the projects that we have supported under Horizon Europe, under LIFE, also under PULSE. But I can assure you that this is a priority, and I think with our strategy it will continue to do so and more and more projects will be launched.

Continuing, the Commission will continue to support, of course, research and investments and innovation through a series of EU initiatives aiming at strengthening also digital and sustainable technologies. And moreover, Member States have a key role to play in supporting research and innovation, including by using loans and grants of the Recovery and Resilience Facility, and I am happy to see that some countries are already going in this direction.

The skills aspects is important for textile ecosystems and up- and re-skilling is yet another tool to empower women who represent two-thirds of the workforce. Our collective efforts need to result in making the ecosystem attractive to skilled and young entrepreneurs, and the ecosystem employees.

The textile industry needs to take advantage of the employment opportunities brought by the digital and green transitions. A strong alliance has been built under the EU Pact for Skills with commitments that now need to be implemented through the national and regional skills partnerships.

Let me also mention a very important part. The life of a product starts with design. Textiles are indeed a key product to be addressed under the broader ecodesign framework, and we are going to propose this together with the strategy. Binding product specific eco design requirements can increase textiles' performance in terms of durability, reusability, fibre-to-fibre recyclability and mandatory recycled fibre content. And we can strive to minimise and track the presence of substances of concern and reduce adverse impacts on climate and environment. We also can take measures to stop the destruction of unsold or returned textiles. We can have better transparency on the number of textile products big companies discard and destroy.

Citizens should also know how these products are treated in terms of preparing for re-use, recycling, incineration or landfill. We can also do much more in terms of information to consumers through a digital product passport and labelling. All these aspects have a place in a future-oriented textile strategy.

You also spoke about sustainable sourcing, both in social and environmental terms, human rights' worsening condition. The European Commission has presented a legislative proposal on sustainable corporate governance. It is part of the implementation of the European Green Deal. It's a corporate sustainability due diligence obligation – a duty to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for actual and potential adverse sustainability impacts in companies' own operations and their supply or value chains.

Let me also highlight a very important and powerful tool – extend the product's responsibility. It can be a really effective instrument to improve waste management and work well together with other measures such as separate collection, pay-as-you-throw schemes and targets. EPR (Extended Producer Responsibility) schemes can also improve design and support waste prevention objectives. We are aware of Member States planning to set up EPR schemes for textiles and France already has it in place for several years. We will consider the role of EPR as a tool to improve textile waste prevention and waste management in the context of the waste legislation review foreseen in 2023.

Microplastic pollution. It is indeed a source of serious and growing concern. It has become widespread in the environment, and one of the main sources of the unintentional release of microplastics are textiles made of synthetic fibres. About 60% of fibres used in clothing are synthetic, of which polyester is predominant and this amount is growing. Synthetic fibres shed into the environment at different stages of the textile lifecycle. Reduction measures can therefore target the design of products, improve manufacturing processes and pre-washing in industrial manufacturing plants, labelling and the promotion of innovative materials. Further options include washing machine filters, which can reduce release from laundering by up to 80%, development of mild detergents, caretaking and washing guidelines, end-of-life textile waste treatment and regulations for improved wastewater and sewage sludge treatment.

The proposal introduces corporate sustainability due diligence obligations, a horizontal cross-sectoral duty to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for actual and potential adverse sustainability impacts in companies' operations. So, the textile sector was identified as a priority sector for its implementation.

Sustainability and circularity of the textile sector in Europe and the world is critical to address current environmental challenges, and this needs to become a joint endeavour, together with business, public authorities and consumers. And I'm glad to count on the European Parliament's support to this goal, and it will be essential to mobilise, first of all, our citizens, in particular, our young generation.

So with this, let me conclude and really thank you for today's exchange, for your work and for such a passionate approach to this topic.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

7. Debata na temat przypadków naruszenia praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (debata)

7.1. Sytuacja dziennikarzy i obrońców praw człowieka w Meksyku

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione su sei proposte di risoluzione sulla situazione dei giornalisti e dei difensori dei diritti umani in Messico (2022/2580(RSP)) (*).

Leopoldo López Gil, autor. – Señora presidenta, señorías, el artículo 19 de la Declaración Universal de Derechos Humanos reza que todo individuo tiene derecho a la libertad de opinión y de expresión; este derecho incluye el no ser molestado a causa de sus opiniones, el de investigar y recibir informaciones y opiniones, y el de difundirlas por cualquier medio de expresión.

Es evidente que la libertad de expresión y la libertad de información son claves para el ejercicio de un periodismo emancipado, capaz de informar de manera objetiva sobre los hechos que afectan a la vida de los ciudadanos, incluyendo las actividades de sus gobernantes y, así, establecer un camino para la rendición de cuentas permanente de la dirigencia, lo que se traduce en un efectivo fortalecimiento de la democracia.

Cuando la divulgación de información delata la corrupción y las tramas infames del crimen organizado, el oficio de informar sufre amenazas y hasta asesinatos, situación agravada cuando los gobiernos son partícipes en ello, por acción u omisión, ignorando la gravedad que tal situación representa para el bienestar del Estado de Derecho y la democracia.

En el Parlamento Europeo sabemos que la situación crítica que sufren los periodistas y medios de comunicación en México es lamentablemente de larga data. Pero hoy contemplamos perplejos cómo a partir del cambio de gobierno, hace tres años, los asesinatos a estos profesionales se han triplicado y, solo en los primeros meses de este año, hemos contado con casi un asesinato por semana.

Es inexplicable, frente a esta trágica situación, la retórica presidencial contra los periodistas y los medios de comunicación. Consideramos deplorable la creación de plataformas estatales para exhibir, estigmatizar y atacar a los periodistas con el pretexto de combatir la desinformación. Más del 90 % de los crímenes que han sufrido los periodistas ni siquiera han sido investigados.

Ante esta inaceptable impunidad, entendemos la contundente respuesta de una valiente periodista mexicana ante la pregunta: «Y ¿por qué sucede esto en su país?» Y contestó: «Simplemente porque se puede».

No podemos seguir así.

Inma Rodríguez-Piñero, Autora. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, las resoluciones de urgencia del Parlamento Europeo sirven para denunciar situaciones inaceptables que suelen resultar desagradables para los Gobiernos de los terceros países a los que se refieren, lo que es especialmente difícil cuando se trata de un país amigo, como es México. Pero hay que tener en cuenta que, en los últimos veinticinco años, al menos 150 periodistas han sido asesinados en México. Desgraciadamente, con la llegada del nuevo Gobierno la situación ha empeorado.

En esta legislatura ya se han superado las cifras de la legislatura precedente. Solo desde principios de 2022 seis periodistas han sido brutalmente asesinados, lo que marca uno de los peores períodos para la prensa mexicana en los últimos tiempos. Además, según declaraciones oficiales, el 90 % de las agresiones a periodistas quedan impunes. Por todo ello, la violencia contra periodistas ejercida con impunidad en México nos preocupa, y mucho, a mi grupo y a este Parlamento. Y así queda perfectamente expresado en esta Resolución, que manifiesta nuestra preocupación y que es apoyada por una amplia mayoría de este Parlamento.

Pedimos a México que refuerce la estrategia del Mecanismo de Protección para Personas Defensoras de Derechos Humanos y Periodistas. A los demócratas no nos gusta que el presidente de un país señale a periodistas en sus frecuentes alocuciones en público y, menos aún, si se da la fatídica coincidencia de que se convierten en víctimas de violencia.

La libertad de prensa y el ejercicio libre y seguro de la profesión del periodista son señas de identidad de la democracia y del Estado de Derecho en un mundo libre. Los periodistas y la prensa libre están para opinar sobre lo que hacemos los políticos. No al revés. Estamos con México solidariamente en la tristeza que supone esta lacra para las personas y para la democracia. Solo con respeto, con transparencia y seguridad será posible garantizar la libertad de expresión en México y fortalecer así su democracia.

Esta Resolución añade la voz de este Parlamento al clamor mundial para que se revierta la situación de inseguridad e indefensión que sufren los periodistas y los defensores mexicanos de derechos humanos.

Nicolae Ștefănuță, *author*. – Madam President, I might be the only non-Spanish-speaking author of this resolution, but that's important because this is a European issue, defending the rule of law and defending journalists across the world.

Exposing high-level corruption led to the death of Mexican journalist Roberto Toledo. Criticising local authorities for their relationship with Mexican organised crime got media worker José Luis Gamboa killed. Over the last two months, we've seen what's very likely the deadliest time for the Mexican press in over a decade. Toledo and Gamboa are two of seven journalists who have lost their lives in Mexico since the beginning of the year, while others were threatened or went missing.

There are two outstanding actors in these tragic stories. One is the violence unleashed by the war against the drug cartels. The other is the near total impunity. As the country's justice system has eroded, corruption has proliferated at all levels. While 99% of all crimes are not prosecuted, Mexico is launching a war on truth, killing journalists and human rights defenders.

Dear colleagues, here in this House, we defend freedom of speech as it is an essential part of our functioning democracy. It's high time we called on Mexico to do the same, not to let murder go uninvestigated, to strengthen the protection mechanism, and to refrain from stigmatising media workers and let them do their job. Let's remind those involved in such brutal murders of a simple truth: even if you kill the messenger, you will never kill the message.

The people of Mexico are angry at censorship and they don't want to be complicit in the murder of freedom of expression in their country. We also call on these people, who are very dear to us and who are very close to us, to fight for their right to speak freely and to stand for the journalists in their country. They don't carry weapons: they only carry a notebook and a pen to defend themselves.

One last message, perhaps, to the Mexican Government: you are an essential partner for the European Union, but we won't close our eyes when your democracy, when your freedoms, are eroded.

Diana Riba i Giner, *autora*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, el 5 de julio del año pasado un individuo mataba de un disparo a Simón Pedro cuando se dirigía al mercado. Lo mataron de forma cobarde, ante los ojos de su propio hijo.

Simón Pedro había sido presidente de Las abejas de Acteal, una organización indígena que denunciaba la violencia estructural en Chiapas, a través del pacifismo más radical.

En México, defender la libertad de expresión, el medio ambiente o los derechos humanos es un trabajo de altísimo riesgo que puede costar la vida. Según las últimas cifras, que proporcionó la Secretaría de Gobernación de México, desde diciembre de 2018 han sido asesinados 98 defensoras de derechos humanos y 54 periodistas y permanecen impunes más del 90 % de los casos.

Vamos a ser claros: deben cesar los mensajes que el propio presidente mexicano lanza criminalizando a periodistas y a organizaciones de la sociedad civil y hay que exigir que se destinen todos los esfuerzos a construir una política pública de protección integral que atienda a la prevención, la protección, la investigación y la reparación.

Estas peticiones deben ser una condición en la reforma del Acuerdo global entre la Unión Europea y México, porque creer en el Estado de Derecho es precisamente esto: exigirlo dentro de nuestras fronteras, pero, también, a nuestros socios más estrechos.

Hermann Tertsch, *Autor*. – (*inicio de la intervención fuera de micrófono*) ... Resolución sobre la violencia contra el periodismo en México, en la cual se han incluido otras víctimas de la violencia. Podíamos haber extendido la lista indefinidamente porque la violencia brutal que se extiende por todo México es absolutamente increíble y nos recuerda a las situaciones más brutales en algunos otros países, donde estas han colapsado directamente ya la ley y el orden.

El periodismo tiene allí un carácter especial, porque si bien tenemos víctimas —como digo— en toda la geografía mexicana y, en algunos Estados ya el crimen organizado, aliado en gran parte con los poderes públicos, se ha hecho con el poder efectivo y mata directamente a todo aquel que se le opone o le molesta, los periodistas son un caso especial porque son objeto de acoso directo, de señalamiento por parte de las autoridades en la capital. Y lo son directamente —y esto sí que es un caso bastante inaudito en una democracia— por parte del presidente de la República.

Las acusaciones directas, personalizadas que ha hecho el presidente López Obrador contra la prensa en México es algo absolutamente —como digo— inaudito que debe ser denunciado por todos; hemos de pedir encarecidamente a este jefe de Estado que retorne a una conducta razonable de protección de los periodistas, de búsqueda de los culpables de los muchísimos asesinatos, en un 96 % no esclarecidos, que busque a los responsables y que no vierta más gasolina sobre lo que es una gran pira en la cual se consumen las libertades de los mexicanos.

No puede ser que México caiga en la misma espiral, con la misma retórica, en la que está Venezuela.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor*. – Señora presidenta, la persecución, intimidación y violencia de la que es objeto la prensa es un problema muy preocupante. Al menos 47 periodistas han sido asesinados desde 2018, lo que ha convertido a México en uno de los países más peligrosos del mundo para la prensa. Una violencia que también golpea de forma especialmente preocupante a los defensores de los derechos humanos y a los defensores del medio ambiente, con 42 asesinatos en 2021.

Además de los asesinatos, una de las amenazas más peligrosas a las que se enfrentan los periodistas y los defensores de derechos humanos son las desapariciones: casi 100 000 personas han desaparecido desde 1964, según la Comisión Nacional de Búsqueda de México.

Todos estos son problemas reales a los que se enfrenta la sociedad y que deja patentes las carencias del Estado mexicano.

Desde aquí, hacemos un llamado para implementar políticas que aseguren un derecho tan básico en democracia como el derecho a la información, sin que esto suponga arriesgar la propia vida, solidarizándonos con periodistas como Guillermo García, un nuevo caso, entre tantísimos otros, de acoso a la prensa.

El problema es que algunos grupos políticos de esta Cámara están utilizando esta situación como un arma arrojada contra el Gobierno mexicano, con unos intereses que poco tienen que ver con la defensa de los periodistas y de los defensores de los derechos humanos. Y esto es intolerable.

Francisco José Millán Mon, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, México vive una situación muy preocupante. Es muy elevado el número de periodistas asesinados; el último, el pasado viernes. Además, los asesinatos de periodistas y también de defensores de derechos humanos se producen en un clima de impunidad, pues los responsables son raramente detenidos y llevados ante la justicia.

Añadamos los muy numerosos casos de violencia sobre la mujer y los cuantiosos crímenes relacionados con el narcotráfico. México sufre una media de noventa asesinatos al día. El país vive un auténtico tsunami de violencia y cada semana está siendo asesinado un periodista.

Se produce en México un claro deterioro del Estado de Derecho. El Gobierno populista se centra en el liderazgo personalista de su presidente y no en el funcionamiento eficaz de sus instituciones, en especial las responsables de la seguridad y la justicia. No hay seguridad para las personas, tampoco hay seguridad jurídica para las empresas. Esta carencia la sufren, por ejemplo, las inversiones extranjeras en el sector eléctrico, entre ellas empresas europeas.

Gobernar es, ante todo, garantizar la vida, los derechos y libertades de los ciudadanos, incluidos, desde luego, los de los periodistas, que son profesionales indispensables en una democracia. También es prioritario buscar y asegurar el bienestar y la prosperidad de los ciudadanos. Sin embargo, en México, la marcha de la economía está siendo muy decepcionante. No se ha producido el rebote que se esperaba del crecimiento económico tras la crisis de la COVID.

El buen gobierno de un país no es pronunciar discursos diarios que buscan polarizar y la acusación regular a sectores e instituciones. Gobernar tampoco es obstinarse en desenterrar el lejano pasado colonial ni inventarse enemigos exteriores con un ánimo de confrontación.

México es un gran país, socio indispensable para la Unión Europea en América Latina. Fue el primer Estado del continente con el que la Unión Europea firmó un Acuerdo de asociación económica y concertación política. Hace 25 años, fue en 1997. Y desde 2009 es uno de los llamados socios estratégicos de la Unión Europea.

Pues bien, en esta década deberíamos dar un nuevo salto en nuestra relación y poner en marcha cuanto antes el nuevo Acuerdo concluido en el año 2020, que moderniza y amplía el del 97. Supondría un fuerte impulso para nuestras relaciones económicas y comerciales y también para la concertación política.

Evin Incir, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, democracy is in danger all over the world. Journalists are being killed even on open streets and a dangerous culture of impunity is growing. The spike in the murder of journalists in Mexico is a part of the deteriorating situation of journalists in the whole world. 2020 has proved to be a very deadly year for journalists in Mexico, and it is the worst place on this planet in which to exercise their profession. Between 2012 and 2022, 78 journalists were killed in the country; 33 of them were killings linked to their professions. Violence against journalists, human rights defenders, indigenous women and LGBTI people are rarely investigated or prosecuted.

Dear colleagues, it is a matter of deep concern and a mockery that a country with these kinds of growing violations continues to call itself a democracy. Inhuman acts of killing and violence against journalists and human rights defenders in Mexico must be condemned. The Mexican authorities must uphold commitments to investigate and resolve these crimes and prosecute perpetrators to the full extent of the law. That is how it should be in a rule-based country. The Mexican Government must strengthen protections for journalists and human rights defenders, and the authorities must implement their international commitments on human rights and the rule of law.

The EU can't continue with business as usual. We need to toughen up and step up our support for the journalists and human rights defenders and all those who are suffering right now at the hands of the Mexican Government.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, México ha comenzado uno de los años más sangrientos para la libertad de prensa con seis periodistas asesinados (47 desde 2018), una situación estremecedora que muestra la situación de violencia que viven los periodistas en México.

En este contexto, también esta violencia tiene rostro de mujer porque en el período 2010 a 2021 se han registrado más de 1 200 agresiones contra mujeres, principalmente reporteras (769 de estos casos en los últimos tres años).

Esta es la situación; este es el contexto.

México cuenta con un mecanismo federal de protección de defensores y periodistas que está claramente superado por la violencia. Lourdes Maldonado, recientemente asesinada, tenía protección, pero no sirvió de nada. No sirve de nada porque la impunidad es alarmante: el 95 % de los asesinatos de periodistas queda sin resolver.

Y, en este contexto, no es aceptable que el gobierno cree una plataforma gubernamental aprovechada por el presidente para estigmatizar, criticar y ridiculizar a periodistas con el pretexto de luchar contra las mentiras y las noticias falsas. Esta plataforma debe eliminarse y se debe luchar contra los verdaderos enemigos de la democracia en México, que son aquellos que están asesinando impunemente a los periodistas.

Sin libertad de prensa no puede haber democracia.

Susanna Ceccardi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Thomas Jefferson diceva che «dove la stampa è libera e tutti fanno leggere, non ci sono pericoli». La cartina tornasole delle nostre democrazie è proprio la libertà di stampa. Perché la stampa libera può essere buona o cattiva, ma senza libertà la stampa non può essere altro che cattiva.

Proprio per questo quel che sta avvenendo da anni in Messico è molto preoccupante. I numeri ufficiali forniti dal governo messicano parlano di 43 giornalisti uccisi dal dicembre 2018 al luglio 2021, e questo trend inaccettabile prosegue anche nel 2022, con almeno sei giornalisti già assassinati. Due anni fa esatti sono stata in Messico in una missione ufficiale del Parlamento. È un paese con ampie possibilità di crescita, è la quindicesima economia del mondo e sta diventando negli anni non più una nazione di emigranti in America ma una meta di immigrati dal Sud America.

Il problema della sicurezza e della criminalità nel paese è uno dei problemi principali che fa da tappo a maggiori possibilità di sviluppo. In Messico nel 2021 sono stati registrati 33 308 omicidi, e può darsi che il dato ufficiale sia più basso del reale. Un bilancio spaventoso, che sottolinea l'incapacità delle autorità messicane di fronteggiare l'emergenza, alla base c'è l'impunità. Di solito gli accusati di omicidio sono solo pedine, i mandanti restano liberi e impuniti.

Il dubbio è che tutto ciò sia anche ascrivibile alle politiche del presidente socialista messicano Obrador, poco incisivo nel combattere i criminali. D'altronde preferisce investire in politiche socialiste, che bloccano lo sviluppo del paese, invece che sulla repressione dei reati violenti. Le sue dichiarazioni traballanti di condanna all'invasione ucraina ordita da Putin assomigliano pericolosamente alla posizione pro Russia dei dittatori comunisti di Venezuela e Cuba.

Quest'Aula ha il dovere di condannare l'atteggiamento indulgente di chi ha il potere per prendere misure drastiche e imporre una strategia urgente a tutela della sicurezza e della libertà di questi professionisti. Dobbiamo agire subito, affinché nessun cronista debba più morire e il diritto fondamentale all'informazione possa tornare a essere garantito anche in Messico.

Clare Daly, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, Reporters Without Borders describes this year in Mexico as beginning with a bloodbath for journalists, and the reality is that it has continued so since. But it's not new and as we approach the 10th anniversary of the murder of Regina Martínez, the veteran crime journalist who was beaten and suffocated in her apartment in 2012, we should take note. Mexico is of course now the most dangerous country on Earth for journalists. Many are being killed – on average, as colleagues have said, almost one a week now. Many more are missing. No investigations. Total impunity because of the collusion between the state forces and criminal gangs, and this is obviously completely unacceptable.

But it's not the only area of criminal impunity, and we should look at our relationships with Mexico, our FTAs, where we see that transnational corporations, including some of our own, have also had impunity for their actions and violations against human rights defenders and indigenous peoples in Mexico. If we're to be consistent, we have to condemn all such violations.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señora presidenta, en 2021 en México murieron asesinados muchos periodistas, pero también 42 defensores de los derechos humanos, de los cuales 30 eran defensores de los derechos de los pueblos originarios sobre sus tierras ancestrales. Evidentemente, México debe mejorar su insuficiente Mecanismo de Protección para Personas Defensoras de Derechos Humanos y Periodistas, pero la Unión también se tiene que comprometer a fondo en este empeño.

Necesitamos, primero, que las delegaciones de la Unión Europea en países como México se impliquen en la implementación efectiva de las Directrices del Consejo para la protección de los defensores de los derechos humanos.

Y, en segundo lugar, la Unión no puede aceptar los proyectos de grandes empresas europeas en México y en el resto de América Latina que violan los derechos de los pueblos indígenas, que degradan el medio ambiente, que perjudican los derechos laborales, que minan el Estado de Derecho, incluyendo la participación del crimen organizado, o que instauran una estructura económica neocolonial. Por ello, la futura tramitación en este Parlamento de la Directiva sobre la *due diligence* es trascendental y debe recoger todos estos objetivos.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, já bych chtěl také na tomto místě podpořit návrh usnesení. Myslím si, že je mimořádně důležité reagovat na situaci v Mexiku. O to více je to důležité, protože Mexiko je naším klíčovým partnerem v Latinské Americe. Je to dlouhodobý obchodní, politický partner, významná země a ta situace se v poslední době v Mexiku výrazně zhoršuje, což se týče ochránců lidských práv a novinářů. Správně to tady bylo řečeno, nemá cenu opakovat fakta, ta fakta jsou opravdu tragická. Jenom na počátku tohoto roku zemřelo 6 novinářů a ta situace se bohužel stále zhoršuje. My proto musíme chtít po tamním prezidentovi, který je jednou z příčin tohoto neutěšeného stavu, aby stát, politická reprezentace začala situaci řešit, aby justice začala ty kauzy vyšetřovat, protože většina těch vražd není vyšetřena. A musíme to spojit s naším dialogem mezi Evropskou unií a Mexikem a musíme to spojit i se vzájemně výhodným obchodem. Není možné obchodovat se zemí, kde se novinářům a ochráncům lidských práv děje takovéto násilí.

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Fru talman! María de Lourdes Maldonado López, Margarito Martínez, José Luis Gamboa, Ever López Vázquez, Roberto Toledo – bara för att nämna några av de journalister och medierbetare som har mördats i Mexiko under de senaste åren. Mexiko är världens farligaste plats för journalister, undantaget världens krigszoner. Sedan 2018 har situationen försämrats. Sammanlagt har 47 journalister mördats. Journalister som utreder korruption av tjänstemän eller drokarteller lever särskilt farligt.

Mexikos president López Obrador har sedan makttillträdet 2018 förödmjukat och hotat oberoende journalister i sina dagliga presskonferenser. Under förevändning att motverka falska nyheter har regeringen inrättat en statlig medieplattform för att angripa granskande journalistik. Sammanlagt har minst 68 människorättsaktivister mördats. Kvinnoväldet är utbrett och kvinnomorden vanligt förekommande.

Miljöaktivister, ursprungsbefolkningar och kvinnorättsaktivister är särskilt utsatta. Mexikos regering måste vidta konkreta åtgärder för att journalister ska kunna arbeta utan rädsla för repressalier. EU och medlemsländerna har nu ett särskilt ansvar att sätta frågan högst på agendan i dialogerna med Mexiko.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Fru talman! Fru kommissionär, kolleger! Journalistik är aldrig ett brott. Graden av mediefrihet och möjligheten för journalister att uttrycka sig är ett lackmestest på demokratin i ett land. När journalister trakasseras, fängslas, mördas, som i Mexiko, är det vårt ansvar att se och agera. Mexiko sticker ut men är tyvärr inte unikt. I Kina, Belarus och inte minst i Ryssland ser vi tydligt samma mönster och hur farligt – hur livsfarligt – det är att vara just journalist.

Trygga, demokratiskt valda makthavare vågar låta sig kritiseras och granskas. Osäkra, desperata, mer eller mindre självtänande presidenter runtom i världen tar till alla medel för att tysta det fria ordet. Genom att desinformera och kontrollera vad som får sägas och höras vill man styra sin befolkning. Målet är att förvränga människors världsbild, så att de inte tvingas att lyda, utan på falska grunder väljer själva att lyda.

Att säga sanningen är det största hotet mot auktoritära ledare. Vi ser modet hos de journalister och aktivister i Mexiko som utsätts för brutala övergrepp. Vi måste ställa regeringen till svars och sanktionera alla ansvariga för våldet. Det fria ordet är grunden för demokrati i Europa och världen.

(¹) Vedasi processo verbale.

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

místopředsedkyně

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση διατηρεί ισχυρές οικονομικές σχέσεις με το Μεξικό. Οι ευρωενωσιακές κυβερνήσεις χαιρέτισαν τη δήθεν αριστερή διακυβέρνηση που εφαρμόζει σκληρά αντεργατικά μέτρα και κλιμάκωσε την καταστολή λαϊκών κινητοποιήσεων. Κατά την πανδημία, τα κέρδη των μονοπωλίων υπερδιπλασιάστηκαν, ενώ ο πληθωρισμός ξεπέρασε το 13, κατατρώγοντας το τσακισμένο εισόδημα της λαϊκής πλειοψηφίας. Συνδικαλιστές, εργάτες, φοιτητές, άλλοι αγωνιστές, δημοσιογράφοι, όσοι αποκαλύπτουν την ένταση της εκμετάλλευσης, οργανώνουν την εργατική λαϊκή πάλη, μπαίνουν στο στόχαστρο και παρακρατικών μηχανισμών, συνδεδεμένων με συμφέροντα μεγαλοεπιχειρηματιών, αστικών κομμάτων, τμημάτων αστυνομίας και στρατού, καθώς και των καρτέλ.

Η εμφάνιση της ΕΕ ως υπερασπιστή δικαιωμάτων είναι αβάσιμη. Τέτοια φαινόμενα και δολοφονίες δημοσιογράφων συμβαίνουν και στα κράτη μέλη. Σχετίζονται με το οργανωμένο έγκλημα, συμφέροντα μεγαλοεργοδοτών με καπιταλιστές-ιδιοκτήτες μέσων, τους οποίους εξυπηρετείτε και που αφήνουν εκτεθειμένους και ακάλυπτους τους δημοσιογράφους. Ελευθεροτυπία a la carte και με σκοπιμότητα, αφού η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρωτοστατεί και υποθάλλει απαγορεύσεις εφημερίδων κομμουνιστικών κομμάτων. Να σταματήσουν τώρα οι διώξεις και η καταστολή του λαϊκού κινήματος στο Μεξικό! Εκφράζουμε την αλληλεγγύη μας στο κομμουνιστικό κόμμα και στους αγώνες του λαού. Καταδικάζουμε απερίφραστα τις δολοφονίες. Απαιτούμε να διαλευκανθούν πλήρως τα εγκλήματα σε βάρος αγωνιστών και δημοσιογράφων.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtarán, Tá bród orm labhairt as Gaeilge sa díospóireacht seo go háirithe os rud é go bhfuil Seachtain na Gaeilge ar siúl i mo thír féin faoi láthair.

Is é Meicsiceo an áit is dainséaraí ar domhan d'iriseoirí, lasmuigh de zóin cogaidh oifigiúla. Tá cúrsaí ag dul in olcas agus dúnmharaíodh ochtar iriseoirí ó thús na bliana seo. Leis an scéal a dhéanamh níos measa, níl aon bhaol go ngearrfar pionós ceart. Níor cuireadh pionós ar 90% de dhúnmharfóirí iriseoirí i Meicsiceo.

Chun an scéal a dhéanamh níos measa fós, cáineann an tUachtarán López Obrador iriseoirí neamhspleácha agus cosantóirí chearta an duine go minic, agus cuireann sé imeaglú orthu.

Tá údarás Mheicsiceo ag cur in iúl go bhfuil an foréigean seo ceadaithe.

Táimid ag impí ar Mheicsiceo a dhualgas a chomhlíonadh agus leasuithe a chur i bhfeidhm chun iriseoirí agus cosantóirí chearta an duine a choimeád sábháilte.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Madam President, the growing stigmatisation, the weakening of institutions, the increase in violence and the diffuse impunity all provide a clear message: in Mexico, the press and freedom of expression overall are under siege. Since his election in 2018, López Obrador has not only failed to improve the country's human rights record, but he has allowed the loss of many of the hard-fought gains activists, rights groups and campaigners have achieved since the end of one-party rule in Mexico.

The Western world, the European Union included, has been noticeably silent regarding these accelerating attacks on democracy and fundamental rights. So far, the democratic clause of the global agreement has not resulted in any decisions or measures that help alleviate the continuous violation of human rights. If journalists and activists, especially activists for indigenous people's human rights, are deliberately targeted and threatened while those who attacked them go unpunished, democracy itself is also under threat.

As we are working at the modernisation of our joint comprehensive agreement, we need to be clear with the representatives – Mexico is a long-standing and, we stress in our resolution, vital partner of the EU – that the prospect of ratification is heavily reliant on improvement on human rights and on the government's clear commitment to international standards and obligation.

¡Derechos y libertad para todos los periodistas y los activistas mexicanos! ¡No estáis solos!

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, journalists and human rights defenders are central to functioning democracies. They are key in holding governments and societies to account and speaking up for those who otherwise would not have a voice.

Mexico is one of the EU's strategic partners and a like-minded partner in multilateral fora, and currently we extend our gratitude and appreciation for Mexico's support in condemning Russian aggression and standing up for Ukraine's sovereignty and its democracy at the UN Security Council, the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council. The protection of human rights and upholding the rule of law and accountability are part of the government's declared political objectives, but Mexico continues to face serious challenges in the implementation of its human rights legal framework.

The most significant threat to the promotion and protection of human rights remains organised crime. The current situation as regards journalists is especially worrying. We are highly concerned about the rising number of assassinations and attacks against journalists and human rights defenders in Mexico and about the hostile environment in which they work and risk their lives. The press can never be fully free if journalists are facing harassment, attacks or even mortal danger while doing their jobs.

Mexico's federal mechanism for the protection of journalists and human rights defenders, launched in 2012, is an interesting model. However, the death toll suggests that a far more comprehensive effort is needed if the challenge of violence against journalists is to be successfully addressed. We regularly address these issues with the Mexican authorities with regard to the human rights situation, as well as specific cases of human rights defenders and journalists, both in a dedicated human rights dialogue and in other contexts. As well as speaking out clearly against this violence, we engage continuously through our delegation in Mexico City with civil society, human rights defenders, journalists and international actors. This is in order to show our support and to raise awareness about the need for further action to address the current situation.

We also provide practical, financial and technical support to the largest extent possible. Governments can never be fully accountable if human rights defenders and journalists cannot carry out their work safely. Attacks against journalists and human rights defenders are therefore a threat to the foundation of our democracies. When they come under attack, effective protection must be provided, and the perpetrators of such attacks must be brought to justice.

The fight against impunity is therefore a key priority to stop threats and attacks against journalists. If not addressed, the silencing of journalists and human rights defenders is bound to continue.

We welcome the European Parliament's strong commitment on this issue and reiterate the EU's commitment to cooperating and working with Mexico to foster the protection of human rights defenders and journalists, both with concrete projects on the ground and with dialogue, including our regular high-level dialogues on human rights and civil society seminars.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place today.

7.2. Mjanma/Birma – rok po zamachu stanu

President. – The next item is the debate on six motions for resolutions on Myanmar, one year after the coup (2022/2581(RSP)) (†).

Seán Kelly, author. – Madam President, one year on from the coup in Myanmar, the situation there remains critical. We continue to condemn in the strongest possible terms the coup executed by the military in Myanmar in February of last year and call for the reinstatement of the elected government.

Since they seized power, the military have implemented a series of severe restrictions on freedoms and everyday life. They have shown little respect for human rights and are causing untold suffering for the people of Myanmar. Particularly concerning are reports of killings and unlawful arrests of peaceful pro-democracy protesters. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights estimates that at least 1 500 people have been killed and over 11 000 arrested since the military seized power last year.

The humanitarian situation in Myanmar is dire, with reports of a systematic and sustained attacks on the Rohingya, Christians and other groups perpetrated by the military government. With regard to everyday life, the government has imposed a number of extreme restrictions on personal freedoms, including freedom of expression and access to media and information.

Women's rights also have been seriously curtailed since the military took power, with the women subject to widespread detention, sexual assault, gender-based violence and in some cases killings. The government has also exploited the COVID-19 pandemic to facilitate a crackdown on pro-democracy activists, a trend which is extremely concerning.

It is imperative that former leaders – the President and the State Counsellor – are immediately and unconditionally released and the results of the democratic elections of November 2020 are respected.

Although Myanmar's former government did not demonstrate full respect for human rights either, they represented the only viable alternative to the current military rule. It is crucial, therefore, that we, the international community, do everything in our power to halt the systematic human rights abuses that are occurring in Myanmar.

Evin Incir, author. – Madam President, I want to start with thanking my colleagues from the different Groups represented yesterday at the meeting for very fruitful and constructive negotiations, and I hope that we will be able to send a clear message to the horrific military junta in Myanmar today.

Over one year has passed now since the bloody military coup in Myanmar. The military junta has erased years of progress and the people are suffering. It is with a heavy heart that we observe the deteriorating situation, but we can't continue just observing. We need to strengthen the sanctions and demand change. That includes EU companies taking their share of responsibilities also. We can't just observe while violations of international law are taking place because it is about real people's lives we are talking.

There has been an increasing number of reports of violent attacks and killings against civilians, labour unions, journalists, religious representatives and peaceful democratic protests. According to the UN, over 14.4 million people are in need of urgent humanitarian assistance. Of the affected, the most vulnerable are women, girls and children.

The international community has to drastically increase demand of an immediate end of the military junta's violence towards the civilian population, including religious and minorities such as the Rohingya. We cannot stand by while the people of Myanmar are suffering. The latest two weeks have shown that actions can be taken if the will is there. Let us create the will today before it is beyond even more of our control.

Svenja Hahn, Verfasserin. – Frau Präsidentin! Seit einem Jahr mordet, vertreibt, verhaftet und vergewaltigt Myanmar's Militärjunta ungestraft – so pervers geplant und systematisch, dass wir klar von Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit und Kriegsverbrechen sprechen müssen. Und es ist kein Ende in Sicht für die grausame Militärherrschaft.

Im letzten Jahr hatten Kollegen und ich hier die Möglichkeit, online gewählte Abgeordnete Myanmar's zu treffen. Sie mussten untertauchen, um ihr Leben oder das ihrer Familien zu schützen. Die zivile Regierung ist im Exil, auf der Flucht, ermordet oder nach Scheinprozessen inhaftiert.

Es muss das Interesse aller Demokratien sein, Myanmar noch junge Demokratie wiederherzustellen. Deshalb darf es für uns keine internationale Zusammenarbeit mit Myanmar Machthabern geben, vor allem, wenn wir sehen, wer die Freunde der Militärjunta sind: China und Russland liefern verlässlich Waffen für das Morden und blockieren den UN-Sicherheitsrat. Sie destabilisieren ein Land, das sich eine demokratische Zukunft erhofft. Sie destabilisieren eine gesamte aufstrebende Region.

Der große Konflikt unserer Zeit heißt Autokratie versus Demokratie. Dieser Konflikt ist mehr als nur noch ein wirtschaftlicher Wettbewerb. Die Autokraten und Despoten dieser Welt terrorisieren und morden weltweit, weil sie den Wunsch nach Freiheit und Demokratie verachten und fürchten.

Deshalb ist es mir auch völlig unverständlich und offen gesagt auch unerträglich, dass die Kommission immer noch keine Prüfung der Handelsvorteile Myanmar veranlasst hat. Danke, Kommissarin Jourová, dass Sie heute hier sind, aber ich frage mich wiederholt bei außenpolitischen Debatten: Wo ist eigentlich Herr Borrell?

Ich verlange von der Kommission: Stellen Sie endlich sicher, dass kein Unternehmen des Militärs durch den bevorzugten Zugang zu unserem Binnenmarkt profitiert! Setzen Sie die Handelsvorteile aus! Denn als Europäische Union müssen wir unserer Verantwortung als demokratische und wirtschaftliche Macht gerecht werden.

Kein demokratisches Land darf uns zu klein oder zu weit weg sein, um nicht an der Seite von Freiheit und Demokratie zu stehen. Danke für euren Einsatz, Kollegen!

Heidi Hautala, *author*. – Madam President, one year after the military coup of 1 February 2021, we can see that the situation is very dire and that we need to add to the pressure against the military junta.

We as Parliament welcome sanctions which have now come to four rounds, but we would demand that more needs to be done as for sanctions. We can still add, for instance, the State Administrative Council to the list as an entity, not just as a person. We welcome the fact that now, finally, the Council has added the national oil and gas company, MOGE, to the sanctions. But we demand that a derogation allowing European oil and gas companies to operate and conduct transactions in the country be removed.

So what more can be done? I believe that it's very important to point out to European businesses that they should not mix with anything in the business of Myanmar which touches the interests and adds to the interests of the army, the Tatmadaw.

And finally, I want to say that we need to find support for the refugees fleeing the country. We especially need to expect that there will be no forced returns to Thailand, China and India as neighbouring countries.

Bert-Jan Ruissen, *Auteur*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, de oorlog in Oekraïne eist vrijwel alle aandacht op. We zouden bijna vergeten dat elders in de wereld ook vreselijke dingen gebeuren. Zoals in Myanmar, waar ruim een jaar geleden een staatsgreep plaatsvond die de nog kwetsbare democratie gewelddadig de kop indrukte.

De trieste balans na één jaar: meer dan 7 000 gerichte aanvallen op burgers door het leger; bijna 1 500 mensen omgekomen, waaronder vrouwen en kinderen; honderdduizenden mensen op de vlucht in eigen land; tientallen gedocumenteerde rapporten van aanvallen op kerken en andere religieuze instellingen; religieuze leiders zijn vermoord of opgepakt; het leger blokkeert de toegang van humanitaire hulp; er is een tekort aan alles ...

Gelukkig heeft de Raad eerder dit jaar een nieuwe ronde met sancties ingesteld. Ik moedig de Raad aan om hiermee door te gaan en samen met de internationale gemeenschap de druk op de militaire junta op te voeren om het geweld te stoppen en de levering van humanitaire hulp niet langer te blokkeren. Tevens moet de regering van nationale eenheid als legitieme behartiger van de democratische wensen van de bevolking van Myanmar betrokken worden in een inclusieve politieke dialoog en bij het streven naar een vreedzame oplossing van de crisis. Ook de bevolking van Myanmar moet op ons kunnen rekenen!

Pernando Barrena Arza, *author*. – Madam President, a year ago, the military of Myanmar seized power through a coup d'état and arrested the State Counsellor, Aung San Suu Kyi, and the President. In August, the Commander-in-Chief of the army announced he was appointing himself Prime Minister and since then a mass protest movement has taken to the streets and protested for a return to a democratically elected civilian government.

Since the coup, military authorities have once again perpetrated crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. Human rights violations, in particular against the Rohingya, have continued.

We support the EU-adopted the sanctions against those involved in serious human rights violations in Myanmar, but we cannot limit the scope and not give a look at whom. The derogation that explicitly allows EU oil and gas operators remaining in Myanmar is unacceptable and must be suppressed.

It's time for peace and democracy in Myanmar and that will only arrive along with demilitarisation, dialogue, diplomacy and international law. Europe should make pressure to the Tatmadaw to immediately stop repression against peaceful activists and members of the public in general and transfer powers to the organised civil society. That is the only way forward acceptable.

Michaela Šojdrová, *za skupinu PPE*. – Paní předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, paní místopředsedkyně, pro Evropskou unii je v těchto chvílích nejpalcivějším úkolem podpořit Ukrajinu, pomoci jí v obraně proti agresi Putina, který i v těchto chvílích, v těchto minutách bombarduje ukrajinská města. Přesto nesmíme zapomínat na ochranu lidských práv i v dalších místech a týká se to i Myanmaru, kde dál pokračuje skutečná genocida místních obyvatel – Rohingů. Od poslední rezoluce Evropského parlamentu z října minulého roku se bohužel nic nezlepšilo. Vojenská junta i nadále páchá násilí, vraždí civilisty, systematicky pronásleduje křesťany, ničí kostely. Více než 9 500 politických vězňů již bylo obětí tohoto represivního režimu a 1 600 z těchto politických odpůrců bylo dokonce zabito. Evropský parlament silně odsuzuje vojenskou juntou a zejména odsuzuje podporu Ruska a Číny, které ji podporují. Tyto země se tak přímo podílí na této genocidě a bohužel stejně jako v případě ruské invaze zde selhává Rada bezpečnosti OSN, proto Evropský parlament vyzývá ke konkrétním akcím a sankcím.

Andrea Cozzolino, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è trascorso un anno dal colpo di Stato in Myanmar. Da allora, le già precarie condizioni umanitarie sono enormemente peggiorate: più di 1 500 cittadini sono stati uccisi, più di 8 600 persone sono in carcere, 80 quelle condannate alla morte, più di 400 000 sono i nuovi sfollati. Tutto questo da quando c'è stato il colpo di Stato militare di un anno fa e dopo le contestate elezioni democratiche. Oggi il potere è nelle mani della giunta militare.

Noi siamo in campo, come Europa, come Parlamento, in difesa della popolazione civile e dei difensori dei diritti umani e, in particolare, a difesa delle minoranze etniche e religiose, che già prima del colpo di Stato soffrivano di pesanti persecuzioni. Chiediamo alla giunta militare il rilascio di tutti i detenuti politici e di ripristinare il governo democraticamente eletto. Solo la politica, un processo democratico può ripristinare una condizione di pace e stabilità nel paese. Al tempo stesso, al nostro Borrell, alla Commissaria Jourová, alla Commissione nella sua interezza l'invito a sostenere tutte le iniziative diplomatiche, come quelle in corso all'Associazione delle nazioni del sud-est asiatico, ma soprattutto mettere pressione, pressione, sulla giunta militare per rendere possibile l'ingresso degli aiuti umanitari per tutta la popolazione civile nel paese, in particolare per gli sfollati.

Dobbiamo essere risoluti, determinati e vigili, soprattutto in questo momento. Se non ci sono sviluppi positivi, essere pronti a rafforzare e introdurre nuove sanzioni. Colpire fino in fondo gli interessi economici che si raccolgono intorno alla giunta militare: questo è il compito dell'Europa e questo è il compito che si dà il Parlamento europeo.

Adam Bielan, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, since the military coup in February 2021, the Myanmar military has committed serious crimes and has violated a range of human rights by murdering civilians, arbitrarily detaining prisoners, forcing displacements of thousands of people and oppressing ethnic and religious minorities.

With over 14 million people in humanitarian need, the targeting of civilians and humanitarian actors is unthinkable. Yet it is happening in Myanmar. It is a blatant violation of international law. So today we urge Myanmar military authorities to immediately reinstate the civilian government, allowing a swift return of Myanmar to the path of democracy and to release immediately and unconditionally all political prisoners.

I welcome the recent round of sanctions adopted by the Council against people and entities involved in the coup. This is an important EU instrument to sanction violators of human rights. But we should intensify our help by all possible means. The international community must relentlessly continue to take additional actions to help Myanmar citizens fighting for democracy. Fundamental rights should never be compromised.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Madam President, the recent events made clear that we are facing a global battle: democracy versus authoritarianism; the rule of law versus the rule of power; respect for human rights against their total disregard. It's a battle fought in different places with different means, and Ukraine's invasion is only the most evident example. Nevertheless, it is the same fight.

One of the battlegrounds is in Myanmar. Since the coup in February 2021, the situation has continuously worsened. Some 1 500 civilians were killed, 12 000 arrested, 84 sentenced to death. Numbers that bring back ghosts from the past. China and Russia have taken a clear position in this fight. They block any attempt of the United Nations Security Council to draft a resolution. They legitimise the junta, which supports Putin's war on Ukraine, also providing it with military means that are used every day in the repression.

Words fall on deaf ears. We need strong action instead. New and more stringent measures, coordinated international pressure, the referral of the situation to the International Criminal Court and the immediate suspension of Myanmar from GSP and EBA trade preferences. Yesterday was already late, Madam Commissioner. We need to use all instruments at our disposal and stay united, because their civil society should not feel abandoned and because this is a fight for democracy we can't afford to lose.

Marianne Vind (S&D). – Fru formand! Vi skriver år 2022, men vi har ikke en fredfyldt verden. Det er over et år siden, at juntaen i Myanmar overtog magten og har siden begået drab på civilbefolkningen. Jeg fordømmer på det kraftigste, at Rusland, Kina og Serbien som FN-medlemmer har hjulpet kupmagerne med at levere våben til militæret i Myanmar. At støtte et militærregime, der bruger magt mod civilbefolkningen, fortjener fordømmelse og sanktioner, ikke hjælp fra FN-lande. Den myanmarske befolkning skal ikke leve med tortur og overgreb som en del af hverdagen. Her tænker jeg på rohingyaerne, der er særligt udsatte. Jeg ønsker en fredfyldt løsning, der respekterer det demokratiske valg fra 2020 og giver magten til den civile befolkning – den civile befolknings valg af en regering. Hvis der ikke sker forbedringer, bør vi kraftigt overveje flere sanktioner, for over 14 mio. mennesker har brug for humanitær hjælp. Mange børn og voksne sulter. Jeg opfordrer i dag til, at vi i EU står sammen om sanktioner mod Myanmar's junta.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, in Myanmar come in Ucraina, certo più lontano dai nostri occhi ma altrettanto efferata, la violenza più brutale continua. Arresti, bombardamenti, uccisioni dei civili più inermi, come sempre in queste situazioni, donne e bambini, aggressioni sessuali, persecuzioni dei cristiani e delle altre minoranze, brutale repressione militare, folle immense di profughi che necessitano di cibo e di medicine. Insomma, una catastrofe umanitaria, e ancora una volta colpiti sono proprio gli inermi.

Di fronte a questo io credo che non possiamo più accettare una generale inazione del tutto inadeguata della comunità internazionale. L'ONU deve uscire dal suo torpore, lo dico da appassionata onusiana, deve uscire dal suo torpore e fare qualche iniziativa forte, le commissioni d'inchiesta indipendenti, altre iniziative, ma soprattutto noi chiediamo un ruolo alla Commissione europea, all'Alto commissario Borrell e a tutta la Commissione: dovete fare di più e in prima persona, non lasciare sola l'Asia né agli altri interlocutori, deve farlo l'Unione europea. Il riconoscimento del governo di unità nazionale di opposizione, i corridoi umanitari, l'embargo delle armi; insomma, tutte le iniziative che possono essere fatte per un paese che è diventato un simbolo della democrazia con Aung San Suu Kyi e con un popolo che lotta per difendere la propria democrazia e la propria libertà.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, indeed you are right. This is a matter for the whole Commission. This is not only the matter of Josep Borrell, who cannot be here today because he had to choose how to spend his time in the urgent situation around Ukraine especially. He is in Versailles in Paris on the European Council.

But indeed, you are right by saying that the public attention is now focused on the war in Ukraine and that the gross violations of human rights and disproportionate use of force applied by the military regime in Myanmar increased in recent weeks and months. And this must not be forgotten or we should not lose sight of these horrifying situations.

The country's democratic transition has been halted with disastrous humanitarian, social, security, economic and human rights consequences. The Myanmar military increased arbitrary detentions and used ever more torture, sexual and gender-based violence, persecution of civil society, human rights defenders and journalists, as well as attacks on the civilian population, including ethnic and religious minorities. According to the United Nations, half of the population is now living under the poverty level.

Our policy response is robust and coordinated with like-minded partners. It supports ASEAN and United Nations efforts in devising a peaceful solution to the crisis. We have imposed sanctions, withheld or reoriented development assistance and stepped up humanitarian support.

On 21 February, the EU adopted a fourth package of restrictive measures. These add to the existing EU restrictive measures, including an arms embargo. All sanctions now apply to a total of 65 individuals and 10 entities. This now also includes the Myanmar Oil and Gas Enterprise, the country's main petrol producer. It is key to cut the financial resources of the military junta while seeking to avoid unnecessary suffering for the Myanmar population.

In parallel, the EU and its Member States remain one of the most important donors in Myanmar with the envelope of EUR 65 million. In response to the needs, the EU has provided over EUR 23 million in 2021.

So far, it is the EU's policy to maintain our unilateral trade preferences under the Everything But Arms scheme, with a view to avoiding to harm the most vulnerable, particularly female workers in the garment sector. The scheme contributes to the strengthening of the resilience of the general population.

As regards justice and accountability, we increased our financial support to the UN Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar by EUR 1 million. At the multilateral level, we will present a resolution at the UN Human Rights Council to help ensure that the human rights situation in Myanmar remains high on the agenda of the international community.

Let me also inform you that we have appointed the EU Ambassador to ASEAN to be also our new special envoy to Myanmar to support the efforts of the UN and ASEAN's special envoys and to reach out to other international and regional actors.

Let me assure you, the crisis in Ukraine does not mean we forget the acute suffering of the people of Myanmar. The EU keeps all policy options under review, with the aim of supporting the people of Myanmar and bringing the country back to a path towards democracy.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place today.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Od wojskowego przewrotu w Birmie minął już ponad rok. Jako wiceprzewodniczący delegacji ASEAN w PE z niepokojem śledzę rozwój wydarzeń i bardzo trudną sytuację mieszkańców Birmy, którzy pozbawieni są podstawowych demokratycznych praw, takich jak wolność słowa czy wyznania.

Co więcej, dyskryminuje się obcokrajowców oraz mniejszości religijne i etniczne. Wystarczy chociażby wspomnieć o tym, że od przewrotu wojskowego udokumentowano 35 przypadków napadów na kościoły, miejsca kultu oraz osoby wierzące, w tym chrześcijan i muzułmanów.

Birma nie jest sama. Chciałbym tu podkreślić zaangażowanie ASEANu, który nieustannie podejmuje próby pokojowego rozwiązania aktualnego kryzysu, a także pomoc humanitarną, jaką Birma otrzymuje od UE. W 2021 r. UE przeznaczyła 23 miliony euro między innymi na pomoc uchodźcom z Birmy szukającym schronienia w sąsiednich krajach. Część tej pomocy została też przeznaczona na pomoc w walce z pandemią COVID-19.

Liczę na dalsze kroki mające na celu ustabilizowanie sytuacji w Birmie. Przywódcy przewrotu wojskowego powinni bardzo mocno odczuć, że na ich działania nie ma zgody.

(¹) See Minutes.

7.3. Zniszczenie dziedzictwa kulturowego w Górskim Karabachu

President. – The next item is the debate on six motions for resolutions on destruction of cultural heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh (2022/2582(RSP)) (¹).

Peter van Dalen, Auteur. – Voorzitter, president Aliyev van Azerbeidzjan zorgt goed voor zichzelf en zijn familie. Hun vermogen wordt inmiddels op meerdere miljarden geschat. We zien bij hem wat we bij veel despoten zien: corruptie, witwaspraktijken, het oppakken van politieke tegenstanders, het schenden van de mensenrechten.

Maar er is meer. Azerbeidzjan maakt het leven van de inwoners van Nagorno-Karabach elke dag onmogelijk. Nog deze week: artilleriebeschietingen. Nog deze week: afsluiting van een gaspijplijn. Het leven van de inwoners van Nagorno-Karabach wordt elke dag bedreigd. En er zijn ook nog heel veel vermisten, waar we nooit meer iets van gehoord hebben.

Maar bovenal zien we dat onder leiding van Aliyev het culturele erfgoed van Nagorno-Karabach wordt vernietigd, stelselmatig wordt kapotgemaakt. Kerken, historische gebouwen, monumenten en andere plaatsen worden kapotgemaakt. En zo wordt het culturele erfgoed van Nagorno-Karabach vernietigd.

Dit Parlement is unaniem. We zijn in grote mate eensgezind, we veroordelen ten strengste dit geweld door Azerbeidzjan en we veroordelen ten strengste de "armenofobie" van het regime in Bakoe. En we roepen de Unesco op snel voor een onderzoeksmismissie naar het land te gaan, naar Nagorno-Karabach, om te kijken hoe ernstig de situatie is.

We hopen op en bidden voor verandering. We hopen op en bidden voor gerechtigheid. En we zeggen neen tegen regimes die het leven van andere mensen kapotmaken!

Evin Incir, author. – Madam President, the recent situation in Nagorno-Karabakh is a systematic attempt by Azerbaijan to erase Armenia's history and its rich culture. The Armenian cultural heritage dates back to ancient times and needs to be treated with the respect that it deserves.

Azerbaijan's attack on the Armenian cultural heritage is an attack on its people, a country and most importantly, it is an attack on its future generations. It is also an attack on international commitments. In its attempt to rewrite history, to assert dominance, Azerbaijan has resorted to the destruction of cultural treasures that future generations now never get to enjoy. This is something that I, with my own Kurdish roots, have seen happening to my people and our identity for decades by Turkey. It has consequences beyond possibility of explanation.

In December 2021, the International Court urged Azerbaijan to cease all destruction of Armenian cultural heritage. The resolution that we will vote on today provides us with an opportunity to send a clear message to Azerbaijan. The world is watching and we will not stay quiet if this silence and threat of violence doesn't stop. The European Parliament must stand firm against the unacceptable action of Azerbaijan. International agreements must be followed. We therefore call upon Azerbaijan to comply with its obligation, especially with regard to its membership in UNESCO, which clearly opposed the destruction of all cultural heritage. Enough is enough.

Nathalie Loiseau, auteur. – Madame la Présidente, la culture, c'est la mémoire du peuple, la conscience collective de la continuité historique, le mode de penser et de vivre. Cette phrase de Milan Kundera nous rappelle que chaque fois qu'on s'attaque à la culture d'un peuple, c'est qu'on cherche à le détruire. Nous l'avons vu quand les talibans ont fait exploser les Bouddhas de Bâmiyân. Nous l'avons encore vu quand Daesh a détruit le temple de Nimroud, les sanctuaires de Mossoul ou le Lion de Palmyre.

Le 3 février dernier, le ministre de la culture d'Azerbaïdjan a annoncé la mise en place d'un groupe de travail sur le patrimoine du Haut-Karabakh. Il est vrai que depuis le conflit armé de l'automne 2020, près de 1 500 monuments sont passés sous le contrôle de l'Azerbaïdjan. Parmi eux, 161 églises ou monastères arméniens, 345 pierres tombales, 591 stèles. Il y aurait donc matière à assurer leur protection. Mais il y a, en réalité, matière à s'alarmer de ce que le ministre azéri compte faire.

En effet, le 15 mars 2021, le président Aliyev s'est déplacé à Tsakuri, dans la région d'Hadroust; face à une église du XIIe siècle, il a promis d'effacer les inscriptions arméniennes qui y figurent. D'autres églises ont déjà été détruites. Le prétexte invoqué: rendre justice à la culture des Albanais du Caucase. Si vous ignorez de quoi il s'agit, ne vous inquiétez pas, aucun historien sérieux n'en atteste. Si vous vous demandez s'il y a vraiment de quoi s'inquiéter, sachez qu'entre 1997 et 2006, 89 églises arméniennes, 5 800 stèles et plus de 22 000 tombes, dont celles du cimetière arménien de Djoulfa, ont été rasées par l'Azerbaïdjan dans l'enclave du Nakhitchevan. Bakou nie toute destruction et s'insurge du mauvais procès qui lui serait fait. L'Azerbaïdjan affirme que l'Arménie porte la responsabilité de la destruction de patrimoine azéri dans le premier conflit du Haut-Karabakh. C'est possible, et si tel est le cas, cela doit être condamné.

Mais pourquoi alors l'Azerbaïdjan empêche-t-il l'Unesco de faire son travail et d'envoyer sur place une mission d'experts, comme cela est proposé depuis novembre 2020. C'est pourtant le rôle de l'organisation onusienne d'intervenir dans le cadre de la convention de 1954 pour la protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé.

Aujourd'hui, j'en appelle aux coprésidents du groupe de Minsk pour qu'ils interviennent auprès de l'Azerbaïdjan. J'en appelle à l'Union européenne, afin qu'elle se prévale des liens privilégiés du partenariat oriental pour obtenir des assurances claires de la part de Bakou que le patrimoine arménien sera préservé. J'en appelle à l'Unesco, qui ne doit pas se laisser intimider, mais aussi à d'autres acteurs de terrain, tels qu'Aliyev, pour qu'ils agissent enfin.

Écoutons ce que Sigmund Freud nous a appris: tout ce qui travaille à la culture travaille contre la guerre.

Viola Von Cramon-Taubadel, *author*. – Madam President, the Caucasus, and particularly Nagorno-Karabakh, is the crossroad of civilisations. For millennia, different cultures, nations and religions have been creating masterpieces here. These masterpieces belong not only to the people of the Caucasus, but also to the world. It is our common obligation to preserve them.

What took millennia to build in times of peace can be destroyed in a moment by the war. After the second Karabakh war, thousands of Armenian monuments came under Azerbaijani control. Very recently, Aliyev's government erased Armenian churches, crushed stone tombstones in another Azerbaijan region, Nakhchivan. This provides a dramatic peek into the potential future of Armenian artefacts in Nagorno-Karabakh.

We cannot allow the cultural devastation of Nakhchivan to repeat in Nagorno-Karabakh too. Attempts to revise history should be condemned, be it the so-called Albanisation or removing the conical dome from the Armenian Holy Saviour Cathedral in Shusha.

Equally unacceptable is the destruction of Azeri cultural heritage sites left behind by 600 000 IDPs. After the first four, many Azeri religious sites were destroyed and neglected. Cultural heritage is erased not by bulldozers, but by people full of hate. If the two Caucasian nations focus more on what unites them instead of what divides them, they will discover that their cultures are much more similar than they imagined.

Charlie Weimers, *author*. – Madam President, Commissioner, I witnessed the results of the Islamic State's cultural genocide against Christians, Chaldeans, Assyrians and Syrians when I visited Iraq and Syria. Desecrated millennia-old churches, decapitated statues of Mary, destroyed icons, charred pages from Bibles that littered the streets. To destroy cultural heritage is to erase an identity, a history, a nation.

Azerbaijan's President Aliyev is following in the footsteps of the Islamic State. During the war in 2020, Azeri armed forces deliberately twice shelled the Holy Saviour Cathedral in Shushi. Shortly afterwards, Azerbaijan destroyed the 18th-century St John the Baptist Church.

Reports in satellite imagery have meticulously tracked the systematic destruction of almost 100 medieval Armenian churches, thousands of cross stones and tens of thousands of tombstones. As these sites of religious significance, of history and of culture are destroyed, we may not see them, but we will never forget.

President Aliyev has sought to cover up his crimes by distorting history through the promotion of false Albanisation theories and the erasure of Armenian scripture on churches. We can't let him get away with it.

Commissioner, colleagues, the EU needs to speak up, condemn the cultural genocide committed by President Aliyev against Armenian Christian heritage sites. Will you hold him accountable for the continued cultural genocide against Armenians? We must sanction him. Palmyra, Maaloula, Qaraqosh, St John's Baptist Church in Shushi. Lest we forget.

Željana Zovko, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, cultural heritage, national or religious, is a representation of people's identity. These artefacts, buildings and monuments are built with the greatest care and devotion. It is something that people are proud of. Respect and protection of cultural heritage is not only part of our European values and European neighbourhood policy, it is also enshrined in several international conventions and treaties. If these monuments are destroyed or desecrated, it is an insult and a direct attack.

By erasing cultural heritage, history is altered. The evidence of the existence of an entity vanishes. In conflict areas, such as in and around Nagorno-Karabakh, monuments and religious buildings are often targeted because of their symbolic value, something I deeply deplore and strongly condemn. It is just thanks to the inherent meaning that cooperation on, and mutual respect for, cultural heritage has a power of reconciliation, a power to promote coexistence, a power that can lead to peace. First is to take stock of the status of cultural heritage in the region.

I call on UNESCO and the international community to urgently organise a fact-finding mission in and around Nagorno-Karabakh and I call on the states of Azerbaijan and Armenia to fully cooperate. UNESCO's motto is that war starts in people's heads, and it's there where peace begins.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο πολιτισμός πρέπει να είναι μέσο προσέγγισης των λαών και όχι μέσο μίσους. Η καταστροφή και βεβήλωση μνημείων πολιτισμού θρησκευτικής ή εθνικής κληρονομιάς παραβιάζει το Διεθνές Δίκαιο και τις αρχές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, στις οποίες όλοι μας δεσμευόμαστε και τις υπηρετούμε. Όταν δε η καταστροφή ή η βεβήλωση γίνεται με συστηματικό σχέδιο κατόπιν επικράτησης της ισχύος των όπλων, η παραβίαση αυτή αποτελεί πολιτισμική γενοκτονία και έγκλημα, όπου κι αν συμβαίνει· είτε στην Παλμύρα της Συρίας από το Ισλαμικό κράτος, είτε στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο από την Τουρκία, είτε στο Ναγκόρνο Καραμπάχ από το Αζερμπαϊτζάν, πράγμα που εξετάζουμε σήμερα.

Τα γεγονότα φανερώνουν πολιτισμική γενοκτονία εναντίον του πολιτισμού αιώνων των Αρμενίων στο Ναγκόρνο Καραμπάχ, πράγμα που αποτελεί συστηματική κρατική πολιτική του Αζερμπαϊτζάν. Η άρνηση του Αζερμπαϊτζάν να επιτρέψει πρόσβαση της UNESCO πρέπει να έχει κόστος. Στην περίπτωση ενόπλιον μας υπάρχουν εγκληματικές ευθύνες. Θα δράσει το διεθνές ποινικό δικαστήριο της Χάγης εναντίον καθεστωτικών αυταρχικών ηγετών, οι οποίοι διαπράττουν αυτά τα εγκλήματα, εγκλήματα κατά του πολιτισμού και της ανθρωπότητας; Ο πολιτισμός είναι μέσο προσέγγισης και όχι μέσο μίσους.

François Alfonsi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, je veux d'abord remercier celles et ceux qui ont fait en sorte que la question du Haut-Karabakh soit à l'ordre du jour de cette session.

Dix-huit mois après l'agression menée par la dictature de Bakou contre le peuple arménien de l'Artsakh, la situation reste préoccupante et les tensions très vives. La défaite des forces arméniennes a créé de graves déséquilibres dans les relations entre l'Arménie et les États voisins agresseurs, la Turquie et l'Azerbaïdjan.

Par la proposition que nous votons aujourd'hui, nous apportons un soutien bienvenu à ceux qui sont, à juste titre, inquiets de leur avenir. Le négationnisme à l'égard du patrimoine culturel arménien, et la destruction des édifices par l'armée azérie dans les territoires qu'ils ont conquis par la force qui en est le témoin, sont le prélude à de nouvelles agressions. L'Artsakh est toujours menacé d'épuration ethnique. Par notre soutien, le peuple arménien est plus fort et les intentions belliqueuses de ses voisins seront plus facilement écartées.

Il n'y a pas, dans le Haut-Karabakh, deux belligérants qui se neutralisent: il y a un agresseur et il y a une victime. L'agresseur est une dictature. La victime est une démocratie et elle est très affaiblie. L'Europe doit se mettre aux côtés de l'Arménie et apporter sa contribution pour écarter le risque d'une nouvelle guerre.

Susanna Ceccardi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, chi, come noi, ha la fortuna di essere nato nel terzo millennio ha creduto per molto tempo di vivere nella pace e nella prosperità. Oggi la tragedia è in Ucraina, ma solo due anni fa il dramma aveva bussato a appena qualche centinaio di chilometri più a sud, in un fazzoletto di terra tra l'Armenia e l'Azerbaigian, in una regione, l'Artsakh, dove in poche settimane hanno perso la vita migliaia di innocenti, soldati e civili, e dove un patrimonio culturale inestimabile è in pericolo.

Anche in questa occasione, come nel 1915, e come nel 1938, siamo di fronte a un bivio della storia: restare indifferenti, spettatori passivi, oppure aprire gli occhi sulla sistematica distruzione di una delle culture più antiche e affascinanti del mondo. La storia, come si sa, la fanno i popoli. Ma a scriverla sono sempre i vincitori. E quando lo fanno, il *modus operandi* è spietato e ben elaborato: cancellare la memoria, negare la storia, creare una narrazione parallela e infine la propaganda.

Il dovere delle istituzioni, quindi il nostro dovere, è proprio maggiore laddove è necessario tutelare la memoria e sostenere chi per timore di subire una rappresaglia non ha potuto nemmeno manifestare il proprio dissenso verso la Russia che bombarda l'Ucraina. Li abbiamo lasciati soli in passato e ora non vogliono più esporsi. Rispettare la storia dei vinti, porre le basi per costruire un futuro di rispetto e civile di convivenza, ammettere le atrocità di un genocidio. Questa è l'Europa.

Per questo motivo è nostro dovere impegnarci e impegnare l'UNESCO e tutte le parti in causa a effettuare, censire e proteggere la storia e il patrimonio culturale dell'Artsakh. La distruzione del patrimonio storico di un popolo viola i principi dell'Europa democratica, riportando l'orologio del tempo al 1915 e l'essere umano a ripetere per l'ennesima volta, ancora una volta, lo stesso errore.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, the fate of cultural heritage in armed conflict is a matter of utmost importance. I dedicated a lot of my time in the Parliament to this issue. That includes, of course, Nagorno-Karabakh.

Yes, we have to remember that both sides in recent phases of conflict used a lot of information – actually, disinformation – using it as warfare, actually, so we have to rely on impartial sources like UNESCO's mission. That is a fact finding mission that is to be sent to the region. We have to support this and to remember the role of Russia, that always wants to ignite the conflict and benefit from escalation.

Mick Wallace, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, I welcome the call to allow UNESCO access to cultural heritage sites in Nagorno-Karabakh to assess the damage and take steps towards preservation. The EU also has a role to play in the wider region that has seen conflict in recent times.

I travelled to Iraq last year and met a lot of religious and political public officials. We heard that there used to be EU delegations going to Iraq regularly and cooperating on archaeological digs and restoration. It was perceived as being incredibly helpful by the Iraqis and they are really disappointed that it's not happening anymore because obviously it was stopped by the invasion by the US and allies and the bombing. Sadly, the war gave rise to ISIS and allowed groups like al-Qaeda to flourish and these groups in particular have done untold damage to architectural and cultural heritage.

Today, the Western-backed Saudi coalition are actually deliberately targeting extraordinary cultural heritage. We need to stop all this bombing and militarism everywhere and start to rebuild and preserve the artefacts of our common history. We helped to destroy it. We should help to fix it.

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI). – Madam President, Armenia and Azerbaijan agreed to a cessation of hostilities, but are still a long way from peace. The destruction of the cultural heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh, known as the Republic of Artsakh, is a clear example of this.

The long-running conflict has had a catastrophic impact on the cultural heritage of the region. Azerbaijan needs to actively protect the Armenian cultural heritage in and around the Republic of Artsakh and stop its destruction. It's our duty to ensure the transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage. No development can be sustainable without a strong cultural component. Indeed, only an approach to development based on mutual respect and open dialogue among cultures can lead to lasting peace.

I urge the European Parliament and the European Commission to use its powers and influence to prevent and punish acts of vandalism and desecration affecting Armenian cultural heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Andrey Kovatchev (PPE). – Madam President, the reality of today shows us that history, identity, culture and religions matter. Manipulation, falsification and destruction of historical heritage leads to hate, discrimination and violence. The war of Putin against Ukraine proves this one more time. He's also using these ugly instruments of history manipulation for justification of these terrible actions.

Reconciliation can be achieved only by reaching mutual trust. The topic of the destruction of cultural heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh against Armenians is just one example of how important is trust. The destruction of any cultural heritage sites, artefacts and objects contributes to the escalation of hostilities, lack of mutual understanding and prejudice between and within societies. On the contrary, the respect of minorities, which is one of our core values, includes the protection of their cultural identity and heritage.

The urgency resolution which we are voting today welcomes the UNESCO proposal to send an independent experts' mission to visit Nagorno-Karabakh and assess the situation on the ground. We request further that international experts be given unhindered access by Azerbaijan to all cultural sites for a proper inventory to be carried out. It is critical to remember that the protection, rebuilding and restoration of historical heritage and religious heritage should be seen in the broader framework of the conflict resolution between Armenia and Azerbaijan, and needs to be requested, supported and welcome. This process includes also the condemnation of any destructions of cultural, religious and historical sites, regardless of whether this happened in the past or in the present day, or by whom.

The new generations need to have a peaceful and secure future without the hate from the past.

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – Madam President, aggression of Russia against Ukraine demonstrates once again how important is the EU's engagement with the Eastern Partnership countries. While the EU was largely absent during the second Nagorno-Karabakh war, we can still make a difference if we take a more active role today. War is not the solution, and the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh cannot be solved by military force. This is one of the lessons learned from the first war.

Falsification of history, as well as war against cultural heritage, cannot be justified. Actions perpetrated by Armenia in the past, and damage to Azerbaijani heritage over the past decades does not justify attacks on cultural heritage in the present. Sustainable peace has to be negotiated. Reconciliation and rehabilitation should stem from mutual respect, including respect for minority rights and protection of historical, religious and cultural heritage.

While effort is needed from both sides to resolve this conflict, we condemn the continued policy of Azerbaijan to erase and deny Armenian cultural heritage in and around Nagorno-Karabakh. I would like to recall the provisional measures introduced by the International Court of Justice last year in the case of Armenia v. Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan must take all necessary measures to prevent and punish acts of vandalism and desecration affecting Armenian cultural heritage, and I urge Azerbaijan to remove all obstacles and facilitate the UNESCO independent mission of experts in order to assess the situation regarding cultural properties in and around Nagorno-Karabakh.

Virginie Joron (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, Madame la Commissaire, alors que tous nos regards sont légitimement tournés vers l'Ukraine, un autre pays européen continue à souffrir le martyre, loin des caméras et de l'agitation diplomatique, malheureusement. Ce pays, c'est l'Arménie, ce peuple est le peuple arménien, cruellement lâché par tous à l'automne 2020.

L'Arménie continue aujourd'hui de souffrir. Au Haut-Karabakh, ce territoire disputé avec l'Azerbaïdjan, les troupes azérides procèdent à la destruction du patrimoine culturel arménien de cette région, et ce dans le but de faire fuir la population arménienne de ce territoire. Il y a encore quelque temps, j'étais à Erevan et j'ai pu constater la souffrance du peuple arménien face à cette guerre qui continue. Nous nous étions émus, à juste titre, de la destruction des mausolées de Tombouctou par l'État islamique. Mais qui se soucie de l'épuration culturelle qui menace aux confins du continent européen?

Monastères, églises ou pierres tombales, 1 500 monuments culturels arméniens sont menacés de destruction. Ces actes ont déjà eu lieu par le passé au Nakhitchevan où, en 2006, l'Azerbaïdjan avait fait raser la nécropole de l'ancienne ville arménienne de Djoufa. Ces actes menacent de se répéter aujourd'hui, alors que, semble-t-il, l'Azerbaïdjan vient de créer un groupe de travail dont les activités consisteront à effacer les «inscriptions fictionnelles» arméniennes des monuments religieux ou historiques du Haut-Karabakh.

Si toutes les destructions du patrimoine culturel sont à blâmer, où qu'elles aient lieu, dans le monde entier, cette menace-là nous oblige particulièrement envers ce peuple frère, chrétien et européen.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, Armenië heeft een zeer rijke historie. Als eerste land ter wereld riep het in de vierde eeuw na Christus het christendom uit tot nationale religie. Vele duizenden locaties, onder meer in Nagorno-Karabach, herinneren hieraan.

Door het langlopende conflict met Azerbeidzjan wordt dit culturele en religieuze erfgoed nu enorm bedreigd. Vele monumenten zijn inmiddels beschadigd of verwoest. Armeense sporen worden uitgewist door "albanisering" van het cultureel erfgoed. Het is een regelrechte poging tot geschiedvervalsing!

Met onze gezamenlijke resolutie maken we vandaag een duidelijk statement: 1) de EU moet Azerbeidzjan streng aanspreken op de systematische vernietiging van het cultureel erfgoed; 2) een onafhankelijke onderzoeksmisssie is nodig om ter plaatse de schade te inventariseren; 3) in onze nabuurschapsrelaties met Azerbeidzjan moet het onderwerp een heel prominente plek krijgen.

De afbraak van het cultureel en religieus erfgoed in Nagorno-Karabach moet stoppen!

Martina Michels (The Left). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nach dem Waffenstillstand und dem unerträglichen Siegesgeschrei aus Baku im November 2020 ist der Südkaukasus bis heute so fragil wie zuvor, einschließlich Kampfhandlungen.

Die Zerstörungen von Stein gewordener Geschichte und deren anschließende Fälschung durch Aserbaidschan sind inakzeptabel. Ethnische Homogenität ist eine Fiktion von Rassisten. Sie erklärt nirgendwo auf der Welt die Grenzen von Nationalstaaten. Die kulturellen Identitäten der Völker sind ein Mix aus positiver Migrationsgeschichte, aus einem achtsamen Umgang mit Mahnungen, aus Krieg und Vertreibung. In Bildern, Liedern und Begegnungsorten ist festgehalten, wie Versöhnung und Frieden im Alltag aussieht.

Mit der heutigen Entschließung fordern wir den Zugang von Expertinnen und Experten unter dem Dach der Unesco und den Schutz zivilgesellschaftlicher Organisationen. Sie sollen das Kulturerbe der Regionen insbesondere um Bergkarabach und Nachitschewan kartografieren und sichern können. Dafür müssen auch die Minsk-Gruppe und die OSZE vermitteln, um Stabilität in der Region nachhaltig zu sichern. Die Zerstörung von Kulturgütern ist ein Symbol von Überlegenheitsdenken, das in Kriegen systematisch eingesetzt wird. Und deshalb geht es uns alle an. Und zwar überall.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Madam President, in these days, we are all deeply moved by the criminal invasion of Ukraine, for which Putin created unacceptable justifications. He falsified the past, bending history to his propaganda needs, and he is trying to prevent a sovereign country from choosing its own future.

Similar trends are present in Nagorno-Karabakh, where Azerbaijan's authorities are trying to eradicate the cultural heritage of the autochthonous Armenian population in the territories they occupied with brute force. Monuments, medieval monasteries, churches, tombs: there is no respect for either the living or the dead. Cancelling the past, their leadership intends to criminally justify the future they have in mind for the region, and we cannot accept and let it happen.

From this House we must speak clearly. We call on the Azerbaijan authorities to immediately halt this barbaric vandalism and to open a constructive and inclusive dialogue in the region. Furthermore, we encourage UNESCO to put in place its fact-finding mission, and we must support their endeavours, also taking a strong position vis-à-vis Baku's reluctance to allow such deployment. As the Roman philosopher Cicero said, history is the witness of time, the light of truth, the teacher of life and is committed to immortality. Therefore, it cannot be rewritten to justify expansionist and imperialistic ambitions.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! W Górskim Karabachu niszczone są cmentarze, kościoły i budynki o znaczeniu historycznym, niszczone jest ormiańskie dziedzictwo kulturowe i religijne – to nie tylko bezsensowne akty wandalizmu, ale przede wszystkim akty przemocy. Nie o budynki tu przecież chodzi, tylko o ludzi. Dziedzictwo kulturowe to przecież bardzo ważny element tożsamości całych społeczności. Jego niszczenie jest więc próbą wykluczenia i unicestwienia wszelkich śladów innej kultury i tożsamości, które podsyca tylko wzajemną niechęć i wrogość. Takiemu działaniu mówimy dzisiaj zdecydowane nie.

Zwracamy się do władz Azerbejdżanu o podjęcie natychmiastowych działań w celu zapobiegania aktom wandalizmu i karania ich. Unia Europejska powinna wykorzystać dostępne jej narzędzia, aby wywierać presję na władze Azerbejdżanu i jasno domagać się działania.

Bardzo ważne może być też wysłanie do Górskiego Karabachu misji niezależnych ekspertów UNESCO. Pozwoliłoby to na oszacowanie skali zjawiska i strat. Tu chodzi o coś więcej niż budynki, a nawet o coś więcej niż ich historyczna czy artystyczna wartość. Chodzi o szacunek, o tolerancję i równość – wartości, których musimy bronić.

Lars Patrick Berg (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Ich unterstütze voll und ganz eine unabhängige, von der Unesco geleitete Untersuchungskommission, die das gesamte Ausmaß des kulturellen Vandalismus in Artsach untersuchen und feststellen soll. Ich bin auch sicher, dass diese Mission die mutwillige Zerstörung von armenischen Kirchen, von Denkmälern, Artefakten und Gedenksteinen, den sogenannten Chatschkaren, aufdecken wird.

Was wir erleben, ist die systematische Vernichtung des armenischen Kulturerbes in Artsach, die eindeutig gegen die Urteile des Internationalen Gerichtshofs verstößt. Eine unabhängige, von der Unesco geleitete Mission muss endlich ungehinderten Zugang zu Artsach erhalten, um die weitere Zerstörung des armenischen Kulturguts in Artsach zu verhindern. Und wir sollten nicht zulassen, dass die aserbajdżanischen Behörden eine solche Mission endlos verzögern und behindern.

Pernando Barrena Arza (The Left). – Madam President, the Armenian people have known the worst with the genocides perpetrated by Turkey in 1915, and they have longed for freedom and democracy. Two years after the Azeri attack supported by Turkey against the people of Artsakh, the Armenian people and its cultural heritage are still under threat.

In this context, we firstly call on Azerbaijan to discard once and for all its militaristic approach and territorial claims in Armenia and engage in good faith in negotiations and under the OSCE Minsk Group on the final status of Nagorno-Karabakh.

It's essential to respect the right to self-determination of Nagorno-Karabakh as a democratic principle in order to deal with conflicts in a democratic way. We cannot accept Azerbaijan's stance and we must send a clear message. Azerbaijan must stop attacking and denying the existence of Nagorno-Karabakh as a fully independent political entity. Azerbaijan must be respectful of the people of Artsakh and international law.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, une guerre ne doit pas en faire oublier une autre. Aujourd'hui encore, en Arménie, dans le Haut-Karabakh, des familles attendent le retour de prisonniers de guerre détenus illégalement par l'Azerbaïdjan, maltraités, utilisés comme monnaie d'échange. Des militaires et des civils sont régulièrement pris pour cible par des soldats azéris, au mépris des engagements de cessez-le-feu. Hier encore, le village de Khnushinak a été ciblé par des tirs de mortier, et ce matin, celui de Khramort.

Mais ce ne sont pas seulement les vivants qui meurent. Le président Aliyev veut aussi tuer l'Histoire, comme les talibans à Bâmiyân, comme Daesh au Levant. Depuis la fin de la guerre, des dizaines de monuments, d'églises, de khatchkars, ont été délibérément détruits dans une volonté négationniste insensée d'effacer les traces millénaires de la présence arménienne sur ces terres, que le gouvernement azéri déclare très officiellement être une fiction. Violence ultime qui, en privant un peuple de son droit à décider de son destin, veut lui voler aussi jusqu'à la trace de sa présence. Violence qui nous concerne tous, car ce patrimoine inestimable est aussi le nôtre. C'est un trésor de l'humanité.

Notre résolution, aujourd'hui, affirme l'urgence d'une mission de l'Unesco pour vérifier dès maintenant la protection du patrimoine arménien. Si cette résolution n'est pas suivie d'effets, l'Union européenne doit suspendre les fonds qu'elle verse à l'Azerbaïdjan, car aucun soutien n'est dû à un État qui viole le droit international et ses propres engagements. L'Europe en a pris conscience aujourd'hui, elle doit être enfin présente concrètement aux côtés de l'Arménie.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zarówno w potocznym, jak i politologicznym postrzeganiu konfliktu azersko-ormiańskiego konflikt ten jest sporem terytorialnym i ma charakter narodowościowy. Jednak, jak donosi chociażby Watykan, już od czasu zawieszenia broni pomiędzy Azerami i Ormianami oraz przejęcia kontroli nad znaczną częścią Górnego Karabachu przez Azerów dochodzi do bestialskiego niszczenia religijnego i kulturowego dziedzictwa ormiańskiego na tych ziemiach.

Na terenach zajętych przez wojska azerskie znajduje się co najmniej 1456 zabytków kultury, religii i historii Ormian. Ormianie na całym świecie obawiają się, że zabytki te może spotkać to samo, co spotkało kościoły i zabytki w Nachiczewanie. Według oficjalnych danych w tym regionie zburzono do tej pory 28 tys. zabytkowych obiektów, w tym 89 kościołów, 5840 ręcznie rzeźbionych kamiennych krzyży, tzw. chaczkarów, oraz 22 tys. nagrobków.

Pojęcie ludobójstwa trafiło do prawa międzynarodowego dzięki studiom i badaniom nad przerażającą rzezią dokonaną na ludności ormiańskiej. Badania te prowadził polski prawnik żydowskiego pochodzenia Rafał Lemkin. Dziś świat musi protestować. Dziś świat musi zwrócić uwagę na inne zagrożenie. Tym zagrożeniem, tym bestialstwem jest ludobójstwo kulturowe.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, katedrala svetog Jakova u Šibeniku, crkva svetog Krševana u Zadru, povijesna jezgra grada Dubrovnika, Banski dvori u Zagrebu – sveukupno je stradao 1861 nepokretni spomenik kulture zbog srpske agresije na Republiku Hrvatsku čiji je cilj bio poništiti hrvatski nacionalni identitet, građen stoljećima. Upravo zato, mi u Hrvatskoj znamo koliko je važno ustrajati na zaštiti kulturne baštine, naročito u ratnim okolnostima.

Nažalost, svjedoci smo kontinuirane politike brisanja i negiranja armenske kulturne baštine u Gorskom Karabahu i njegovoj okolini, čime se krši međunarodno pravo i nedavna odluka Međunarodnog suda. Radi se o još jednom slučaju progona kršćana i zatiranja njihovog vjerskog identiteta što je, nažalost, slučaj u mnogim dijelovima svijeta.

Na globalnoj razini 2019. više od 245 milijuna kršćana bilo je žrtvama ozbiljnih progona što je 40 milijuna više nego 2018. To znači da jedan od devet kršćana na globalnoj razini doživljava progon, a o tome se jako, nažalost, malo govori. Stoga pozdravljam prijedlog rezolucije kojom se Europski parlament snažno protivi negiranju armenske kulturne baštine na području Gorskog Karabaha i oko njega.

Kolegice i kolege, uništavanje kulturne baštine u Gorskom Karabahu mora prestati što prije.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Jako człowiek mogę mówić o ludzkich dramatach – tych, którzy tam mieszkają, i tych, którzy stamtąd musieli uciekać. Jako historyk mogę mówić o długiej i skomplikowanej historii tego regionu. Jednak przede wszystkim jako polityk, który był w tym regionie przeszło 20 razy, a więc trochę się na tym znam, mogę powiedzieć, patrząc Państwu w oczy, że z tego konfliktu między Armenią i Azerbejdżanem najbardziej cieszy się dzisiaj ten, który toczy wojnę przeciwko Ukrainie – pan pułkownik prezydent Putin. On jest beneficjentem tego konfliktu. Pamiętamy spotkania prowadzone przez niego, chociażby w Soczi, między prezydentem Azerbejdżanu Aliyevem a ówczesnym prezydentem Armenii Sarkisjanem. To Putin był tym sędzią, ordynatorem, tym, który rozstrzygał. Pamiętajmy – na pytanie „Cui bono?” odpowiadamy: Rosja i Putin.

Věra Jourová, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, the European Union has a very clear position regarding the key role of cultural heritage in promoting peace, democracy and sustainable development. It was only in June last year that the Council approved conclusions welcoming the EU concept of cultural heritage in conflicts and crises, calling for the protection and safeguarding of cultural heritage during periods of conflict and crisis.

This has also been the position of the European Union with regard to all cultural and religious heritage in the territories affected by the conflict in and around Nagorno-Karabakh. As you know, the issue of cultural and religious heritage in the region has been contested and sensitive since at least the beginning of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The war in 2020 has further aggravated this situation. Through public statements and direct discussions with both sides, we have repeatedly called for the protection of all religious and cultural heritage in the region, particularly heritage sites affected by conflict, without any differentiation based on ethnic or religious grounds. Any attempts to destroy or desecrate heritage sites before, during or after the hostilities or attempts to alter their identity will be met with strong condemnation from the European Union. We have also been joined by the international community in these calls.

It is important to have an objective and inclusive international assessment of all religious and cultural heritage affected, or potentially affected, by the conflict. For this reason, the EU supports the initiative of a UNESCO technical assessment mission to visit the area and has asked the sites to allow such a visit to take place and to fully cooperate with it. Steps taken towards such a mission would also contribute to building confidence between the sides, something the EU has been working towards, particularly with the engagement of the President of the European Council, Charles Michel, who visited both Armenia and Azerbaijan last year, held frequent phone calls with the leaders and brought them together for two trilateral meetings.

We will continue to insist with both parties on the need to fully protect all religious and cultural heritage. Key to this will be to allow an international assessment mission to take place, to continue engaging in concrete steps to overcome conflict, to cooperate on core issues and to build an atmosphere of trust.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place today.

(¹) See Minutes.

8. Kalendarz sesji miesięcznych Parlamentu - 2023

President. – At its meeting of Wednesday, 9 March 2022, the Conference of Presidents adopted a proposal for the calendar of part-sessions for the parliamentary year 2023. The dates are available on the plenary webpage. The deadline for tabling amendments is Monday, 21 March at 12.00. The vote will take place on Thursday, 24 March at 11.30.

9. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania

President. – I will now move to the results of the first voting session of today, 10 March 2022.

(The President read out the results of the vote)()*

(The sitting was suspended at 13.06)

(¹) See Minutes.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

10. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 13.50 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)

11. Skład komisji i delegacji

Der Präsident. – Die Renew-Fraktion hat der Präsidentin einen Beschluss über die Änderung von Ernennungen in einen Ausschuss übermittelt. Dieser Beschluss wird im Protokoll der heutigen Sitzung veröffentlicht und tritt am Tage dieser Ankündigung in Kraft.

12. Druga część głosowania

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zur zweiten Abstimmungsrunde des heutigen Tages.

Die Dossiers, über die wir abstimmen, sind der Tagesordnung zu entnehmen. Die Abstimmungsrunde ist von 13.45 Uhr bis 15.00 Uhr geöffnet. Es kommt dasselbe Abstimmungsverfahren zur Anwendung wie in den vorangegangenen Abstimmungsrounden. Alle Abstimmungen sind namentliche Abstimmungen.

Ich erkläre die zweite Abstimmungsrunde für eröffnet. Sie können bis 15.00 Uhr abstimmen. Die Ergebnisse der zweiten Abstimmungsrunde werden um 16.00 Uhr bekannt gegeben.

Die Aussprachen werden um 15.00 Uhr mit der Erklärung der Kommission zu einem systematischen Ansatz der EU in Bezug auf chronische Nierenerkrankungen wieder aufgenommen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 13.51 Uhr unterbrochen)

13. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)

14. Systemowe podejście UE do przewlekłej choroby nerek (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu einem systematischen Ansatz der EU in Bezug auf chronische Nierenerkrankungen (2022/2579(RSP)).

Ich erinnere die Mitglieder daran, dass es bei allen Aussprachen dieser Tagung keine spontanen Wortmeldungen gibt und dass keine blauen Karten akzeptiert werden.

Außerdem sind wie auch bei den letzten Tagungen Zuschaltungen aus den Verbindungsbüros des Parlaments in den Mitgliedstaaten vorgesehen.

Ich weise Sie auch darauf hin, dass Wortmeldungen im Plenarsaal weiterhin vom zentralen Rednerpult aus erfolgen. Ich ersuche Sie daher, die Rednerliste im Blick zu behalten und sich kurz vor Beginn Ihrer Redezeit zum Rednerpult zu begeben.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, it's estimated that chronic kidney disease affects about one in ten Europeans and that alarmingly high number is expected to grow even further. As we all know, typical risk factors such as diabetes and hypertension are becoming more prevalent. If we add to that what we have learned, all of us, with the COVID-19 pandemic, we have seen that all patients with chronic diseases are at a higher risk to suffer a serious course of the infection. That's why I'm really very happy that you have added this point on your agenda today, but also because I've had the opportunity in the last few months to have meetings with associations of patients with chronic disease so I have heard very closely and at first hand the many challenges they are facing.

As a Commission, we have not taken our eye off non-communicable diseases, while, of course, we have been fighting the pandemic together. On the contrary, I would say our efforts have been to help Member States deal with non-communicable diseases even more effectively. We provide support to Member States in their work to meet the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and World Health Organization targets. This goes specifically for SDG Target 3.4, where the international community has subscribed to the goal to reduce premature mortality from non-communicable diseases by one third by 2030. We all know that this can only be done through prevention and treatment and by identifying and sharing best practices at both national and EU level.

To achieve this, we have a number of tools at our disposal. We recently launched a new EU initiative on non-communicable diseases called Healthier Together to address the leading causes of avoidable premature death. Healthier Together focuses on health promotion and prevention. At the same time, it supports improvements in every stage of a patient's life, from screening and early diagnosis to early detection, treatment management and, of course, all important quality of life, along with improving knowledge and data availability. The priority strands of the initiative include cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, chronic respiratory diseases, mental health and neurological disorders. These are the leading causes of avoidable premature death, not including cancer.

As you know, diabetes and high blood pressure are among the main risk factors for chronic kidney disease. By working on these strands, we will also have a positive impact on kidney disease. The priorities and actions of this initiative will continuously be discussed with Member States and with stakeholders via the EU Health Policy Platform, and I will be very happy to be able to share with the European Parliament all progress made on these efforts.

We are all aware that this House has also made a priority Europe's Beating Cancer Plan. This is a comprehensive plan, it is an ambitious plan and it foresees that we tackle health determinants such as tobacco use, nutrition, physical activity and alcohol. This will also help other non-communicable diseases like chronic kidney disease by addressing common risk factors.

Last but not least, we have our new EU4Health Programme. I will never stop thanking all the Members of this Parliament for their vocal support for that programme, which has given the EU4Health the resources to make it a real game-changer and bring about what I would say is a paradigm shift towards the stronger European health union that we're all working together to build. This means we can support networks for knowledge-sharing and mutual learning, we can support capacity-building actions and strengthen strategic planning, and Member States will have more opportunities to exchange best practices. Indeed, a call under the 2022 EU4Health Programme for collecting and implementing evidence-based practices for non-communicable diseases specifically refers to chronic kidney disease.

The EU has funded many research actions under the Horizon 2020 programme. We have 40 projects directly addressing chronic kidney disease worth EUR 64 million and 24 projects related to kidney transplantation amounting to EUR 47 million. In the Horizon 2021 work programme our new flagship, the European Innovation Council, includes a call for medical technology and devices that includes portable dialysis.

So we are working strongly. We are working and supporting Member States in sharing best practices for organ donation and transplantation, where we all know that there are many challenges faced. We are working on digital transplant registries for the kidney transplant recipients and living kidney donors to be able to bring all the data together at EU level and to improve transplantation outcomes.

In ending, honourable Members, we fully appreciate the importance of research and of pooling knowledge, but more than that, we need to bring all this together to increase the quality of life and to increase the life expectancy of those living with chronic kidney disease. That's why our support in this crucial area will not only continue, but I have personally committed to this to the patient organisations themselves. I look forward now to hearing your views on this very important matter.

Sirpa Pietikäinen, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I'm very happy that we are having this very frank and good exchange of opinions here in Parliament on kidney disease, like we have had on other diseases, where you have taken very prompt action.

We know that chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a significant burden for our healthcare system. One hundred million Europeans suffer from it, and predictions are that it is in sharp extension and increase. Of course, this is easy to understand. We live longer. We eat more medicine. There are the other big non-communicable diseases (NCDs) – we heard about diabetes and blood pressure. Then there's our livelihoods and what we eat and what chemicals we put in ourselves – and that all gets into our kidneys.

But the difference with some other diseases, like the big ones like diabetes where we have the European programme, like heart and cardiovascular diseases, is that kidney disease is a silent killer. We do not raise it as a big issue at Member State level.

More often than not, patients are not aware of the situation until it is already a severe condition. Even though, in some cases, it would be preventable with different choices of medication, for example, if there's a lack of understanding, prevention is undone. And then, if doctors often do not take it as a priority, the patients do not know, and the healthcare system doesn't prioritise and understand it, and there you have it.

It keeps on growing and spreading silently in our societies. That's why I think, and we co-signatories of this initiative think, that this would be a very good and proper time for the Commission to start thinking about having a separate kidney disease (CKD) programme that has the normal elements we always see in health programmes: how to prevent, how to diagnose early, how to screen, how to start the best treatments, how to develop better and more cost-effective treatments, as we know that this is one of the most expensive therapies we have in our healthcare system.

And with this, we can tackle this challenge. But I'm only afraid that if this is only one part of the NCD programme, and not even listed as one of the highest, we might not be able to tackle the challenge.

So this is the plea from us to the Commission: please consider having a separate programme about it and action in the future.

Nicolás González Casares, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, primero, me gustaría agradecer tener la posibilidad de debatir en el Parlamento Europeo sobre una enfermedad, la enfermedad renal crónica, que afecta a entre 75 y 100 millones de ciudadanos y ciudadanas europeos, que tiene un alto grado de infradiagnóstico porque no ponemos los medios adecuados y que, en algunos casos, puede ser prevenible. Y ha dicho la comisaria que el Plan Europeo de Lucha contra el Cáncer también interviene, con recomendaciones en salud pública, en el campo de la prevención. Pero, bueno, ya hemos visto que no se ha sido lo suficientemente ambicioso; yo creo que también siendo ambiciosos en esa prevención conseguiremos reducir la enfermedad renal crónica.

Los enfermos renales crónicos, además, sufren, sufren mucho durante su enfermedad. Los tratamientos son, además de costosos, duros, a veces exigen desplazamientos y, además, muchas veces se vive bajo la ansiedad de un trasplante. Pero, a pesar de todo eso, todos quieren y todos necesitan la posibilidad de recibir un tratamiento. Y hay muchas desigualdades en Europa para acceder a esos tratamientos.

Por lo tanto, le pedimos a la Comisión un plan de acción e inversiones. Sabemos que en Horizonte Europa lo está haciendo, pero, además, debe tomar buena cuenta de algunas iniciativas que existen en los diferentes países europeos.

Vengo de un país, España, donde tenemos un orgullo: nuestra Organización Nacional de Trasplantes, que marca récords a nivel europeo y mundial. Ese es un modelo que se puede seguir en Europa para buscar la igualdad.

Pero no nos salgamos del foco. Necesitamos nuevos tratamientos y que estos pacientes tengan nuevas oportunidades de tratamiento, que no se deje de investigar y que se investiguen también las causas de la enfermedad, porque a veces ayuda al tratamiento.

Me quiero acordar de aquellos pacientes a los que alguna vez traté o que iban a diálisis y tenían que desplazarse kilómetros y kilómetros, o que estaban en lista de espera para un trasplante, como mi amigo Fermín de O Corpiño, quien finalmente lo consiguió y ha mejorado su calidad de vida. Eso es lo que yo espero para todos los europeos y europeas. Que nos pongamos manos a la obra.

Jutta Paulus, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to say to Commissioner Kyriakides that she has described the problem very well and has already listed quite a few of the issues that the Commission is doing already, such as focusing on promotion and prevention, screening, diagnosis and knowledge data.

Commissioner Kyriakides, I'm glad that you are ready to take up the idea of having digital transplant registries in order to improve the situation of people that are waiting for an organ. But actually I missed a bit of the answer to part of our oral question, for example, when it comes to equitable deployment, when it comes to innovation and when it comes to greener dialysis. Actually, dialysis is still done in the same fashion as it was done 30 years ago when I was at university studying pharmacy. I think there has been so much progress in other parts of medicine and treatment that it is quite curious that this has not changed a lot and that it is still as time consuming, as resource consuming and as strenuous for patients as it was 30 years ago. I think that is really a realm where we should focus in our research activities and in our innovation programmes. I would really like to see an approach by the Commission which takes this into account.

We have repeatedly heard that, in the EU, 100 million people are suffering from chronic kidney disease. 9 874 people are currently waiting for an organ, and more than 3 000 of those have been waiting for more than five years. For these patients, going to dialysis three times a week, which is a time-consuming, strenuous and expensive exercise, and which also uses up a lot of energy and consumes a lot of plastic waste and lot of water, that should be our push for action.

We should also have a talk with Member States. I come from a Member State where organ transplantation is not as widespread an issue as it actually should be, because I know that there are other Member States – I'm looking to you, Ms Kyriakides! I would like you to address the Ministers of Health of the European Union in order to find how we can actually raise the numbers of people that are ready to donate an organ, for example, having a sort of default choice 'Yes, I will donate organs' instead of, as in Germany, where you have to opt in, not opt out. I think that would be the right way to address this issue in order, in three years, maybe no longer to have 10 000 people waiting for a kidney. And these are only kidneys. There are also things like livers and others.

The numbers on organ transplants are stagnating. They should actually go up because people should be aware of the problem, but they are not. I think the major lack is in screening and early detection because, when this disease is detected, people are already very ill. I think what we need is a really good training programme for the health workers on the front line. I would be very happy if you would support this at the Health Minister stage.

Gunnar Beck, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! 100 Millionen Menschen – das hörten wir schon – leiden an chronischen Nierenerkrankungen, und laut Prognosen werden Nierenleiden bis 2040 die fünfthäufigste Todesursache weltweit sein. Die Nierenfunktion nimmt bei jedem Menschen ab dem 50. Lebensjahr um ein bis zwei Prozent jährlich ab. Kommen gewisse Risikofaktoren wie Diabetes, Übergewicht oder Bluthochdruck hinzu, kann sich die Funktion der Niere sogar um bis zu 15 % jährlich verringern.

Nierenleiden sind eine menschliche, aber auch eine finanzielle Belastung für die Gesundheitssysteme. Die jährlichen Kosten in Europa betragen rund 140 Milliarden Euro – Tendenz steigend. Trotzdem hinkt die Erforschung neuer Therapien gegen chronische Nierenerkrankungen in Europa international hinterher. Den meisten Patienten ist ihr Gesundheitszustand aufgrund der fehlenden Frühdiagnose nicht bewusst – das Ergebnis auch eines Fachärztemangels an Nephrologen in Europa.

Die bevorzugte Behandlung von Nierenversagen im Endstadium ist die Transplantation. Doch die Wartezeit auf eine postmortale Organspende liegt bei 6 bis 8 Jahren. Die einzige Alternative ist die Dialyse. Daher werden in der EU nur 45 % der Intensivpatienten transplantiert, 55 % sind auf Dialyse angewiesen.

Wo können wir Geld einsparen, um Nierenpatienten zu helfen? Hier ein paar Vorschläge:

Das Europäische Institut für Gleichstellungsfragen hat ein Budget von fast 8 Millionen Euro, die wir sofort einsparen könnten. Der Asyl-, Migrations- und Integrationsfonds, der Nothilfefonds für Afrika und die Flüchtlingszahlungen an die Türkei kosten uns jährlich rund 5,5 Milliarden Euro, die ebenfalls eingespart werden könnten, wenn wir die Grenzen sicherten. Nebenbei: Die Bundesregierung lässt sich ihre Migrationspolitik mindestens 60 Milliarden Euro pro Jahr kosten, und die Klimarettung und die Energiepolitik kosten die Deutschen allein schon jetzt über 100 Milliarden Euro pro Jahr. Bedenken Sie die Dialysestunden, Ärzte, Pflegekräfte und Organspendekampagnen, die man damit einkaufen könnte.

Während wir jedes Jahr Hunderte Milliarden für Weltrettungsprojekte verschwenden, müssen wir heute hier im Europäischen Parlament um angemessene Mittel für 100 Millionen Menschen bitten, die dringend auf Gesundheitsversorgung angewiesen sind.

Damit es nicht gleich einen Aufschrei gibt: Wir sind nicht gegen Umweltschutz oder Ortshilfe für Flüchtlinge, nur gilt unsere erste Sorge Landsleuten und Europäern, vor allem wenn sie Not leiden oder erkranken.

Denn moralische Pflichten sind wie konzentrische Kreise – vom Nahen zum Fernen. Das sehen wir so, aber im Einvernehmen mit den Stoikern, Scholastikern, Immanuel Kant, den schottischen Moralisten oder auch Hegel. Nur wollen Sie von europäischer Kultur hier ja überhaupt nichts wissen. Denn Sie denken ja vornehmlich an ferne Länder, von denen wir wenig wissen.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, nos últimos anos tem-se verificado no mundo um aumento do número de doentes com doença renal crónica. A resposta a esta doença exige o reforço do serviço público e da resposta que dá na prevenção, controlo e tratamento da doença a par de apoios específicos aos doentes.

Uma doença que tem vários fatores de risco associados, nomeadamente a diabetes, hipertensão, obesidade, tabagismo, doenças pulmonares, entre outros, a que se tem que dar atenção com vista à introdução não só de medidas preventivas, mas também de medidas para a deteção precoce da doença.

Na Europa, estima-se em 75 milhões o número de pessoas com manifestação de algum dos estádios desta doença. Em Portugal, estima-se que uma em cada dez pessoas tenha algum estágio da doença, verificando-se uma das mais elevadas incidências a nível da Europa, com valores que oscilam entre os 218 e os 235 doentes por milhão de habitantes.

Estima-se que existam cerca de 20 mil doentes renais crónicos, em estágio cinco, em tratamento substitutivo renal, cerca de 60 % em hemodiálise, 37% de transplantados renais e menos de 4 % em diálise peritoneal. Por ano, mais de 2 mil doentes renais crónicos iniciam hemodiálise, constatando-se a ausência de serviços de proximidade para muitos dos doentes, obrigando-os a percorrer largas dezenas de quilómetros para os tratamentos.

Quase 50 % dos doentes têm como causa apontada outras patologias, a saber, a diabetes, (cerca de 30 %) e a hipertensão arterial (cerca de 15 %), as quais importa considerar com vista a adotar medidas preventivas primárias e de controlo da doença que impactem no desenvolvimento e na evolução da doença renal crónica. Sucede que cerca de 25 % dos doentes não tiveram seguimento em nefrologia antes de iniciarem a hemodiálise.

Importa reforçar igualmente a prevenção secundária com vista à identificação precoce da doença renal crónica, o que pode conduzir ao abrandamento da sua progressão, assim como a uma melhor preparação do doente e da sua família para o tratamento e as opções que existem.

Acresce que mais de 90 % dos doentes em hemodiálise são tratados em unidades privadas de hemodiálise convencionadas com o Estado, no essencial detidas por dois grandes grupos privados. No decurso da pandemia, contrariando períodos definidos pelas autoridades de saúde, assistiu-se a iniciativas de redução das sessões para três horas no lugar de quatro. Verifica-se, por sua vez, que muitos dos profissionais de saúde nestas unidades não têm um vínculo permanente, mas são sim contratados. Fica evidente que a preocupação não é assegurar o bem-estar dos doentes, mas sim a obtenção de lucro.

Por tudo isto, é fundamental alargar a resposta pública no Serviço Nacional de Saúde. A resposta à doença e os tratamentos de diálise devem ser incorporados no serviço público de saúde, incluindo respostas de proximidade a par do reforço dos profissionais de saúde e da sua valorização.

Importa ainda referir a dimensão humana e as dificuldades acrescidas que uma doença crónica comporta nas vidas dos doentes, com impactos que se traduzem no plano pessoal, familiar e laboral. São necessárias, por isso, medidas que garantam a proteção laboral destes doentes e a adequação do posto de trabalho, dos horários e das funções às limitações da doença, a par de outras como a isenção das taxas de saúde, o acesso gratuito à medicação e o tratamento da doença.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, Komisijos nare, gerbiami kolegos. Paskutiniaisiais porą metų sveikatos apsauga tapo aktyviai diskutuojama Europos Sąjungos mastu. Didysis kovos prieš vėžį planas ar vieningas atsakas į COVID-19 pandemiją ne tik padėjo užtikrinti geresnę sveikatos apsaugą Sąjungos piliečiams, bet ir parodė, jog sveikata Europos Sąjungoje turi būti reguliuojama bendrai.

Lėtinė inkstų liga, kuria Europoje serga apie 100 milijonų, prognozuojama, 2040 metais taps penkta dažniausia mirties priežastimi. Tai, jog liga dažnai prasideda besimptomiu pavidalu, yra diagnozuojama tik pažengusiose stadijose, sukelia rimtų iššūkių gydymui, o daugelis gyvybių, deja, yra prarandamos. Todėl privalu, kad visos Europos Sąjungos mastu ankstyvoji diagnozė būtų užtikrinta. Ypatingai rizikos grupėse, žmonėms, sergantiems sunkiomis ligomis, kaip diabetas, hipertenzija, širdies kraujagyslių ligos, vėžys, ar turintiems viršsvorio.

Dėmesį privalome atkreipti į dvi sritis. Pirma, daugelis antrinių ligų yra jautrios socialinei įtakai: depresija ar nerimas, – dažnai sukelti ekonominio nepritekliaus, nelygybės ar sudėtingų gyvenimo sąlygų, o dabar ir karo, – ypač labiausiai nepasiturintiems, dažnai veda prie streso, kuris sukelia dalį rizikos grupės ligų. Antra, privalome užtikrinti, kad ankstyvoji diagnozė bei technologinės inovacijos būtų vienodai prieinamos visose Europos Sąjungos šalyse. Tai reikalauja bendro Europinio reguliavimo ir sustiprintos Europos sveikatos sąjungos, kuri apimtų ne tik pasirengimą pandemijoms, bet ir kasdinių sveikatos problemų reguliavimą.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la mortalità correlata alle malattie renali continua ad aumentare ogni anno; si prevede sarà la quinta principale causa di morte entro il 2040. Inoltre, i dati parlano di circa 850 milioni di persone a livello mondiale che soffrono di una malattia renale, tra queste circa 13 milioni hanno avuto una malattia renale acuta pericolosa per la vita e 2,6 milioni hanno subito un trapianto o sono sottoposti a dialisi.

Informazione, prevenzione, diagnosi precoci possono fare la differenza per un percorso terapeutico ottimale e una migliore qualità della vita. Le disuguaglianze e ingiustizie sono tutt'oggi presenti nell'accesso alle cure per queste patologie. Il motivo per cui la malattia cronica è sottovalutata risiede nel fatto che questa progredisce per anni in maniera asintomatica.

In occasione della giornata mondiale del rene di oggi, 10 marzo 2022, il mio pensiero non può che andare ai pazienti affetti da malattia renale che si trovano in Ucraina; deve essere assolutamente garantita la continuità delle cure per la dialisi, i trapianti e l'assistenza sanitaria. Polonia, Romania, Slovacchia e Moldavia stanno attualmente fornendo cure essenziali ai profughi dializzati e trapiantati dall'Ucraina, ma si teme che le loro infrastrutture sanitarie locali saranno presto sovraccaricate; dobbiamo dare una mano, dobbiamo aiutare i paesi in prima linea.

Infine, voglio esprimere tutta la mia solidarietà e vicinanza ai medici, agli infermieri, a tutto il personale sanitario dell'Ucraina impegnati strenuamente in queste ore per garantire cure ai loro connazionali.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I'll start with the last comment I heard from Mr Benifei. You're absolutely right that we need to support those frontline Member States who are receiving, on a daily basis, thousands and thousands of refugees because of the war in Ukraine. What I can assure you is that I am working, almost on a daily basis, with all those Health Ministers, and other Health Ministers, and we have now secured an initial first 10 000 beds in order to be able to transfer patients from those frontline Member States whose health systems are being severely pressed to other Member States who have come forward. These beds include general ward beds, oncology beds, burns units, neonatal beds with their mothers, paediatric beds, ICU and, of course, other diseases. So this is not coming, it is a priority and we are all working on it on a daily basis because we are facing a really tragic situation. In a war, it is the most vulnerable that are, of course, most affected, as all others.

Ms Pietikäinen, you are right that it's almost a silent killer. Personally, I might not have been aware of this if I had not had three close friends in the last two years who needed dialysis, two of whom have had transplants. Reducing the burden of chronic kidney disease has become very evident. We are working on it, and I just want to tell you that there is a separate call for projects, which is open under the 2022 EU4Health work programme on non-communicable diseases, and this includes this.

Mr González Casares, we need to prioritise prevention. I totally agree and yes, as you mentioned, Spain has set an example for the work that you do with transplant and increasing donors. Good practices need to be exchanged between Member States.

Ms Paulus spoke of innovation, and I just want to say that, in our European Innovation Council, we included a call for medical technologies and devices that include portable dialysis. This is in part also to make the dialysis greener, in line with the latest science and technology, which is something that you mentioned. And we do need to do a great deal more on organ donation awareness.

Mr Pimenta Lopes, we need to do much more to raise awareness on organ donation and on how we can save lives. There are disparities between Member States on donation and transplantation and, following the EU action plan on organs, we saw the need to focus on the implementation of the developed knowledge in Member States. We need of course to bring in national authorities and professionals to take the lead on this in the different Member States by exchanging good practice.

Ms Olekas, on health there has been a paradigm shift. We can all see that. Early diagnosis is key, but prevention is really crucial. I want to say here because we are speaking of Europe's Beating Cancer Plan, that the prevention pillar of Europe's Beating Cancer Plan is so significant that it will impact on the prevention of other non-communicable diseases, and we are going to deliver on this plan. On innovative methods of treatment, we are coming forward with a new legislative proposal for the pharmaceutical legislation at the end of this year, which I will very much look forward to presenting to you.

Thank you for this very important exchange on the issues around chronic kidney disease. It's essential that we address these challenges, that we work together among the Member States, that we never forget that those who have been hardest hit by COVID-19 are those with chronic illnesses, and that our healthier together programme will be able to bolster Member States' actions on non-communicable diseases and risk factors which are common to many diseases, including chronic kidney disease. Let me repeat to you that we will be working on it continuously and with the Member States to share good practices, and we will make best use of the call under EU4Health.

Once again, thank you for putting it on the agenda today because, by using your voices, you also in a sense support the work that the Commission is doing and the commitment we have to change the world around non-communicable diseases.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Wir haben jetzt zuletzt dieses ernste Thema gehabt. Wir beenden eine schwierige Woche. Wir haben jetzt zwei Jahre und einen Monat Pandemie. Vor zwei Jahren und einem Monat waren wir zum letzten Mal hier. Jetzt sind wir wieder hier. In der nächsten Woche werden wir erstmals wieder Besucher empfangen können. Und jetzt, nach zwei Jahren und einem Monat, nach der Pandemie, kommen diese schrecklichen Nachrichten, die uns alle betreffen und bedrücken.

Nach dem Brexit, nach der Pandemie und diesem Überfall auf ein unabhängiges Land auf unserem Kontinent werden wir zum dritten Mal in kurzer Zeit daran erinnert, dass wir vieles auf diesem Kontinent gemeinsam schneller und besser erreichen können.

Lassen Sie uns zusammenbleiben, lassen Sie uns zusammenhalten, lassen Sie uns bewusster werden, Bewusstsein entwickeln für das, was wir haben. Es ist kostbar, es ist zerbrechlicher, es ist flüchtiger, als wir manchmal denken. Es ist jedenfalls weniger selbstverständlich, als manche glauben. Lassen Sie uns an die denken, die in diesen Tagen um Freiheit, Frieden und Demokratie kämpfen und die erfahren, dass all dies eben gerade nicht selbstverständlich ist.

Die Sitzung wird um 16.00 Uhr mit der Bekanntgabe der Abstimmungsergebnisse wieder aufgenommen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.38 Uhr unterbrochen)

15. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 16.02 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)

16. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zu den Ergebnissen der zweiten Abstimmungsrunde von heute.

*(Der Präsident verliest die Ergebnisse der zweiten Abstimmungsrunde.)**

17. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące stanowiska zajętego w głosowaniu: patrz protokół

18. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół

19. Petycje: patrz protokół

20. Decyzje w sprawie sporządzenia sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy: patrz protokół

21. Zmiany w przekazaniu spraw komisjom (art. 56 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

22. Zaangażowane komisje (art. 57 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

23. Decyzja o zastosowaniu procedury obejmującej wspólne posiedzenia komisji (art. 58 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

24. Zmiany tytułów sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy: patrz protokół

25. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół**26. Zatwierdzenie protokołów posiedzeń bieżącej sesji i przekazanie przyjętych tekstów**

Der Präsident. – Die Protokolle der Sitzungen vom 7. bis 10. März werden dem Parlament zu Beginn der nächsten Sitzung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

Wenn es keine Einwände gibt, werde ich die in diesen Sitzungen angenommenen Entschlüsse den in diesen Entschlüssen genannten Personen und Gremien übermitteln.

27. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół**28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia**

(Die Sitzung wird um 16.04 Uhr geschlossen)

29. Odroczenie sesji

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

Skróty i symbole

*	Procedura konsultacji
***	Procedura zgody
***I	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, pierwsze czytanie
***II	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, drugie czytanie
***III	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, trzecie czytanie

(Typ procedury zależy od podstawy prawnej zaproponowanej w danym projekcie aktu.)

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

AFET	Komisja Spraw Zagranicznych
DEVE	Komisja Rozwoju
INTA	Komisja Handlu Międzynarodowego
BUDG	Komisja Budżetowa
CONT	Komisja Kontroli Budżetowej
ECON	Komisja Gospodarcza i Monetarna
EMPL	Komisja Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych
ENVI	Komisja Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności
ITRE	Komisja Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii
IMCO	Komisja Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów
TRAN	Komisja Transportu i Turystyki
REGI	Komisja Rozwoju Regionalnego
AGRI	Komisja Rolnictwa i Obszarów Wiejskich
PECH	Komisja Rybołówstwa
CULT	Komisja Kultury i Edukacji
JURI	Komisja Prawna
LIBE	Komisja Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych
AFCO	Komisja Spraw Konstytucyjnych
FEMM	Komisja Praw Kobiet i Równych Szans
PETI	Komisja Petycji
DROI	Podkomisja Praw Człowieka
SEDE	Podkomisja Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony
FISC	Podkomisja do Spraw Podatkowych

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni