

The Government's response to the communication issued by the European Commission

On 28 February 2019 the European Commission released another communication in relation to the Government's information campaign. In this it actually confirmed the existence of plans and proposals which would increase immigration into Europe. One of the statements in the Brussels communication is extraordinarily revealing, as it declares that *"there must still be legal pathways"* for migration. This is not a secret conspiracy, but open cooperation in order to increase immigration. The evidence for the Government's claims can be found in public communications, publicly accessible statements, and the minutes of voting sessions in European Union bodies. The European Commission claims that none of this has anything to do with George Soros. This claim is contradicted by the fact that Brussels' plans are in alignment with proposals previously made public by the billionaire speculator. It is an undeniable fact that over the past few years Mr. Soros has met Brussels commissioners on more than twenty occasions.

1. Proposals for mandatory migrant relocation quotas have not been withdrawn

Mandatory relocation quotas have been continuously on the agenda since 2015. In May 2015 the European Commission adopted the European Migration Strategy, which referred to a *"temporary relocation mechanism"* in order *"to ensure a fair and balanced participation of all Member States"*. This strategy also included a formula for determining the quotas. Jean-Claude Juncker, President of the European Commission, commented, *"We want to go much further: we want to set up a permanent mechanism which is triggered automatically in emergency situations."* Accordingly,



on 4 May 2016 the Commission introduced its proposal for reforming the Dublin system, which by then included an automatic distribution mechanism without an upper limit on numbers. The application of the so-called “Juncker formula” – which would be triggered by a migration influx of 1.2 million people into Europe within one year – prescribed the resettlement in Hungary of more than 15,000 per year. On 16 November 2017 the European Parliament (EP) also voted for the introduction of the migrant quotas, and the related legislative process is still under way.

This means that it is the continuing intention of Brussels to distribute immigrants across Europe on the basis of quotas; and the European Commission itself does not deny this. In its communication, it refers to the legislative process as “*discussions*”, while the monetary fine featured in the proposals is described as “*solidarity*”. This, however, does not change the facts. The fine known as a “solidarity contribution” could amount to as much as EUR 100,000 for every migrant a Member State fails to take in.

In its latest communication, the European Commission also stresses that “*all should show some form of solidarity*”. In this context, in a press release issued last December the Commission stated that “*a safety net must be built into the system*” for when there are migration flows, and that this should ensure that “*real support can be guaranteed to the Member State concerned*”. In this system, the effective balance would be insured “*by means of allocation, including of persons arriving or disembarked at the external borders.*”

The Commission’s falsely claims that in the European Council Hungary had a say in the decision on quotas for the distribution of a fixed number of migrants. The truth is that at an earlier meeting of the European Council Hungary exercised its veto, but this was circumvented: through a further proposal the Commission devised the transfer of the debate to a lower level, at which it proved possible to disregard the opinion of those opposed to the scheme.



The position of the Hungarian government remains unchanged: Brussels is unlawfully seeking to force the quotas on our country.

2. Member States' rights to defend their borders would be overridden

In 2018 the Commission presented another proposal which sought to reform the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (Frontex), in the process of which Member States' sovereignty would be curtailed. In this context, the German chancellor said the following in the Bundestag on 12 September 2018: *“Jean-Claude Juncker has already put forward a proposal which states that Frontex must be reinforced. However, this also means [...] that Member States on the external border of the EU must give up their national competencies in order to give Frontex truly comprehensive competencies”*. Indeed, in the European Parliament on 13 November 2018 the Chancellor confirmed her position, saying that *“In this area, too, we need to forego our national competences to some degree and work together”*.

So Brussels wants to ensure that Member States transfer some of their border defence rights to Frontex. On its official website, the Commission states that it *“may decide [...] to entrust the Agency [Frontex] with carrying out appropriate operational measures”*. This proposal is dangerous because, contrary to practice up until now, it allows the Commission to order a Frontex intervention in Member States on the EU's external borders without the Council's approval. This would violate the sovereignty of Member States on the Schengen Area's borders – including Hungary. Furthermore, Brussels would also facilitate the influx of migrants by creating legal pathways for migration.

It is no coincidence that, ever since the beginning of the migration crisis, European Commission bureaucrats have regularly spoken of “border management”, rather than “border defence”. This in fact means that they want to manage migration, rather than halt it. This is also confirmed in their latest response to the Government's information campaign. An article written by Commissioner



for Migration Dimitris Avramopoulos and published in December 2017 is further proof of this approach. In it he wrote: *“It is time to face the truth. We cannot and will never be able to stop migration.”* Earlier, President of the Commission Jean-Claude Juncker had also said that Europe *“will never be a fortress”*.

The weakening of rights to border defence is in harmony with Jean-Claude Juncker’s statement of August 2016, in which he said, *“Borders are the worst invention ever made by politicians.”* Before this George Soros had published an article in which he stated: *“Our plan treats the protection of refugees as the objective and national borders as the obstacle”*.

3. The European Commission itself supported the introduction of migrant visas

Inexplicably, the European Commission denies plans related to the introduction of migrant visas. It does so despite the fact that a few years ago Commissioner for Migration Dimitris Avramopoulos stated that *“the Commission is already committed to exploring new avenues, in particular the possibility of developing a common approach to issuing humanitarian visas”*.

This means that for some time the Commission has been working on the introduction of a visa which would allow migrants to apply at EU embassies in third countries for visas which would entitle them to enter the territory of the EU, if the purpose of their entry is to claim asylum.

The European Parliament’s Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) officially initiated the introduction of humanitarian visas on 10 October 2018. *“The document is the result of a broad compromise, with which we are sending a message to people who are in the most vulnerable situation”*, said rapporteur Juan Fernando López Aguilar. However, at the plenary session of the European Parliament of 14 November 2018, his proposal failed to obtain the absolute majority which was required for adoption. The Brussels bureaucracy treated

this issue as a particular priority, which is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the proposal was put to the vote again in the EP on 11 December, when it was adopted with a large majority.

According to the report adopted by the European Parliament, there is a “*pressing need for safe and legal pathways to the Union, of which the European Humanitarian Visa should be one*”. Therefore this is a proposal seeking to enable as many immigrants as possible to enter the territory of the European Union as swiftly and easily as possible.

On 19 February this year, in its first response to the Government’s information campaign, the European Commission claimed that “*there are zero plans*” in the EU regarding the humanitarian visa. This denial has no basis in reality. The Commission has once again denied the existence of an ongoing legislative process. In its second communication, the Commission admitted that “*the European Parliament earlier adopted a decision asking the Commission to present a proposal on the introduction of so-called humanitarian visas*”. Taking into consideration the migration commissioner’s words, the EP’s decision and the circumstances in which it was adopted, it is clear that the issue of migrant visas is still on the agenda in Brussels institutions.

4. No one is denying that more money is being given to organisations supporting migration

It is a revealing fact that even in its latest communication related to the Hungarian government’s information campaign, the Commission does not deny that, in the EU’s multiannual budget for 2021–2027, funding provided to pro-immigration activist groups will increase significantly. It is widely known that on 17 January the European Parliament decided to increase funding for political activist groups: they will be given a total of EUR 1.8 billion, or some HUF 570 billion. Experience shows that such funding is mostly granted to organisations which support immigration. According to data on the European

Commission's official website, earlier the Commission provided funding for an organisation which has been taking part in the implementation of the migrant bank card programme. The Commission's proposed legislation published on 30 May 2018 in relation to the Rights and Values Programme – which focuses on supporting non-governmental organisations – specifically mentions promotion of the integration of migrants and the fight against hate speech. What is perhaps less well known is that in 2016 a pan-European pro-immigration political activist group called Liberties – which is sponsored by George Soros – made a proposal for the establishment of an EU fund for organisations like theirs.

5. Tens of thousands of immigrants are already receiving prepaid debit cards

In its latest communication, the European Commission itself admitted that it is also financing the migrant bank card programme. This means that European taxpayers are also financing the programme. The essence of the migrant bank card programme is that immigrants receive anonymous prepaid debit cards. The Commission claims that *“EU aid does not encourage migration”*. The body states that cards are only issued to refugees and asylum-seekers who are in Greece legally. This is yet another example of blurring the line between refugees and economic migrants: economic migrants also submit asylum applications; but submission of an asylum application does not in itself mean that the applicant is a refugee. If an immigrant's entry into Europe is for economic reasons rather than to escape real persecution, such a bank card can indeed act as an incentive for them. This means that the migrant debit card programme is yet another invitation to illegal immigrants.

The Commission continues to claim that *“There are no anonymous debit cards”*. However, they themselves admit that the only form of identification is a number. It is also far from irrelevant that the anonymous nature of the cards runs counter to EU regulations on the prevention of money laundering and terrorist financing.



So while the Commission expects EU nationals to observe the relevant stringent regulations to the letter, it does not expect the same from migrants whose identities are often impossible to establish.

This scheme involves a huge number of people: according to the latest report in January, almost 64,000 people have received funds via the migrant debit card scheme.

6. They want to legalise migration with pilot projects

In a communication issued on 12 September 2018, the European Commission suggests to Member States that they launch pilot programmes with African countries. The purpose of these is *“replacing irregular and unsafe pathways with legal, orderly and safe channels”*. This clearly shows that the European Commission is seeking to find ways to legalise migration, rather than to halt it.

In its current communication, the Commission admits that it has proposed the establishment of an EU framework system for resettlement from outside Europe, but now it denies that it is seeking to make this mandatory. And yet the European Commission’s communication of 4 December 2018 reads as follows: *“the Union Resettlement Framework Regulation [...] will replace the current ad-hoc schemes and set EU-wide two-year plans”* for resettling migrants.

The purpose of the pilot projects is to enable more immigrants to work in Europe. This means that leaders in Brussels look upon immigration as an opportunity, rather than as a threat. In his State of the Union speech last year, the President of the European Commission himself spoke about *“the need to open legal pathways to the Union”*.

7. Funding for countries opposed to immigration would be reduced in a number of ways

The European Commission is not telling the truth when it says that *“EU funding is in no way linked to support for or opposition to migration”*. The Commission unintentionally revealed its own plans when it acknowledged that during allocation of cohesion funds it will take into account the amount of *“net migration from outside the EU in the [given] country since 2013”*.

Brussels plans to ensure that from 2021 to 2027 countries receiving migrants receive more EU funding than they did earlier, and that Member States rejecting migration receive less funding than previously. In May 2018 the European Commission proposed that, in addition to per capita GDP, a criterion for determining the amount of EU funding a Member State receives should be the number of migrants it has admitted. Indeed in Lisbon in December 2018, Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission, went even further, saying: *“in the Structural Funds of the next Commission, a substantial part shall also be directed to helping cities and regions to integrate newcomers”*.

Brussels would subject countries that reject immigration to a double withholding of funds: countries which do not accept migrants would be penalised both as part of cohesion policy, and also under the new Dublin system. According to a Commission proposal presented on 4 May 2016, countries which do not take part in the quota system seeking to distribute immigrants would be required to pay enormous penalties. On 16 November 2017 the European Parliament itself voted for a proposal relating to such penalties.

The Hungarian government will follow the path of open dialogue, even if this involves disputes. We are committed Europeans, and reject surrender. We want a Europe which respects the rights of nation states, builds on its Christian values, protects its communities, and is also able to preserve its security in the long term. This is why we shall make our voice heard whenever we believe that these principles are in danger.

