



AA18CR32

AS (2018) CR 32

## 2018 ORDINARY SESSION

---

(Fourth part)

### **REPORT**

Thirty-second sitting

Wednesday 10 October at 10 a.m.

In this report:

1. Speeches in English are reported in full.
2. Speeches in other languages are reported using the interpretation and are marked with an asterisk
3. The text of the amendments is available at the document centre and on the Assembly's website. Only oral amendments or oral sub-amendments are reproduced in the report of debates.
4. Speeches in German and Italian are reproduced in full in a separate document.
5. Corrections should be handed in at Room 1059A not later than 24 hours after the report has been circulated.

The contents page for this sitting is given at the end of the report.

*(Ms Maury Pasquier, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 10.05 a.m.)*

The PRESIDENT\* – The sitting is open.

**1. Joint debate: Regulating foreign funding of Islam in Europe in order to prevent radicalisation and Islamophobia / Radicalisation of migrants and diaspora communities in Europe**

The PRESIDENT\* – We now come to the joint debate on two reports. The first, from the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy, is titled “Regulating foreign funding of Islam in Europe in order to prevent radicalisation and Islamophobia”, Document 14617, presented by Ms Doris Fiala; the second, from the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons, is titled “Radicalisation of migrants and diaspora communities in Europe”, Document 14625, presented by Ms Sahiba Gafarova.

I remind members that on Monday morning the Assembly decided that speaking time in this debate was limited to three minutes. In order to finish by 12 noon, I shall interrupt the list of speakers at about 11.40 a.m. to allow time for the reply and the vote.

I call Sir Roger Gale on a point of order.

Sir Roger GALE (*United Kingdom*) – Madam President, I would like to raise a point of order of which I have already given you notice. You will recall that yesterday two points of order were raised concerning the potential misconduct of members of the Secretary General’s staff. You indicated, entirely properly, that it was a matter for the Secretary General to respond to and that he would come to this Chamber and make a statement in due course. It would not be satisfactory for him simply to include that in his statement tomorrow, because there is limited time. I will be grateful if you can indicate when he will come to this Chamber and make the statement about his staff.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Sir Roger. I can answer your question in the following terms. Yesterday evening, I received a letter from the Secretary General, Mr Jagland. It is a reply to the question raised yesterday and, according to the customary procedure, I will convey it to national delegations using the normal channels, bearing in mind that he will in any case come tomorrow to answer various questions from members of the Assembly, as you yourself pointed out.

I call Ms Fiala to present the first report. You have 13 minutes in total, which you may divide between presentation of the report and reply to the debate.

Ms FIALA (*Switzerland*) – President, ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues and visitors, it is a pleasure to stand in front of you. I apologise; I will speak in my native language because I want to be precise and sure that there are no misunderstandings. The report is too important for that, not only to me but to all of us.

*(The speaker continued in German.)*

The number of Muslims in Europe is growing. In Switzerland, within 20 years the Muslim population has increased more than tenfold to 400 000. A call for integration is justified. In that connection, it is important to make sure that we fight Islamophobia. We need mutual understanding, respect and confidence, in a country with freedom of religion. That will help to promote peace internally and success in our fight against radicalisation, moving us towards deradicalisation, which is precisely what my report is about.

In-depth research shows clearly how challenging it is for us to make sure that we are respectful of Islam and deal with it appropriately, without any preconceived ideas. There is the so-called model of the church established by law; many of us are familiar with the concept of the institutionalised church. For instance, in Germany a tax is levied on those who practise the Catholic faith. In Islam, there are individual beliefs in certain tenets and it can be practised anywhere. In Austria there is another interesting model, as I mention in the report; it is well known about in broader Europe. I visited Austria and the United Kingdom and organised extensive hearings to find out what was happening there. In addition, I put a long list of detailed questions to seven different member States: Germany, Belgium, Bulgaria, the United Kingdom, France, Switzerland and Turkey. Detailed replies came in; only Bulgaria was too late for inclusion in my report.

On 10 September I arrived in Paris for a joint meeting at which some members of the Assembly were present, where we heard about the online debate about Islam in France and the fact that influence was being

exerted, according to Hakim El Karoui. His call was for moderate Muslims to get more involved and that it is important for us to proceed on the basis of reason rather than fear.

I thank our experts warmly for their detailed and careful work on the issue, and for accompanying me on the path towards the report. There is a motion on the report, and a memorandum. There was a hearing with the president of the French Muslim association and two information-gathering missions to Vienna and London.

The report tries to see to what extent there is foreign funding for Islam in Europe, and to what extent it is transparent. If it is not sufficiently so, to what extent can that lack of transparency lead to more of a breeding ground for radicalisation? If it is a small but persistent proportion, how can you avoid people confusing different issues – for instance, the support that should be provided to the Muslim community and the development of Islamophobia? Some of the fundamental questions about foreign funding of Islam have to do with diversity of relations between state and religion, and with the organisation of the Muslim faith. We also need to look at statistics. Perhaps we do not have all the global statistics but there are certain factors that we simply cannot forget. For instance, some States are exploiting religion in order to exert influence abroad, which could prove problematic in the future.

Eight years ago the Assembly adopted a resolution on the fight against Islamophobia in Europe. We considered the different measures adopted by member States to regulate the foreign funding of Islam. On the basis of my observations, I have made some proposals. We also need to consider the question of national political expansion under the cover of Islam, which we wish to avoid. We do not want to see the development of a parallel society in our member States.

It is important for us to ensure that whatever we do is fully in line with the principles of the Council of Europe, which is the right way forward. A sweeping ban on foreign funding is probably not appropriate in a democratic society – the Venice Commission has said that a blanket ban would be disproportionate and unnecessary – which is why we need instead to work to increase transparency. The measures taken in the United Kingdom are an inspiring example. If drastic measures are to be taken, all religions and faiths have to be dealt with on an equal footing. The Muslim community should not be placed under general suspicion, which is inappropriate because it could lead to greater Islamophobia.

The question of funding should not be exploited for other purposes. Many countries are discussing how to train imams in the countries in which they live. That might be controversial, but it is being discussed. Two European studies on the integration of Muslim communities in Europe are mentioned in the report, and we need to act accordingly to prevent Islamophobia.

I thank members for their openness and participation, and for entertaining the mere idea of considering the report. Thank you for your support.

The PRESIDENT\* – I thank the rapporteur, who has five minutes remaining in which to answer questions at the end of the debate.

Ms GAFAROVA (*Azerbaijan, Rapporteur of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons*) – The radicalisation of migrant and diaspora communities became the focus of world politicians and mass media following the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks. The recent terrorist attacks in Europe have provoked intense debate on the infiltration of terrorists into recent refugee and migrant communities

In reality, the majority of terrorist attacks are carried out by diaspora members, not refugees. It is therefore extremely important that politicians do not link the refugee population with the extremist threat, and that they do everything possible to prevent the radicalisation of migrants and diaspora communities at the earliest stage.

The report concentrates on factors that influence the radicalisation of migrants, and on European strategies to prevent the radicalisation of migrants. The report's findings are important for the understanding of the radicalisation process. Contrary to common belief, European surveys show that the majority of radicalised people are not religious fanatics. Many of those involved in terrorism have never read the Koran, nor are they regular visitors to mosques. The majority of attacks appear to have been masterminded and perpetrated by individuals inspired by Daesh.

One of the main reasons why migrants, especially second and third-generation migrants, become radicalised is a crisis of identity. These young people have neither adopted the western secular way of life nor the Muslim identity of their parents. Seeking to rediscover their religious roots, they can be easily

influenced by Salafist jihadists who, through extremist ideology, give them the impression of finding a new identity.

Young migrants are more vulnerable to radicalisation than other age groups. The typical profile is young second-generation migrants, aged between 16 and 24, with a history of failure in school, a criminal record and no work experience. Young unaccompanied migrants are more vulnerable to radicalisation because they are separated from their parents. Another potential reason for radicalisation is economic and social instability. Many migrants live in segregated areas or communities and are surrounded by poverty, social exclusion and dissatisfaction, so they look for illegal ways of earning.

Discrimination is another important factor that influences radicalisation. Migrants are regularly confronted with inequality in education, employment and housing. They also face inequality in facial recognition controls in certain urban areas. After analysing all those factors, I conclude that, to prevent the proliferation of radicalisation, European governments should revise their policies to promote the social inclusion and involvement of migrants.

Education is key to preventing radicalisation. Both primary and higher education have a crucial role in preventing radicalisation by confronting misperceptions and promoting mutual understanding. The prevention of radicalisation should therefore be a regular part of teacher training. Teachers should be trained to understand and accept cultural and religious differences. Students should be taught democracy and human rights on a daily basis. They should learn how to become responsible citizens and to be actively involved in social life.

Radicalisation now mostly happens via the Internet and social networks, which is why European governments should encourage grassroots initiatives to promote the self-regulation of the Internet and to combat online radicalisation. Religious communities have a key role in tackling the radicalisation of vulnerable populations. Radicalised young people do not have a good knowledge of Islam. Recruiters present them with a distorted interpretation of Islam and, in the absence of different opinions, young people tend to believe them. The leaders of Islamic communities, scientists and mass media should therefore present counter-narratives to promote religious understanding and provide true knowledge of Islam in order to prevent radicalism.

Some European countries have launched special projects to encourage religious representatives to become involved in preventing radicalisation. In France, for example, the prefect office of the Bas-Rhin region, together with the protestant theology faculty of the University of Strasbourg, has developed training to instruct Muslim associations on how to prevent the radicalisation of young people. A more effective reorganisation needs to be considered on a national and European level, so that different religious bodies can come together to agree on joint efforts to promote peaceful co-existence.

The best way to prevent radicalisation is to explore the potential of diaspora communities to counter radical views. Society and authorities can only do part of the job. Diaspora associations can help to remove misunderstanding and distrust and to promote personal relationships and dialogue between people of different origins.

I stress the role of women in preventing radicalisation. Women, as mothers, can be the first to identify signs of radicalisation. Their voice as a counter-narrative to the radicalisation process could be decisive. However, their role should not be limited to the family environment and they should be encouraged to be involved in the shaping of policy, educational activities and community work on the prevention of radicalisation.

Many European countries have taken measures at local, regional and national levels to prevent the radicalisation of migrants and members of the diaspora. You can find in the report positive examples from Norway and Italy, where I conducted fact-finding missions, and from other countries.

The draft resolution suggests a number of measures on policy planning, preventive strategies through education and social inclusion, and the prevention of radicalisation online and in prisons. One of my main conclusions is that the fight against radicalisation should not be confused with anti-Islamism. It is very important to stop the anti-Islam rhetoric, which reinforces Daesh's anti-Western messages addressed to migrants and young people in Europe. Policies for the prevention of radicalisation and extremism should be focused more on how to ensure that migrants feel secure in host countries and socially included in societies without abandoning their own cultural identity.

Combating radicalisation and violent extremism requires close and co-ordinated collaboration between a range of stakeholders – governments, municipalities, law enforcement authorities, individuals and civil society – at all levels of governance, from local to regional and national. All efforts should lead to the protection of human rights values and the rejection of violence as a mode of self-expression. The role of local authorities and municipalities is crucial in the prevention of radicalisation and extremism. More people of migrant origin should be involved in the local police and municipalities. Co-operation and co-ordination of effort between municipalities, police and civil society is very important. Finally, interfaith dialogue in all European countries should be promoted as a tool to counter violent extremism and radicalisation.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Ms Gafarova. You have five minutes remaining.

In the debate I call first Mr Xuclà.

Mr XUCLÀ (*Spain, Spokesperson for the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe group*)\* – I congratulate both rapporteurs – Ms Fiala and Ms Gafarova – on these two extremely relevant reports. I had a number of reservations with regard to Ms Fiala's motion; I believed it might foment Islamophobia because it stigmatises a religion as a whole, but the opposite is true. It is absolutely necessary to understand the particular finance mechanisms she describes in the report. She spoke about parallel financial structures and transparency, particularly in respect of financing from outside member States. We must have strong, influential and political instruments.

Ms Gafarova's report makes interesting points that we must take into consideration on the radicalisation of young people, and particularly second generation young people. Last year, a number of terrorist attacks were conducted by radical Islamic groups, including on 17 August in Barcelona. The attack in Barcelona was managed and started 40 km from where I was born. They were second generation immigrants, just as Ms Gafarova describes. There was a simulacrum of integration, including linguistically, but they were in a different part of community life. They were apparently integrated – we thought they were integrated. Those individuals undoubtedly had a kind of identity crisis, which led very quickly through the Internet and social media to radicalisation. They were minors – 16 and 17 years old – and it is good that Ms Gafarova spoke specifically of the 16 to 24 age range.

I once again thank the rapporteurs for their excellent work and for these wonderful reports.

Mr GAVAN (*Ireland, Spokesperson for the Group of the Unified European Left*) – I thank both rapporteurs on behalf of my group. An awful spectre is haunting Europe again. It is not Islam; it is fascism. We know only too well the devastation that fascism brought to Europe 70 years ago and there are clear parallels with what we see now. Those on the far right are targeting vulnerable minority groups and all those who stand up to them. One of their biggest targets is Muslims, and their ideology is dripping in Islamophobia. One of their core hate messages surrounds the foreign funding of Muslim groups. Just like before, they are targeting religious minority groups claiming they are foreign agents and that they do not belong in this continent.

On behalf of the Unified European Left, I want to express a concern regarding the title of the report. As my colleague and leader of our group Tiny Kox has previously pointed out, it should be called "Regulating Foreign Funding of Terrorism in Europe" because, as the report says, all religions must be treated equally. Our group has no issue with the broad thrust of the conclusions in the report, although I would issue a note of caution regarding the ambiguity in regard to the Austrian Islamgesetz laws. Again, I have concerns on the basis that all religions must be treated equally. We fully support the recommendation that we increase the transparency of foreign funding and endorse the corollary – any transparency requirements should not contribute to the restriction of freedoms and should concern all religions equally.

I welcome the acknowledgment that discrimination against Muslims remains high and that they form one of the most marginalised social groups. Indeed, we should acknowledge the economic deprivation prevalent among Muslim communities and encourage member States to take steps to ensure inclusion and improvements in living standards and prospects for these groups.

We must always challenge Islamophobia and the lies of the fascists head on. The report rightly concludes that it is for Council of Europe member States to take the needs of Muslim citizens into account in terms of protecting their right to practice their religious freedom. That includes their right to raise funds and to combat Islamophobia. We all know that, although foreign funding can facilitate radicalisation, Islamophobia is without a doubt one of its breeding grounds.

Finally, I want to refer to the elephant in the room. I am of course speaking about the decades of invasions and attacks by Western powers on countries throughout the Middle East, and the senseless slaughter of millions of people in wars in Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, Libya and Yemen that continue to this day. Member States of this Organisation supported those wars. They are wars of terror in which not just combatants but countless numbers of innocents have lost their lives. The vast majority of those victims are members of one branch or another of the Muslim religion. Could that have something to do with the so-called radicalisation of young Muslims? Whether we like to acknowledge it or not, there is a connection between these wars of terror and the horrific acts of terror carried out by groups such as al-Qaeda and Daesh.

Ms PASHAYEVA (*Azerbaijan, Spokesperson for the Free Democrats Group*) – I thank both rapporteurs, Ms Gafarova and Ms Fiala, for preparing these reports, which are of close interest to Muslim communities in Europe.

I would like to talk about the most prominent general problems faced by Muslim communities and migrants in Europe. While Turkey has been embracing millions of refugees and migrants, it is worrying to see in Europe the willingness, and even the determination, to take certain extreme measures in not welcoming even a low number of refugees. Migrants hoping to find peace and calm, who face a multitude of challenges on their way to Europe, encounter, on the contrary, Islamophobia and xenophobia, and are forced to abandon their identity once they arrive in some European countries.

These challenges must be addressed by the international community. In this context, I call on member States to find effective and humanitarian policies to improve inhumane conditions of migrants, and especially refugees, as quickly as possible. Portraying migrants as inclined to radical beliefs will lead to radicalisation in some host countries. The fundamental reason for radicalisation in some European countries is a negative attitude towards migrants because of their different identity. The preservation of the identity of Muslims and migrants in some European countries does not lead to any issues, but making them choose a single identity is a cause for serious concern. This situation constitutes a breeding ground for radicalism. A high rate of participation from educated young people in Europe in terror organisations such as Daesh clearly illustrates that the root causes of the problem lie, to a large extent, in inappropriate policies pursued by some European countries.

In recent years, media and politics have been trying to instil fear in European societies in line with increasing migration movements. Closing the border gates to prevent these waves of migration, or taking measures that harm human dignity, will never bring positive results. A proper approach by the member States towards proper integration policies and immigration is an important part of the effective solution for the prevention of radicalisation of migrants. For this reason, it is of great importance to consider and evaluate the needs and ideas of migrant communities and Muslim communities living in Europe.

Mr MUNYAMA (*Poland, Spokesperson for the Group of the European People's Party*) – On behalf of the EPP, I congratulate both rapporteurs on the great job they have done.

On the first report, we are all aware that events relating to the terrorist attacks in Council of Europe member States and the mechanisms revealed in the Panama Papers investigation showed that, despite the adoption in May 2015 of updated anti-money laundering rules – the fourth anti-money laundering directive – there are still gaps in the supervision of many financial resources used for terrorists, from cash, to trading in cultural goods, to virtual currencies and anonymous pre-paid cards. The fifth AML directive aims to eliminate these gaps while preventing the creation of unnecessary obstacles to the functioning of the payments market and the financial market for law-abiding citizens and businesses. Member States are required to comply with implementing administrative provisions necessary to comply with this directive by 2020. An important aspect of the European Union's activities in the area of counteracting money laundering and financing terrorism is striving to strengthen operational co-operation between the financial intelligence units of member States. Both the fourth and the fifth AML directives contain provisions regarding important issues of information exchange between individuals.

In the second report, by Ms Gafarova, we have also observed positive elements in issues concerning migrants and the diaspora. Diaspora members can make a very positive contribution to the development of their countries and communities of origin. A great number of countries have therefore begun to establish consolidating relationships with their citizens who have left their own country, thus contributing to building a strong foundation for economic, social and cultural development of their own societies. However, we should be very critical of the radicalisation of migrants in the diaspora communities in Europe. This should be tackled effectively. Inclusion and education would minimise the problem of radicalisation.

Mr COAKER (*United Kingdom, Spokesperson for the Socialist Group*) – On behalf of my group, I welcome both of these very important reports. As we stand here this morning, we know that across Europe we are seeing a threat of radicalisation of some in our communities, but also, alongside that, a rise in Islamophobia. For the Council of Europe, those are both hugely serious challenges that we must meet. Indeed, these reports are a very good contribution to how we should tackle this.

I want to particularly emphasise the fact that, if we want to tackle radicalisation and combat the threat of Islamophobia, then we have to recognise that the vast majority of people in those communities want to do exactly the same thing. They themselves, as Muslim families, want to help us stop radicalisation in their own communities. They do not want their young sons and young daughters having perverted Islam put before them. As one of the rapporteurs said, this is not done through many mosques. There may be such a mosque here and there, as we know in the United Kingdom, but the biggest threat comes online through young people, in particular, watching videos and live streaming of events on the Internet. The only way to combat that is to work with those communities and individuals.

We, in the United Kingdom, have tried to do this, and there is also another issue that we are trying to address. I say to everybody here, how many people know much about the religion of Islam themselves? In our schools, religious education is often relegated as against other subjects. Is not part of combating Islamophobia increasing our awareness and understanding of that religion, as well as many other religions?

The reports strike an important balance between the need to tackle radicalisation, particularly through the medium of online activity, and to work with communities, and the need to say to everyone that this is about a small number of people. Islamic countries – Muslim countries – and Muslims themselves want to join with us in tackling radicalisation and trying to increase the understanding and awareness of Islam that will help us all to build the better communities and more co-operative work between nations that we all want.

Lord RUSSELL (*United Kingdom, Spokesperson for the European Conservatives Group*) – I thank our two rapporteurs, Ms Fiala and Ms Gafarova.

Radicalisation is not new. Violence and wars in the name of religion are not new either. But what is new is the advent of modern communications, mass movements of people, and the constant blurring of lines between politics as a belief system and religion as a political system. The combination of, and the clash between, those two can be toxic.

It is important to keep things in perspective. In the United Kingdom, Muslims make up 5% of our population – 3 million people – and they are very welcome. They are served by 1,750 mosques, of which over just over 100 are classified as Wahhabi or Salafi, and only a tiny proportion of those mosques have caused any problems. It is therefore essential to keep things in perspective.

My first point is that if any group – Muslims included – feels excluded, disengaged or uninvolved, there is potential for what we call in English “a dialogue of the deaf.” Secondly, as my parliamentary colleague who just spoke reminded me – he used to be a policing Minister – you have to engage with communities. How many parents from Muslim families and Christian families would like any members of their family to become radicalised? The answer is virtually nobody.

Thirdly, one needs to come down very hard if and when one discovers that things are going wrong. Paragraph 69 of Ms Fiala’s report describes that the Spanish authorities acted quickly and decisively in Catalonia having discovered that two mosques financed by an organisation out of Kuwait had been actively preaching separation, disengagement and hatred about the country that was hosting their fellow Muslims. Fourthly, organised religions are as much a force for division and despair as they are for peace, harmony and enlightenment. In particular, I strongly believe that when any religion or belief system believes – even if it does not state so openly – that it is the one true faith and that everybody else is wrong or an infidel, they are, in my view, fundamentally unreligious. It is divisive, aggressive, condescending and disrespectful to most of the rest of the human race. In other words, it is just wrong.

The PRESIDENT\* – The rapporteurs have the opportunity to reply now following the points made by the political groups. Would you like to speak?

Ms FIALA (*Switzerland*) – I would prefer to answer later please.

Ms GAFAROVA (*Azerbaijan*) – I would prefer that too.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you. You will be able to reply after we finish the speakers’ list.

I call Sir Edward Leigh on a point of order.

Sir Edward LEIGH (*United Kingdom*) – Madam President, despite this debate being one of the most important issues facing our continent, when it ends, a very large number of speakers will not have been called. I make the point to everyone that, given the money pressures that our Organisation is under, this surely shows that we have to, in a sense, draw in our horns and have fewer reports and concentrate on the most important issues. It is surely not acceptable that a very large number of people who wish to speak in this vitally important debate will not be called.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Sir Edward. We have taken due note of that. I remind you that the agenda was approved by the Assembly at the beginning of this part-session, so we are not going to spend any more time on that. We want as many people as possible to speak.

Mr STROE (*Romania*) – I congratulate both our rapporteurs, Ms Gafarova and Ms Fiala, on presenting these important and sobering reports.

It is clear that we must do everything in our power to preserve our shared democratic values. They are the foundation of our freedom and prosperity and the very thing that makes Europe such a coveted destination for refugees fleeing war and destruction, and for economic migrants fleeing crushing poverty and a lack of opportunities. Tolerance and freedom of expression are two of the core tenets of Western democracies, but they face a very difficult test when confronted with the phenomenon of religious radicalism and intolerance. There can be little space for compromise with a world view that does not allow for a plurality of life choices and the equal treatment of all citizens.

Member States ought to take measures to preserve democratic standards and safeguard groups that are at risk of radicalisation. To that end, our rapporteurs have provided a very useful list of recommended measures. I cannot emphasise enough the importance of continuous and substantial dialogue with the groups that run the risk of becoming breeding a ground for radicalism and extremism.

I am very happy to be able to offer an example of best practice from my own country. Dobrogea is a multi-ethnic and multicultural region, home to a small but thriving Muslim community. The State provides financial assistance to the Muslim clergy and places of worship, all but eliminating the need for external financing. The Grand Mufti of Romania is a widely respected person and is actively engaged in preventing the more extreme versions of Islam from making in-roads into Romania. I believe that this kind of dialogue and support for the community breeds trust, mutual respect and social peace, and it is a model that can be applied successfully in other member States.

Mr EFSTATHIOU (*Cyprus*) – I welcome both excellent reports. I note that in her report, Ms Doris Fiala rightly remarks that some countries are criticised because they are using religion for political purposes and as a means of exerting influence in a foreign country. These States are primarily Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait. What is their legitimate interest in funding Islamic institutions or organisations in another country or countries? Do the scale of funds and the obscurity in the way they are allocated comply with the interests of the democratic and equal society that Europe believes in?

I believe that there are serious doubts about whether there is such democratic legitimacy – either in Turkey's Diyanet, the budget of which exceeds €2 billion annually and which has more than 150 000 government employees, or in Iran's Islamic College for Advanced Studies in the United Kingdom, to take two examples. Do we really believe that their sole purpose is to execute works about the beliefs, worship and ethics of Islam? Their sheer size precludes that. Do we really think that we share any common values with Saudi Arabia? That is not because it is an Islamic State, but because it is a totalitarian, ruthless and undemocratic State for its own people and the people of neighbouring countries.

Therefore, the answer to the question that arises from the report is clear: there are serious concerns that the foreign funding of Islam does not serve any legitimate goal compatible with the Council of Europe, but rather leads to radicalisation and to the dependence of Islamic institutions on foreign governments and interests. For which legitimate purpose does Saudi Arabia spend \$4 billion abroad to promote Wahhabism, as mentioned in the report? The same concerns apply to a certain extent with regard to Qatar's or Kuwait's funding.

Dear colleagues, we live in an area in which we take pride of our values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law. These are our values, and they have nothing to do with radicalisation, fanaticism and the

export of any radical forms of any religion. We cannot afford division based on religion or ethnic or racial criteria. That is why we have to be vigilant when controlling foreign funding and must continually ask ourselves what the legitimate purposes of this foreign funding and the potential interests and commitments behind it are. What is at stake in some of our member States that are governed and bound by the fundamental values and principles in the European Convention on Human Rights are attempts by foreign governments to effectively hack our democratic societies with the installation of fear and hate through the exportation of jihad and a radical expression of political Islam.

I should just like to add that as European societies, we need to combat radicalisation not by degrading the Muslim faith, but through integration policies, respect for values and diversity and by investing in dialogue and tolerance and the openness of our democratic societies.

Mr CSENGER-ZALÁN (*Hungary*) – I congratulate both the rapporteurs on their excellent job. Their reports deal with Europe's biggest challenges today: illegal migration's most dangerous consequences and radicalisation and terrorism.

Ms Gafarova's report shows the factors that make refugees vulnerable to extremist organisations – primarily, social environment, identity problems, discrimination, economic conditions, cultural marginalisation and the influence of the country of origin – and underlines how measures to prevent radicalisation must be in balance with the security of the population and respect the fundamental rights of refugee communities. Policies to prevent radicalisation must ensure that refugees feel safe in host countries and that their social integration is successful without their being forced to surrender their cultural identity. Ms Fiala's report reviews the extent and transparency of Islamic foreign funding and examines the lack of transparency and control of organisations that contribute to the radicalisation of immigrant communities and ways to avoid Islamophobia.

The reports make concrete policy recommendations for preventive strategies. Hungary perceived the dangers of mass migration at the very beginning. We have not only strengthened the border guard but taken steps to filter out real refugees, accommodate them and organise their care. We also created the legal framework for the transparency and control of organisations supported and financed from abroad, regardless of religious affiliation and without discrimination, in order to reduce radicalisation and terrorism, as stated in the recommendations of the reports.

Mr VALLINI (*France*)\* – The foreign funding of Islam in Europe is giving cause for concern. As the reports point out, there is an issue with places of worship that could foster terrorism, but mosques are not the main place of radicalisation. It more often occurs on the Internet. The perpetrators of the French terrorist attacks were mainly common criminals and most had never set foot in a mosque.

I am much more concerned about the impact of the foreign funding on the integration of Muslims in European societies. If states such as Algeria and Morocco are funding places of worship in Europe, it is because they want to maintain links with people they consider their diaspora. That is not an issue, of course, and such funding is not designed to promote political or fundamentalist Islam. It is different with Turkey, however. We have seen the impact of the elections there and how the Turkish diaspora was exploited in Europe. When the funds come from the Middle East, the aim is often to promote an orthodox vision of Islam that advocates a return to its practice at the time of the Prophet Mohammed – Salafism or Wahhabism – and such thinking can lead people to break gradually with the rest of society. This is a real threat to integration in Europe.

Where foreign funding is necessary – for example, to provide for decent Islamic places of worship in place such as France, where they are not funded – it needs to be transparent and should be stopped where firebrand preachers are practising in these mosques. We can combat radicalisation by combating discrimination and promoting a more inclusive society. Stigmatisation of Muslims also fosters radicalisation.

Mr BÜCHEL (*Switzerland*)\* – It is indisputable that Islam in Europe is being funded from outside Europe, and it is good to have a report that takes note of that. It worries a lot of people in many member States, but we must avoid general suspicion of foreign funding and unnecessary red tape. We are talking about countering radicalisation, as the report points out quite forcefully, and about funding for what can lead, directly or indirectly, to terrorism. I do not wish to see Islamic radicalism in my country, but then I do not wish to see radicalism of any sort. Is that something that you want in your countries? I doubt it.

Eight years ago, the Council of Europe noted that there were Islamic organisations active in member States initiated by foreign governments and provided with financial support and political instruction by those foreign States. What has happened since? There have been so many victims of attacks carried out by

crazed Islamists. In 2010, this Chamber called for Islam not to be used as a cover for national political expansion and said that member States could expect transparency and accountability from Islamic associations. I commend those members who supported that call. They were aware of what was going on, but could they have anticipated the awful attacks that were about to happen – committed, by the way, not by atheists or Buddhists?

I am pleased that yesterday the Foreign Minister of Tunisia told the Chamber that he would be prepared to take back nationals who were in Europe illegally. If that was more than just words, it will be an important contribution to peaceful co-existence in the culturally diverse societies of Europe, but if he was only paying lip service, I am afraid that mistrust among our population will continue to grow. We, as legislators, have the power to counter this phenomenon. We must not just talk but act on this in our national parliaments.

Mr KILIÇ (*Turkey*) – Thank you, Madam President, for accommodating our request that I be moved up the list of speakers. I wish to thank Ms Fiala and Ms Gafarova for their efforts and to note that my remarks are not a criticism of Ms Fiala or her work, which I know she has done in good faith.

It is a mistake, when discussing the funding of religion or religious ideas and fundamentalism, to mention only Islam. How many members – how many of our fellow citizens in the galleries watching – have studied Islam? Have those who have talked about newspaper reports or radical and unacceptable behaviours looked at who was responsible? I am talking about al-Qaeda, Daesh – terrorist organisations, murderers and thugs. I am a Muslim. I try to practise my faith as much as I can, but I will never have anything to do with Daesh, al-Qaeda or any of these murderers. They are not a part of our community or faith simply because they claim to be Muslims.

We distance ourselves from them, but we also have to look at what is happening in countries with predominantly Muslim populations. What is happening there? Who has the right to say, “Because of your beliefs, you do not fit into this country or that country?” None of us does. I was born and raised in Germany as a Muslim. I have good friends there. We have debates in this Chamber, all of us together; but, as the report mentions, the Venice Commission says that, above all the emphasis on co-ordination on this matter, equality is very important. Are we talking about any funding of other groups in other places in the world? I understand that some of you have reservations, but Islamophobia is the problem. The labelling of others is the problem. That is the thing we must address here.

It is important to make an effort, and the key point is distinguishing between believers of any faith, or non-believers, and people who murder, kill, engage in terrorism or commit acts against our common values as humans and people who want to live together. It is not about one religion, but everybody who is in any way terrorising or killing people, not accepting others because of their skin colour or their beliefs; that is what we should be addressing.

*(Ms Kyriakides, Vice-President of the Assembly, took the Chair in place of Ms Maury Pasquier)*

Mr FOURNIER (*France*)\* – In this joint debate, Ms Fiala has come forward with a raft of proposals on how to regulate the funding of Islam. In many European countries, Islam is a new religion but has many members. It came to France after the law of 1905, which governs the separation of church and state, and has come to count as the second biggest religion in the country, accounting for close to 6% of the population or about 3.7 million people.

The Muslim community is marked by its links with its members’ countries of origin, primarily Morocco, Algeria and Turkey. That is why we should be talking more about Muslim communities in the plural. That is particularly true when it comes to the imams who are sent here, the training of French imams, the authorisation for halal slaughter or the funding of mosques, because all too often imams on secondment are civil servants in their countries of origin. They are not fluent in the French language and know very little about French culture and society. That is why they can only be a stop-gap while we await the training of imams in the countries in which they preach, on the basis of a standardised curriculum geared to the national context.

When it comes to funding, the Muslim Brotherhood plays an avowed role in Europe, and the origins of funding for many organisations are opaque and diverse. Funding to remunerate imams and build mosques often comes from the Gulf, and that has been the case for the last 40 years. In 2016, a report by the French Senate estimated that about €12 million, essentially from Morocco, Algeria, Turkey and Saudi Arabia, had reached France. Because we do not have precise accounts, it is impossible to know exactly how much of that funding is of private origin. That is why it is important that we see to it that all funding is channelled via a single institution that is authorised by the law, and ensure that the Act of 1905 is properly respected. We

should make sure that the cultural associations are more transparent when it comes to their funding. What is more, countries of origin should ensure that they channel their funding through that same institution, and flag the subsidies from specific states for specific charities. A recent report proposes that we create an institution responsible for organising and funding the Muslim faith in France. That is an interesting avenue that we will explore, and it chimes with the proposals from our rapporteur.

Ms JONES (*United Kingdom*) – It is a great privilege to take part in this debate; I thank both rapporteurs for their reports. I believe that our continent has been greatly enriched by diaspora communities new and old. Some of us speaking as members of the Parliamentary Assembly have had the privilege of living in nations other than our own, as I have. In my case, living and working overseas was a choice. For some who come to our continent, it is of course a matter of circumstance, war or hardship that brings them here. However, I believe that the bulk of people who move wish to contribute positively to their host nations.

I will use today's debate to pose a question: what can we as elected representatives of different political traditions do to make radicalisation less appealing to those who are drawn to it? Let me be absolutely clear: I am not speaking of the radical leaders, the people who hate our European values of democracy, equality and freedom and seek to destroy them at every given opportunity. I am speaking of those who are tempted to follow.

There are definite challenges, albeit different challenges, for all of us. For some of my political opponents on the right or centre right, I suspect the overriding challenge may be found in qualms about multiculturalism. It is my personal view that we need to be open, to embrace and to see our European cultural heritage not as a static phenomenon, but as something that embraces new and different cultures, mindsets, philosophies and faiths. That is something that I believe can be done while affirming the Judeo-Christian traditions of much of our continent.

My political colleagues on the left and centre left face a different challenge. I am conscious that there are many different definitions of the word secularism, and that the best includes the need to embrace tolerance and freedom. However, all too often, what we see are the very worst manifestations of secularism – an increasingly militant, indeed a fundamentalist secularism, totally unwilling to see the value and importance of religious faith and related ethical principles to so many of our fellow citizens. That mindset can drive away many people, including some from diaspora communities. Wherever we stand on the political spectrum, we as representatives need to examine issues including, but certainly not restricted to, the ones I have raised today.

The PRESIDENT – Ms Hopkins and Dame Cheryl Gillan are not here, so I call Mr O'Reilly.

Mr O'REILLY (*Ireland*) – I suppose at the outset we need to state some fundamental principles that are core to our belief system in this Chamber and in most of our parliaments. First, we recognise, as I certainly recognise in my own country, that we have a small, peace-loving, well-integrated minority Muslim community, and the same is true for the vast majority of Muslim communities across Europe. That needs acknowledgement at the outset. It must also be acknowledged that Islamophobia and fascism are alien to all our core values, and that there are sadly a lot of extreme right-wing groups growing strong across Europe that are fascist in orientation. As democrats, we have a great responsibility and a great challenge to prevent their growth, and to create societal conditions where they will not prosper.

It also merits saying that it is from the diaspora, and mostly not from the migrant community, that terrorism arises. We should not confuse the two and conflate terrorism and migration and target migrants or say that we should not integrate our migrants.

Having stated those principles, I agree that it is important that the funding issue is tackled. I congratulate the rapporteurs of these two excellent reports. Funding has to be tackled. The greater good dictates that all sources of funding should be closely monitored and, as Mr Fournier from France said, that could be channelled through a single source. It certainly needs observation and state monitoring for the greater good. No one who is bringing in funding for the right reasons should have difficulty with that proposal. We should be unambiguous about that and support and encourage our governments.

In policing, there should be ethnic liaison officers among our police services, as there are in Ireland. We need those officers Europe-wide. They can work with the migrant communities in both a positive and an observational way – the two are directly linked.

Parallel to the necessary funding and policing controls, we obviously have to address the root causes of radicalisation. We have to tackle intergenerational unemployment. We have to give financial and

institutional support to moderate Muslim groups, leaders and movements in the countries, and we have to ensure integration to the greatest degree. It is a two-sided coin and we must not flinch. It is too serious a matter to flinch from policing or from controlling funding. That must be twinned with positive steps towards integration.

Mr HUSEYNOV (*Azerbaijan*) – I thank the authors of both reports for their work on these important issues. Today, a quarter of the world's population worships Islam and the Muslim population of the world is growing. The Prophet Mohammad, founder of the religion, said that God is beautiful and loves what is beautiful. Islam is a network of beliefs founded on the principles of beauty, which also praises and propagates the truth, justice and humanism. The philosophy of Islam is against all kinds of violence, oppression and hypocrisy. It is completely wrong to have phobias about the religion of Islam, to seek negativity in it or to stand against it.

The famous idea of the great Russian and international writer Feodor Dostoyevsky is often quoted, but for some reason people often give only half of his thought. He said that beauty would save the world, but he went on to say that money would destroy it – that is to say, material interests, different policies, extortion, war and conflict and the provocations for those situations.

Let us pay attention to the political landscape of the modern world and look for answers ourselves. How is it that Muslim countries face bloody wars, endless military conflicts, refugees, misery and other serious problems? Is that happening independently, by natural causes, or is it purposefully directed? The debates on Islam that are supposedly aimed at defending the religion, even those organised on international platforms, have other unhealthy goals. They seem to defend Islam, but actually a policy of deepening the phobia against Islam is being implemented. Today, those who are most vulnerable to radicalism, military pressures and terrorism in the world are Muslims. They suffer most from the after-effects.

Behind those pressures, there are strong policies and a broad intelligence base, with the aim of carrying out their intentions with high professionalism. There is a global spider web. They create the scenarios and choose the actors. They take the most serious steps against Islam at the time they deem necessary, and they also organise the most serious answers on behalf of Islam.

The financing of Islam in Europe and across the world should certainly be regulated. Publicity and transparency should be ensured in that matter. We must fight every kind of radicalisation, and we must constantly strive to destroy myths about Islamophobia. Nonetheless, we should not be naïve. We should not forget the screenwriters, producers and those behind the scenes who pull the strings. What is visible to us in these matters is only a fraction of the truth, and it is impossible to get the right results without analysing the truth with integrity.

Mr PSYCHOGIOS (*Greece*) – I congratulate the rapporteurs on their excellent work. The ongoing argument that terrorism is connected to migrant flows is, at the very least, dangerous. It is clearly unfounded. It is a xenophobic stereotype that is not based on true facts. Rather, it is an excuse to justify the conservative turn of the European Union in its migration and refugee policy, as it invests in the risk of terrorism and thus cultivates a widespread sentiment of fear. Certain political forces in governments are attempting to cover their denial to implement the basic principles of international law for asylum seekers. In fact, there is no evidence that migrant and refugee flows increased terrorist attacks. The majority of recent terrorists were European citizens, born and raised in the European Union.

In that context, as the report correctly analyses, we need to develop counter-terrorism strategies through combating the root causes of terrorism and radicalisation, which are the wars and armed conflicts, dictatorships and totalitarian regimes, as well as poverty and hunger in many countries around the world. A fundamental cause is the increase of social inequalities within the European Union, leaving large groups of people on the social margins without basic economic rights.

Last but not least, it is urgent that we address the rise of far right and neo-Nazi parties in Europe and elsewhere, which adopt racist, sexist and xenophobic ideas and policies. Those are the true reasons that lead to extremism. We must bear in mind and never forget in this Chamber that the law of the jungle that some forces are trying to put forward threatens not only refugees and migrants, but minorities, vulnerable groups, poor and homeless people, members of the LGBTI community, and everyone who struggles for an open and democratic society.

Our answer must not be fences, denial and repression. Our answer lies in the full respect of international and European legal frameworks and standards, and in the basic values and principles of solidarity and social justice. That is why it is more urgent than ever to work effectively and collectively on a

complete integration plan that includes education, access to healthcare systems and work, as well as involvement in cultural events and sports for everyone. Only through the essential participation in social life and activities can we strategically counter the influences that may lead any person or group to radicalisation.

Mr SCHENNACH (*Austria*)\* – I thank the rapporteurs for the reports. Paragraph 7 in the report on regulating foreign funding of Islam in Europe states something very important indeed – that all religions should be dealt with “on an equal footing”. Islam is of course part of Europe. It belongs to Europe, and the Muslim communities should not be seen as being suspicious. I commend what was said by the head of our delegation and the speaker from Turkey: we need to be very clear that there is no passage in the Koran that justifies terrorism and the use of force. It is completely erroneous to say that.

We need to acknowledge that other religions, such as evangelical religions, are funded aggressively – they receive a huge amount – and we often hear about protests by the Catholic Church. We need to be sensitive in discussing this issue; we do not want it to result in Islam being subject to general suspicion.

Picking up on what Mr Kiliç has said, however, if imams show no understanding of the democratic principles of a modern society, and if they preach messages that fly in the face of what we are trying to achieve, including gender equality, that is an issue. That is why state funding of imams should be prohibited. In Germany, the training of imams with regard to the society in which they live and where their religion is practised is very important. There is a danger if imams who preach in mosques do not undertake such training. A colleague from France has said that mosques are not that important because radicalisation is happening on the Internet, but we do need to develop partnerships. I fully agree with Ms Fiala’s report that there is a danger that parallel societies are being created and developed, poisoning a country’s society.

Islam has not gone through a period of enlightenment similar to that experienced by the Catholic Church after the middle ages. Given the situation in the western Balkans and the funding provided by Saudi Arabia, we must ask why this is happening. I fully approve the report.

Mr TORNAVE (*Switzerland*)\* – I, too, congratulate our two rapporteurs: my colleague from Zurich, Ms Fiala, and Ms Gafarova.

I want to make four points. First, on the funding of Islam, as Ms Fiala states in her report, there are no overarching, aggregated statistics. There’s the rub – that is the problem. If we really want to know where the money comes from, we are able to find out. My country – I approve of this – has tried to track tax evasion in certain countries, including mine, and we have been able to find solutions and inject greater transparency into the process. If there is political will, we can do similar regarding the funding of mosques. For instance, in a recent case, it was found that Turkey had funded a large mosque in Sarajevo. The absence of statistical data is a problem, but we can find solutions if we wish. Of course, the absence of figures gives fuel to rumours.

Secondly, the effects of state funding of religions are all too visible. The French writer Malraux said that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century we would be either religious or not religious. Clearly, we are in a religious phase and it is not only Muslims who are waving the flag and using religion for political purposes. Evangelists are also doing so in the American south and elsewhere. The same is true of Catholics in Poland and the Orthodox Church. Throughout his adolescence and teenage and early adult years, Putin was opposed to the Church, but he is now supported by it. We must also consider the role of religion in North Africa, the Emirates and Turkey. It is simply not on, wherever it happens.

Thirdly, as the rapporteur has rightly said, if we are to counter radicalisation, it has to happen through education. However, people who are radicalised in western Europe are often highly educated and highly cultured; I know of some in my own city of Geneva. Education is very important – I used to be the head of a secondary school – but it is extremely important that we get teachers to teach about religions rather than religious faith.

Fourthly, I am sorry to say that discrimination against people of different faiths in Europe leads to radical excesses. That is why we need better integration. As has been said, imams on secondment, who are foot soldiers of the faith and paid for by their home countries, have extremely negative repercussions.

Finally, representatives from various Muslim countries have said that we need to do more in Europe. By the same token, however, it is vital that Muslim countries do more to defend human rights in their own countries. If Turkish representatives accepted Jews, Armenians and Orthodox people in their own country, we would be more prepared to listen to them.

I would very much like a more secular and republican solution to problems in Europe, including the protection of all religions, without exception, and avoiding State religion of any sort.

Mr GONÇALVES (*Portugal*)\* – The reports on the radicalisation of migrants deal with a crucial issue in our societies. Unfortunately, we are considering it in the wake of terrorist attacks.

Migration in Europe is on the agenda in our political debates. Perceptions of Migrants are often negative and they are often exploited for the purpose of populism and xenophobia. We need to consider in depth the question of migration in Europe, and that is what we are doing today. The reports on radicalisation allow us to understand the vulnerability of migrants in the face of the discourse and methods of extremist organisations.

Several strategies have been rolled out in Europe, particularly on prevention, and they need to be followed up, improved and encouraged. We need specific action with regard to young people, including facilitating integration and avoiding the trap of radicalisation, which ultimately, as we know, can lead to terrorism. We also need to develop the critical thinking of adolescents, including when they engage with media, and we need to ensure that they do not fall into the trap of cognitive shortcuts on social media.

The reports' recommendations for planning policies, strategies and prevention measures are an excellent contribution to the attempts to find solutions to this major challenge. I thank and congratulate the rapporteurs for their excellent work.

I know that this particular subject is not on our agenda today, but I want to take this opportunity to draw attention to what is happening right now in Venezuela, in particular the migratory crisis that has hit it. In three years, it has lost 1.6 million inhabitants, who are fleeing poverty, hyper-inflation and shortages in their shops. The continuing migratory flow has been exacerbated by the country's economic disaster. The issue affects a number of South American countries, including Brazil, Ecuador, Peru and Colombia, which say that they are overwhelmed by the influx. There is also deterioration in human rights, democracy and the rule of law. People in Venezuela no longer have access to basic commodities or services, including food, water or medicine.

Venezuela has a sizeable community of Europeans, including 400 000 Portuguese. It is important to note that thousands of people of European origin who were in Venezuela have now come back to Europe – to Spain, Portugal and other countries. In the light of that situation, I would argue that the Parliamentary Assembly needs to show its solidarity with the people of Venezuela, but we also need to ask Venezuela to authorise humanitarian assistance. We need to act here and in our countries to find solutions to help the people who are suffering in the country or are leaving the country. We cannot remain indifferent to the situation.

The PRESIDENT – Given the importance of this debate and the number of members who wish to speak, I propose a change to the agenda, moving the current affairs debate from this afternoon to tomorrow afternoon, where it would be the second item. We would then continue with the list of speakers now, continue it in the afternoon and then vote. I need a two thirds majority for the proposed change to be agreed.

Does the committee agree to the proposed change?

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – Yes.

The PRESIDENT – I have a very long list of speakers, and to make the change would allow those who have put their names down to make their speeches. We would continue with the list of speakers until 12 and then try to complete the list in the afternoon before we vote. We cannot have the current affairs debate as the first item tomorrow afternoon, as we have guests. If the proposal is agreed, I can proceed with the list of speakers.

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – It is a perfect idea, although I would like to know when we would vote.

The PRESIDENT – Thank you, Ms Oomen Ruijten.

The committee is in favour. I call Mr Kiral to speak briefly against the proposal.

Mr KIRAL (*Ukraine*) – I oppose the idea, because the current affairs debate is on the future of the Council of Europe. There are many speakers listed for that debate. I have put my name down to speak, but

I would not be available to speak tomorrow afternoon. I think that is the case for many other colleagues, so I am against the proposal.

The PRESIDENT – On any motion to change the agenda, one member has to speak against the proposal and one member has to speak for it. We have had a member speak against it. Is anyone willing to speak for the proposed change? I call Ms Fiala. You have 30 seconds.

Ms FIALA (*Switzerland*) – We agree with continuing the debate now. We think it would be good to continue the debate this afternoon and have a vote.

The PRESIDENT – We will now proceed to the vote on the proposed change to the agenda. Those who wish to change the agenda should vote yes. Those who do not wish to change the agenda should vote no. A two thirds majority is needed to change the agenda.

The vote is open.

*The proposal is rejected.*

The proposal has not achieved a two thirds majority, so I am afraid we have to continue with the agenda and interrupt the list of speakers shortly. Members on the speakers list who have been present during the debate, but have not been able to speak, may submit their speeches to the Table Office for publication. I remind colleagues that all typewritten texts can be submitted. We can take a few more speakers, so I will immediately give the floor to Ms Christoffersen.

Ms CHRISTOFFERSEN (*Norway*) – The two reports are closely linked. Recently, we have experienced tragic terrorist attacks targeting innocent people in many countries within Europe, as well as in other parts of the world. Such attacks are often committed by young radicalised persons, either operating on their own or as part of an organised network. It would be a big mistake, however, to employ stereotypes and relate such actions solely to migrants and diaspora communities in Europe. For the same reason, we would be wrong to regulate the foreign funding of one specific religion only. I therefore agree with Ms Fiala that all religions should be on an equal footing in terms of transparency on funding.

Extremism and radicalisation may occur in different settings and among migrants and natives. The terrorist attack on Utøya in Norway in 2011 is a well-known example of the latter. Another source of concern is so-called foreign fighters, who are often born in European countries. They may seem to be ideologically driven, but usually they are not. A well-known Norwegian journalist, Kadafi Zaman, has studied the background of many of these people. He found that sex and violence was more of a driving force than the Koran and Allah. In fact, they know very little about the Koran. Their process of radicalisation does not take place within a mosque. Rather, they are self-radicalised Google-Muslims. The pattern is very similar to that of the Norwegian terrorist who massacred 77 people in 2011. He was an outcast and a self-radicalised right-wing extremist.

I agree with Ms Gafarova, who underlined that the prevention of radicalisation and violent extremism should focus on the need for migrants to feel secure and included in their host countries without being forced to abandon their cultural heritage. At the same time, we should not overlook our natives being in the same situation. The problem is not people being Muslims; the problem is violent extremism. By the way, the culture of several member States is based on a Muslim cultural heritage, which is similar to the Christian heritage.

Yesterday, the Tunisian Minister of Foreign Affairs said something very important that we should all bear in mind. In answering a question about preventing the radicalisation of young Tunisians, he mentioned a national educational program that aims to raise vulnerable and exploited children's hopes and expectations for life. His words are worth noting in our European societies.

The PRESIDENT – If we keep within our time, we can take two final speakers. I call Lord Balfe.

Lord BALFE (*United Kingdom*) – I offer my congratulations to the rapporteurs. I agree with an earlier speaker that this report is somewhat misnamed. Indeed, we seem to be getting mixed up between Islam and the foreign funding of religions. My family was an immigrant family. They came from Ireland to England. I was brought up in the early days as a Roman Catholic. Every time we went to church, there was a money box there for missionaries. It was to send money for missionaries to go and convert poor, benighted Africans to the true religion, which was Catholicism, not Protestantism. It was taught with a degree of certainty that it did not deserve. I recall being told by the nuns at a very early stage that the Jews had killed Jesus and that whatever happened to them was well deserved.

We have come a long way in our tolerance, but we do still get mixed up. We forget that certain events in the Western Balkans were nothing to do with Muslims, but were a lot to do with Christians attacking Muslims. We need to step back and separate the idea of foreign funding of religions from an automatic reflex that this is about terrorism. Like the many other religions in our multicultural society, the vast majority of mosques and Muslims contribute towards society.

I want to make a brief reference to paragraph 120 and the four points within it. First, it says that Muslims are attached to the countries in which they live. Migrants are attached to the countries in which they live. My family is now an English family, not an Irish family, and something similar is the case for most migrants. We have friends from other European countries; they now regard themselves as British. Paragraph 120's second point is that Muslims have "strong ties with their countries of origin". Of course you tend to follow what happens in the country that your family came from – you probably still have relatives there – but that does not make you unpatriotic. Thirdly, it says that Muslims are "more religious" than other groups. I dispute that. The Polish and Filipino communities in our local Catholic church have their own groups and work together, because it is a base and a way of their meeting and having some solidarity. It is not just Muslims who do this; it is the way that people act. Paragraph 120's final point is that discrimination "remains high". It does so because we need better understanding of the multicultural society in which we live. The sooner we get there, the better.

Mr MARQUES (*Portugal*) – I congratulate both rapporteurs on the two reports, which are both quite balanced. In this debate we need balance. We need to work together to fight any kind of radicalism – religious radicalism and fundamentalism, but also the radicalism of those who want to block European borders. We need to settle a place where everybody can work together. We cannot concede to those who want to impose their values on Europe, but we need to integrate those with different values into our civilisation and our communities.

The diaspora network of parliamentarians is not only for members of the migration committee; each day, it should be more of a network for all members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, because that is how we can work together with non-governmental organisations and the leaders of other religions in our countries. It is only with the moderate ones that we can fight the radicals, because radicals have no place in Europe but moderates can live together with all of us. We need to work together with those who are like us and fight those who are radicals – even those inside Europe, European citizens with European origin.

We do our best to help refugees from Africa, but more than 2 million people of European descent are trying to escape the radical regime in Venezuela. We should do more for those European migrants from Italy, Portugal, Spain, England and the Netherlands who want to come back from Europe and to be integrated in our societies.

The PRESIDENT – That brings us to the end of the time available. We need to be very quick here. I call on Ms Fiala to reply. If you could keep within five minutes, that would really help because we need to finish by 12 noon and we have a number of amendments.

Ms FIALA (*Switzerland*) – Madam President, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for this very open debate. I listened carefully to what was said and, being a Catholic, I totally agree that Catholicism must have total transparency. The Pope himself says that he tries everything to provide more transparency, and we have to follow his example in our member States. That was not easy in Switzerland; I had to go forward step by step. Our report talks about an equal footing; I did not give more importance to one thing than another. I will do the same as a rapporteur concerning the transparency of Catholic money flows.

On the question asked by our Hungarian colleague Mr Csenger-Zalán, of course I would be pleased if the world was easy and we could put a fence around every country to solve all our problems. You might think it unfortunate but the truth is that all the important and common risks in the world are global: terrorism, cyber-crime, organised crime, human trafficking, refugees and pandemics. All the fences in the world would not stop those problems, so co-operation is important.

I appreciated my collaboration with Mr Kiliç, and we found good solutions on our amendments. I understand that he had to speak in favour of his country, but I remind him that Turkey also suffers from terrorism and radicalisation so we are in the same boat. You have an organisation with 100 000 people under your president, Mr Erdoğan. Please understand that many member States, including Switzerland, are

frightened about what is said in our countries. We do not even understand the language. That is another discussion, but we have common ground.

Last but not least, I come to my dear colleague from Switzerland, Roland Rino Büchel. If you listened to Switzerland's office of prosecutions, you would understand that foreign funding of Islam was a relevant question and that we should push further on transparency. It is also true that religious foundations that are under no state control in Switzerland are a problem, but I cannot speak for every country; some countries have different solutions. I would be happy if you convinced your political party that more transparency was an important approach to better security. Red tape should not impede positive action, here or in Switzerland.

The PRESIDENT – Does the chairperson of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy wish to speak? You have a maximum of two minutes, otherwise we will not get through the amendments and the votes.

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – I thank everybody for the high quality of the debate. All the speakers confirmed that this is a core topic in the political debate of almost all our member States. My thanks go to the rapporteur of our political affairs committee, Ms Doris Fiala, and to all the members for the exemplary way in which they dealt with this sensitive subject.

In the political affairs committee, we changed the initial title because we wanted to dismiss any ambiguity about the scope and purpose of the report. We wanted to make sure that it was understood to be about preventing radicalisation and Islamophobia, and not to be about the stigmatisation of Islam. I am happy that the debate confirmed that.

I thank Doris Fiala and Mr Kiliç, the chair of the Turkish delegation, for the responsible way in which they drafted the final text. I sincerely hope that this text will now be adopted without changes so that the report remains straightforward and balanced, as we want it to be.

The PRESIDENT – I call Ms Gafarova. You have a maximum of five minutes.

Ms GAFAROVA (*Azerbaijan*) – I thank everyone for their contributions. I thank Ms Oomen-Ruijten, Ms Fiala and the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy for their co-operation in this joint debate. I have listened carefully to all the opinions that have been expressed, which show the need for these reports in light of the current situation in Europe and across the world. The reports highlight the problems for everyone.

To solve our problems we must first be self-critical and ask ourselves what we have not done. Statistics show that the majority of terrorist attacks are committed by our own citizens. These people may or may not be migrants, but they are our citizens and we are responsible for them. Unfortunately, our societies have yet to rid themselves of hatred and discrimination towards migrants.

I do not want to undermine the concerns about Europe's experience of multiculturalism, particularly in relation to second-generation migrants, but we should shift our focus to the contribution of migrants to our member States. My report considers the problem of radicalisation. Radicalised people are not yet terrorists or extremists, and it is our task to ensure that they never become so. We need to anticipate changes in our societies and work to do our best.

I am grateful to my colleagues on the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons who have commented on the reports today. They have shown that this is a difficult issue and that we should follow up on our report and our recommendations. The work should not stop here. I thank the secretariat of our committee for their support and assistance.

The PRESIDENT – We now come to the first of two draft resolutions we have to consider, on "Regulating foreign funding of Islam in Europe in order to prevent radicalisation and Islamophobia", Document 14617. The Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy has presented a draft resolution to which five amendments have been tabled.

Ms FIALA (*Switzerland*) – I understand that we are pressed for time, but I want to thank the rapporteur of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons, Ms Sahiba Gafarova, for her report. She has done an excellent job. I support everything in the report, which made my report possible. It would be fantastic if every collaboration were so good.

The PRESIDENT – As always, thank you for being so understanding and helpful.

I understand that the Chairperson of the Committee on Political Affairs wishes to propose that amendment 4 to the draft resolution, which was unanimously approved by the committee, should be agreed by the Assembly. Is that so?

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – That is right.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone object? That is not the case.

*Amendment 4 is adopted.*

We come to Amendment 1. I call Mr Kiliç to support the amendment.

Mr KILIÇ (*Turkey*) – There is no clear definition of radical Islam, and especially Islamic nationalism. The two terms could easily be exploited by political groups with malicious intent, especially given the rise of far-right parties in Europe. There is also the risk of misapplication of the terms to the diaspora.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment?

Ms FIALA (*Switzerland*) – I will be tough and stick to the formulation, although we have considered all the amendments in a friendly way.

The PRESIDENT – What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – The committee is in favour, with a small majority.

The PRESIDENT – The vote is open.

*Amendment 1 is rejected.*

We come to Amendment 2. I call Mr Kiliç to support the amendment.

Mr KILIÇ (*Turkey*) – If the funding is to be terminated, it is important that objective criteria should be used. I think the rapporteur is with me on that.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? That is not the case.

What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – The committee is in favour, with a large majority.

The PRESIDENT – The vote is open.

*Amendment 2 is adopted.*

We come to Amendment 3. I call Mr Kiliç to support the amendment.

Mr KILIÇ (*Turkey*) – Islam should be treated equally with other religions. Muslim communities are an equal part of European society. Any measures that are applied should not be more restrictive for the Muslim community than for other religious groups.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? That is not the case.

What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – The committee voted against.

The PRESIDENT – The vote is open.

*Amendment 3 is rejected.*

I call Mr Kiliç to support Amendment 5.

Mr KILIÇ (*Turkey*) – In line with the principles of participatory democracy, Muslim communities should be consulted on their needs before determining the level of training and Islamic education. Our friend from Switzerland should check how many mosques and synagogues have been renovated in Turkey by Turkey.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? That is not the case.

What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN (*Netherlands*) – The committee is in favour by a large majority.

The PRESIDENT – The vote is open.

*Amendment 5 is adopted.*

We will now proceed to vote on the whole of the draft resolution contained in Document 14617, as amended. A simple majority is required.

The vote is open.

*The draft resolution in Document 14617, as amended, is adopted, with 115 votes for, 10 against and 4 abstentions.*

We now come to the second of the two resolutions, in respect of “Radicalisation of migrants and diaspora communities in Europe”, Document 14625. The Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons has presented a draft resolution, to which no amendments have been tabled.

We will now proceed to the vote on the whole of the draft resolution contained in Document 14625. A simple majority is required.

The vote is open.

*The draft resolution in Document 14625 is adopted, with 109 votes for, 7 against and 2 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT – Thank you so much for your understanding.

*(Ms Maury Pasquier, Vice-President of the Assembly, took the Chair in place of Ms Kyriakides.)*

## **2. Communication from the Committee of Ministers**

The PRESIDENT\* – We now come to the communication from Ms Pejčinović Burić, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Croatia, and Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers. This will be followed by parliamentary questions for oral answer. A written question has been circulated in Document 14631.

It is a pleasure for me to welcome you, Ms Pejčinović Burić, once again to our Chamber. This will be the last time you speak to our Assembly in your capacity of Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers. I therefore take advantage of the opportunity to thank you very warmly indeed for your co-operation and your work during your chairpersonship.

This last exchange with Members of our Assembly is an opportunity to take stock of your achievements in these past months. We are delighted to continue to play a full role in the implementation of your framework, including the high-level conference, “Strengthening transparency and accountability to ensure integrity: united against corruption”, and the parliamentary conference, “Building democratic security in the Mediterranean: Common challenges, Shared responsibility”.

I invite Ms Pejčinović Burić to address the Assembly.

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ (*Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers*)\* – First of all, I thank you very much indeed for those warm words of welcome and your appreciation of our work during our chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers. It is a great personal honour to address you today in my capacity as Chair-in-office of the Committee of Ministers.

The progress report on the advances made under the Croatian chairmanship over the past few months has been forwarded to Assembly members, so today I should like to take you through a number of recent developments that strike me as important for the future of our Organisation and of Europe. Without a shadow of a doubt, one of those developments is your deliberations this autumn on the report by the Bureau's Ad Hoc Committee on the role and mission of the Parliamentary Assembly. I am also thinking about the debate you had yesterday and on Monday on the follow-up to the report, "Strengthening the decision-making process of the Parliamentary Assembly concerning credentials and voting", which was drafted by the Chair of the Rules Committee, your eminent rapporteur Ms Petra De Sutter from Belgium.

I thank you, Madam President, for the way in which you have unfailingly sought to both inform and involve the Committee of Ministers, including on those sensitive subjects. You spoke of the importance of pursuing co-operation when you addressed the Ministers' Deputies in July and followed up on that statement of intent. At your request, the Joint Committee met again on Monday this week for an exchange of views. During that meeting, some challenged the interpretation of the rules governing credentials, prerogatives and competencies of our respective bodies, but I firmly believe that we are duty-bound to recognise, as well as respect, the important roles played by the key Council of Europe institutions. Equally, we must safeguard the best possible level of collaboration and co-ordination between them, and particularly between the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly.

Having said that, it is important that we are clear about the specific roles, rights and prerogatives of the two statutory organs of our Organisation. I am aware that there will be complicated issues to address on occasion, but am inclined to consider the Statute of the Council of Europe as our constitution. Whenever we have doubts, or whenever we feel that the text is unclear on the specific prerogatives and functions conferred on our respective bodies, we have to consult the Statute, and if necessary ask for a legal opinion. This is the case, for example, whenever we are faced with issues relating to sanctions, suspending rights of representation, or even the withdrawal or exclusion of a member State.

Many ambassadors and delegations have been in contact with the chairmanship, and they intimated that it would be worthwhile commissioning a legal analysis on issues that are as complicated and vital as the ones that I have just mentioned. That is why I personally, in my capacity as the Chair of the Committee of Ministers, along with the Secretary General, took the initiative jointly to call on the Council of Europe's legal adviser to draw up a legal analysis of the role and responsibilities of the statutory organs of the Council of Europe, with special emphasis on the limitation of membership rights. I very much hope that this legal analysis, which I gather has been made available to you, Madam President, will bring greater clarity to the issue and assist us in having a constructive and considered debate on the matter. I should like to thank the Council of Europe's legal adviser for having drawn up such a comprehensive and clear document.

After a very lengthy debate, you eventually decided yesterday to refer back to committee the report entitled, "Strengthening the decision-making processes of the Parliamentary Assembly concerning credentials and voting". Rest assured, Madam President, that the Committee of Ministers is determined to pursue constructive dialogue as well as engage in close co-operation with your Assembly. This is the spirit according to which I intend to act in my capacity as the Chair of the Committee of Ministers. It is by joining together that we will be able to address current challenges as well as safeguard human rights, democracy and the rule of law in Europe.

*(The speaker continued in English.)*

Allow me also to mention another important issue that I am sure many of us both in the Assembly and among the ambassadors and governments reflect on. The Russian Federation is a member State of the Council of Europe. However, it has chosen not to participate in the work of one of the statutory organs – the Parliamentary Assembly. At the same time, we regret that the Russian Federation has decided to withhold its obligatory contribution to the budget of the Council of Europe. I strongly believe in the Council of Europe as a pan-European platform for dialogue and co-operation, and a vehicle to promote and protect our common values and standards in respect of human rights, the rule of law and democracy throughout Europe.

Due to this unprecedented situation, coupled with some other challenges, we find ourselves today, as an Organisation, in a difficult situation, but we need to find a way forward. In the lead-up to our annual ministerial meeting in Helsinki in May next year, the Secretary General has launched a broader discussion on additional reform measures while outlining the key political challenges facing this Organisation. Given the difficult circumstances, my hope is that through this process we will be able to further strengthen its important work and help it fulfil its vital mandate in today's Europe. I remain optimistic, but at the same time realistic.

It is imperative that we come together and protect and support the Council of Europe in these challenging times for Europe – and in particular, the multilateral framework that we have built up since the Second World War. In that regard, on 3 September this year we marked the 65<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the entry into force of the European Convention on Human Rights. This was an important milestone because the Convention, as interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights, has deeply impacted on the development of our respective countries. It is the first legally binding international instrument for the protection of human rights and is central to a modern democratic Europe. It is a precious legacy which was handed down to us by our predecessors and which each and every one of us has a responsibility to protect and promote.

I know that the Parliamentary Assembly is a strong defender of the Convention system. Likewise, the Committee of Ministers is working towards securing the long-term effectiveness of the system. It is presently working on a number of issues relating to the Copenhagen Declaration. Given the obvious importance of electing judges of the highest calibre to the Court, which is fundamental to its authority, it has started examining the passage of the declaration concerning the process for the selection and election of judges. I am pleased to note that your Assembly is also working on these issues. It is our aim to carry this work forward in a spirit of co-operation and close dialogue with the Assembly.

The European Convention on Human Rights secures fundamental rights and freedoms not only to nationals of member States but also to everyone within their jurisdiction. That includes migrants and refugees. Your Assembly has taken a very active interest in migration, as is once again reflected in your session agenda, which includes various debates and reports related to this subject. The Committee of Ministers is likewise very conscious of the importance of migration issues. Last month, the Ministers' Deputies held two exchanges of views with Ambassador Tomáš Boček, the Secretary General's Special Representative on Migration and Refugees. Mr Boček presented the deputies with a report on the implementation of the action plan on refugee and migrant children in Europe, and, in so doing, triggered a highly informative discussion that the deputies will continue through an informal meeting devoted to migration issues in November. The activities conducted under the action plan, which takes a transversal approach, focus more especially on children who are unaccompanied or have been separated from their families. During the discussions, several delegations made specific reference to your parliamentary campaign to end detention of migrant children.

The protection of personal data is also an integral part of human rights. At 1 p.m. today, following our exchange of views, I will have the pleasure of participating in the opening for signature of the protocol modernising the Council of Europe convention on data protection. The drafting of this protocol was a long process that involved many stakeholders with different perspectives and interests, but we have succeeded. The adoption of the protocol by the Committee of Ministers demonstrates the ability of our Organisation to set standards, to reach compromise, and to respond to the new challenges faced by our societies. In this respect, I would like to underline the key role played by the Parliamentary Assembly, which supported this text from the very beginning of the drafting process.

Recent scandals show the dangers of the use of personal data, which may affect not only the right to privacy and the right not be discriminated against by our fellow citizens, but actually manipulate the decisions they take. I am pleased that today, 21 States will sign the protocol, and I sincerely hope that many other States will also rapidly sign and ratify it, so that the modernised convention can enter into force as soon as possible and continue to protect us against abuses of personal data in Europe and beyond. Once again, the assistance that you, distinguished members of the Assembly, may provide to accelerate the signing and ratification process of this instrument would be most welcome.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in August this year we marked a sad anniversary: 10 years since the outbreak of the war in Georgia – a conflict that unfortunately has still not been resolved. In my capacity as Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers, I took the opportunity to express my deepest sorrow and support for the victims of the conflict. Numerous colleagues from across Europe did likewise and used the occasion to reiterate member States' unequivocal support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognised borders, and to call on the Russian Federation to honour its obligations and commitments in accordance with international law. As you know, this issue, which is a standing item on the Ministers' Deputies agenda, remains a priority for the Committee. Next month, the Ministers' Deputies will examine a new bi-annual report by the Secretary General on the conflict in Georgia.

At the same time, the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine has entered its fifth year. Despite the diplomatic efforts, there has been no tangible progress in the conflict settlement and a tenable ceasefire is yet to be established. The conflict continues to cause loss of life and other types of human suffering, thus impairing the human rights protection granted and guaranteed by the European Convention on Human

Rights. I understand that the security situation remains tense in the Donbass, in the two regions of Luhansk and Donetsk. I hope that the ongoing efforts to establish an international peacekeeping mission to the Donbass will be successful, and I note that Kurt Volker, the United States special representative for Ukraine, stated in a recent interview that a number of countries are ready to take part in such a peacekeeping operation.

While the Council of Europe itself is not directly involved in the conflict settlement agreements, humanitarian issues, such as the release of detainees and prisoners, remain pertinent. The agreement reached during the summer between the Presidents of Ukraine and the Russian Federation on mutual visits to detainees by the ombudspersons of both countries was a welcome step. However, recently the process has unfortunately stalled.

Our principles on Ukraine cannot be compromised, as has been made clear in several Council of Ministers decisions on the situation in Ukraine, including Crimea. A primary challenge in Crimea remains the inability of independent monitoring mechanisms of the Council of Europe to exercise their mandate, including having access to the peninsula in order to conduct an independent assessment of the human rights situation and alleged violations. Work in this direction has so far proven difficult, but it must continue.

Although the Council of Europe does not have direct responsibility for security and prevention of armed conflicts, which is in the remit of the United Nations Security Council and the OSCE in Europe, the Organisation has worked and can deploy its efforts and expertise to reinforce democratic security and protect individual rights, which can in turn defuse or avoid armed conflict.

I would also like to mention that in August this year, a commemorative ceremony was held here in Strasbourg in memory of Roma and Sinti victims of the Holocaust. The Romani genocide was the plan by the Nazi regime and those who supported it to exterminate the Romani people of Europe. For Croatia, which has made the protection of the rights of national minorities and vulnerable groups a priority of its chairmanship, it is important to dedicate special attention to the promotion and protection of the rights of members of Roma communities. Acknowledging all the suffering endured by the Roma people in the past is important, but improving Roma rights today and in the future is also key.

Before concluding, I should briefly like to mention the other priorities of the Croatian chairmanship. Back in June, I introduced our plans to you and now I wish to give you a brief overview on what has been done in other areas. In September, we organised the meeting of intercultural cities co-ordinators on mainstreaming inclusive integration policies in the city of Rijeka. Just a few days ago, on 4 and 5 October, the regional forum on cyber-crime legislation in south-east Europe took place in Zagreb. Furthermore, tomorrow, on 11 October, the Croatian chairmanship will be organising a side event on the margins of the United Nations General Assembly, dedicated to the protection of children in the digital environment. This will be a great opportunity to present guidelines for member States to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of the child in the digital environment, which had been adopted by the Committee of Ministers in July.

Allow me to highlight once again the main event of the Croatian chairmanship: the high-level conference, "Strengthening transparency and accountability to ensure integrity: united against corruption". It will be held in Šibenik on 15 and 16 October. The conference is organised in close co-operation with GRECO. In addition, we will organise a number of events in the course of October and November, including, for example, the conference on balance in sport and achieving gender equality on 25 October in Zagreb; the conference on underwater cultural heritage in Europe today on 25 and 26 October in Zadar; the regional conference on the role of the regulatory authorities in combating hate speech and promoting media literacy in Zagreb in early November; and the Routes of the Olive Tree conference in November on the island of Lošinj.

As we are approaching the end of the Croatian chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers, allow me, dear Members of the Assembly, to draw your attention to the parliamentary conference that will be held in Dubrovnik on 6 November, organised in collaboration with the Croatian Parliament and the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. The conference will deal with challenges to the stability and building democratic security in the Mediterranean and will gather high-level participants including you, Madam President, Deputy Secretary General Madam Battaini-Dragoni, the President of the Venice Commission and the President of the European Parliament. We would be glad to welcome in Dubrovnik as many members as possible of your Assembly.

In conclusion, I would like to say what an honour it has been – and still is – for us to chair the Committee of Ministers. Next month, our chairmanship will come to an end and I would like to express the

full support of my delegation to Finland, which will succeed us. I thank you for your attention and will be very glad to take your questions.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you for your address, Madam Chairperson. I am looking forward to the questions and debate to follow. I took close note of what you told us about the considerations that caused you, as Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers, to request a legal analysis and to your appeal for a constructive debate and close co-operation between the Committee of Ministers and our Assembly.

We come now to questions. I remind you that questions to the Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers should not be longer than 30 seconds and should be questions, not speeches. I call Mr Ghiletschi.

Mr GHILETSCHI (*Republic of Moldova, Spokesperson for the Group of the European People's Party*) – On the one hand, we have the legal analysis, which caused much frustration and negative feelings among honourable members of the Assembly, and on the other hand, we have the draft report from Ms De Sutter, which was referred back to the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs yesterday. What will the Committee of Ministers do in this heated, complex and regrettable context, besides the dialogue you mentioned in your speech?

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – As you mention, I referred to this in my speech. The draft report by Ms De Sutter was an important first step. As I also mentioned, it is important to acknowledge and respect the important respective roles played by the key institutions of the Council of Europe, as was reflected in the draft report. We need to preserve the best possible co-operation, as I repeated several times in my speech. Co-operation and co-ordination between the key organs, particularly the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly, are key. We hope that this dialogue will continue and that, no matter how complicated and difficult this is and how many different opinions and interests there are, we will, as responsible people on all sides, find a solution that honours this honourable Organisation.

Ms STRIK (*Netherlands, Spokesperson for the Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group*) – Thank you, Deputy Prime Minister, for your speech. It is encouraging that the Croatian chairmanship has taken combating corruption as its main priority. As you know, we have evidence that one member State is responsible for the corruption cases that have severely harmed the Parliamentary Assembly and the Council of Europe as a whole. What concrete measures will the Committee of Ministers take to punish this conduct and to prevent it in the future, and will it investigate corruption cases in other organs of the Council of Europe?

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – Thank you. I will restate what I have already stated – it is so important that I think I need to repeat it: corruption undermines the confidence of citizens in our democratic institutions, hinders economic development and goes against the very values to which we adhere. In that regard, the work of GRECO is increasingly important, as is appreciated both by Council of Europe member States and internationally. The fight against corruption is a top priority of this institution and the top priority of our chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers.

As I mentioned earlier, we, together with GRECO, are holding a high-level conference next week on strengthening transparency and accountability to ensure that we are united against corruption. The allegations of corruption within the Assembly affected not only the Assembly but the whole Organisation. The reputation of the whole Organisation was brought into question, which is deplorable and unacceptable. We must do everything possible to prevent such things from happening again. The Committee of Ministers welcomed the Assembly's decision to appoint an independent external investigation body to look into this, and we urged member States to co-operate with the investigation. With respect to the publication of the report, the Committee of Ministers welcomes the Assembly's zero tolerance for corruption and unethical behaviour, and as I have informed the Assembly, GRECO will take the findings of the report into account in its monitoring of the member States mentioned in the report. I can assure you that the Committee of Ministers will continue to follow GRECO's work closely, as well as the follow-up to the recommendations from member States, and that the fight against corruption remains high on the agenda of the Committee of Ministers.

Earl of DUNDEE (*United Kingdom, Spokesperson for the European Conservatives Group*) – On European stability and how it might be advanced through decentralisation and localism, when you came here in June, you mentioned existing cross-border initiatives, your working relationship with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and the need to strengthen local self-government, as well as regional co-operation across Europe. Which particular aspects of that will you now draw to the attention of your successor chairman countries so that the useful progress you have made may be further advanced and consolidated?

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – My answer will be short. As I mentioned in June, we cherish cross-border co-operation, but the real work is done through the Congress. Cross-border co-operation is partly up to local communities, and so it is more pertinent to ask the Congress what it plans to do, but as Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers, I can say that we agree that cross-border co-operation helps to fulfil the important values of the Council of Europe, including building trust, co-operation and dialogue. With these smaller-scale projects, we can forge people-to-people contacts and facilitate – at least in part – better understanding and co-operation between people. That has always been pertinent, but in today's Europe, with the rise of nationalism, it is even more important. The Committee is not the body dealing with that directly, but it certainly has the power to encourage others to act and thereby fulfil the basic values of the Council of Europe.

Mr JENSEN (*Denmark, Spokesperson for the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe*) – Instead of pressuring us to make rule changes to get the Russian Federation back, should the Committee of Ministers not talk about the real problem, which is that the Russian Federation has not fulfilled any of its obligations under numerous resolutions and is in direct violation of our values? What concrete steps are you, as Chairperson, and the whole Committee of Ministers willing to take to ensure that the Russian Federation fulfils its obligations and that all our talk about being a values-based organisation is not just talk?

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – Thank you for that question. I remind you that, last autumn, your Assembly and delegations from the member States decided to initiate a procedure aimed at harmonising the rules governing participation and representation of the member States in both statutory organs, while fully respecting the autonomy of those bodies. A report was subsequently adopted by the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs, with almost all members voting in favour. The process within the Assembly is ongoing and the report has been referred back to the Rules Committee.

Having said that, I believe we need to acknowledge and respect the important roles played by the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly respectively, and preserve the best possible co-operation and co-ordination between the two. We are working very hard on that. Co-ordination and co-operation are the key words here. As I indicated in my speech, we must be absolutely clear on the specific roles, rights and privileges of the two organs. If we have doubts or believe there is a lack of clarity regarding the specific powers or functions given to the respective institutions, we must consult the Statutes or, where necessary, seek legal analysis.

However, to answer your question about what the Committee of Ministers can do on its side, there are monitoring reports that we can do. Through such mechanisms we can certainly oversee what a member State is doing. That, apart from what I have already mentioned, seems to me the most direct thing that the Committee of Ministers can do at the moment, in dialogue and co-operation and together with the Assembly.

Mr KOX (*Netherlands, Spokesperson for the Group of the Unified European Left*) – Personally, I sincerely thank you for your clarification on the position of the Committee of Ministers regarding our debate, which we interrupted yesterday but will have to continue tomorrow. Your contribution was most useful and I hope everybody will re-read it.

My question is about Bosnia and Herzegovina, where elections were held on Sunday. In those elections, at least three heads of State or government openly declared support for one candidate or another for the presidency. Do you think it is acceptable or wise that heads of State or government intervene openly in elections in a member State, or is it counterproductive? President Putin, President Erdoğan and your Prime Minister all chose the position of one candidate. Should we not leave elections to the citizens of a country instead of intervening from abroad?

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – Thank you for your question, but I do not think I can answer it in my capacity as Chair. I can answer it in my national capacity from the Croatian side; I cannot speak on behalf of others. Bosnia and Herzegovina is in many ways Croatia's most important neighbour; if there is one country in this hemicycle that is absolutely, truly and honestly interested in the stability, prosperity and integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is Croatia.

I will just mention why that is so. We have the longest external European Union border, which is 1,001 km long. We have Croatian people as one of the three constitutive peoples within Bosnia and Herzegovina. We have exchange; we are the second biggest investor in Bosnia and Herzegovina. For us, Bosnia and Herzegovina is first on the list for technical assistance and technical co-operation, by far. We support Bosnia and Herzegovina in trade. In trade volumes, we are one of the first on their list and in exchange they are sixth on ours. I could continue with that.

In our constitution, it says that we must care about Croatians living outside Croatia. In that capacity, and that one only, in addition to the fact that Croatia is a guarantor of the Dayton Peace Agreement with some other countries, we have a real base, obligation and responsibility to act in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to protect – I repeat – a sovereign, integral Bosnia and Herzegovina, helping it on its European and Euro-Atlantic path. We believe, as we believe for other countries in our surrounding area, that European integration is the best transformative power and the best way to promote prosperity and transformation of societies and to have peace in the region. Today, there are migratory flows that go through Bosnia and Herzegovina, which has recently opened as an alternative route. It was not the route in 2016 when there was a huge migratory flow, but it is now an alternate route. With such a long border, we need colleagues, friends and partners to co-operate with us on the other side.

The Croatian Government and Croatia have the biggest interest of all in peace and stability in the country. After this election, unfortunately to our mind, for the smallest of the three constituent peoples, for the third time and for reasons that I will not elaborate here, the elected representative of the Croatian people in Bosnia and Herzegovina according to the constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Dayton Peace Agreement is the member who was not elected by the Croatian people. That goes exactly against the very constitutional principle confirmed in the constitutional court ruling, where the legitimate representation of all constituent peoples and all citizens should be guaranteed. That has not been the case. We deplore that; we are very sad that it happened.

Now that we have this situation, people in Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially politicians but also the international community, need to do something that is long overdue and change the electoral legislation. That needs to be done, and of course authorities need to be put in place at all levels in order for things to continue to work. Croatia will be very supportive of Bosnia and Herzegovina on its European and Euro-Atlantic path. We think that is the best way for all those countries, but in particular it is a very important framework in which Bosnia and Herzegovina, in time to come, can develop into a fully prosperous and stable country. At the moment, unfortunately, that is not the case.

Ms PASHAYEVA (*Azerbaijan, Spokesperson for the Free Democrats Group*) – My question is about intercultural dialogue, which is an important issue. Which underlying values do you think are important for the policy of promoting intercultural dialogue in the Council of Europe area? Are new values needed? How should the Council of Europe co-operate with other international institutions to achieve maximum impact of its activities promoting intercultural dialogue?

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – I will be brief, because I was quite extensive in answering the previous question. Maybe we do not need new values, but enhanced action in fields such as education, youth policy and culture.

The PRESIDENT\* – We will now continue with the list of speakers. I will take three questions at a time and give you the floor once we have heard three questions. We will make our way through the list in that way for as long as we have time.

Mr GATTOLIN (*France*)\* – On 13 August, Ilgar Mammadov's prison sentence was commuted to a conditional sentence, which is something we very much welcome. He has been freed conditionally on probation for a period of two years, with restrictions placed on him. The Council of Europe must remain vigilant and continue the procedure initiated under article 46, paragraph 4. What does the Committee of Ministers plan to do to follow up on that matter?

Ms Aleksandra TOMIĆ (*Serbia*) – In your opinion, does the Council of Europe work hard enough to actively influence the governments of countries, in particular the European Union countries, to accept the guidelines of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance and to provide in their countries a legislative framework for the full protection of the rights of all minorities?

Ms EBERLE-STRUB (*Liechtenstein*)\* – The emphasis has been on fighting corruption. You mentioned this as something that was of major importance and a number of different conferences were organised. It would be best to draft a particular text on corruption, and to have a proper negotiation on that, in order to avoid such situations in the future.

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – I will start with the last question, which I have answered quite extensively in previous answers. We will do everything we can to fight corruption at the highest possible level, as well as at the Council of Europe, and to continue the battle in the future. It is a continued effort and a battle that never stops; no one can ever say that the work is completely done. We remain committed to the work on

fighting corruption, and one proof of that is the conference that we are organising with GRECO in Šibenik next week.

In respect of the ECRI report issued for Croatia, we have great respect for such reports and pay great attention to them. We read the report carefully. Respect for minorities, or the enhancement of the position of minorities is also a priority of the Croatian chairmanship, and – I speak now in my national capacity – we are of course paying a great deal of attention to that, which is shown, for example, by the fact that minorities are included in our coalition Government. We also have a plan of operation for each particular minority, which we check every month, and I have responsibility for the follow-up on that work as Deputy Prime Minister responsible for human rights. You should be assured that my Government will do its utmost to follow-up and tackle the issues raised in the report.

*(The speaker continued in French.)*

On the case of Mr Mammadov, we also very much welcome that an important step has been taken. The Committee of Ministers has asked for the unconditional release of Mr Mammadov on several occasions; what is more, taking into consideration the extraordinary importance of the case, the Committee of Ministers launched infringement proceedings under article 46.4 of the Convention in 2017. Proceedings are currently pending before the Grand Chamber of the Court. That is the current state of play, but as you rightly said, Mr Gattolin, we deplore the fact that Mr Mammadov spent more than five and a half years in jail in total. We are delighted that he has been finally released but, even so, we are not entirely satisfied, since he has been conditionally released and placed under probation. The Mammadov case will remain on the agenda of every meeting of the Committee of Ministers until the Court hands down its judgement.

Mr HOWELL (*United Kingdom*) – In your discussions about the future of the Council of Europe, what discussions have you had about the number of parliamentary representatives that should be represented here in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe?

Ms Mónika BARTOS (*Hungary*) – The intergovernmental joint committee for the protection of minorities in our countries has proved to be an efficient mechanism between Croatia and Hungary. How do you see the role and importance of that institutional framework in reaching and strengthening stability in south-eastern Europe?

The PRESIDENT\* – The next speaker, Mr Kandelaki, waives his opportunity to speak. I call Ms Şupac.

Ms ŞUPAC (*Republic of Moldova*) – On 6 September, seven Turkish citizens who were teachers were kidnapped in the Republic of Moldova and deported to Turkey the same day. They are now in Turkish prisons. Does the Committee of Ministers plan to take a position towards the Republic of Moldova and Turkey in this illegal case?

Ms PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ – On the first question, the Committee of Ministers has not discussed that issue, so I cannot answer that. At the moment, we are addressing the issue from a different angle, which is the budgetary difficulties. It is all linked, but they are different facets of the issue.

On the issue of minorities as bridges between countries, I come back to what I said before, which is that minority protection is an important priority of the Croatian chairmanship. It is an important issue for the Council of Europe. In my national capacity, I would say that we are committed to implementing the highest standards when it comes to minority rights. The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities is an important instrument, and we were very glad to celebrate the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the convention during our chairmanship, as well as the anniversary of its sister text, the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages. We believe that all member States of the Organisation must sustain a commitment to the Framework Convention. That is the best way to improve neighbourly relations, as well as the situation of each and every minority in each country.

On the link to stability in south-east Europe, we believe that it is very important to protect the rights of minorities. Speaking in my national capacity, we very much insist on that in the framework for these countries' integration with Europe. We truly believe that a country's democracy and attitude towards human rights can be judged on how it cares for the most vulnerable, and minorities always seem to be the most vulnerable and they need to be looked after. Croatia very much supports that.

In response to Ms Şupac's question, the issue has not been discussed by the Committee of Ministers, but I know that it has attracted attention in the Republic of Moldova. I also note that the application

for the expulsion of Turkish citizens has been lodged with the European Court of Human Rights, so I should refrain from commenting on that specific case. Generally speaking, however, I underline that the arrest, detention and expulsion of individuals can only take place strictly in accordance with the international legal obligations of member States, in particular the requirements of the European Convention on Human Rights. That is all I can say for the moment.

The PRESIDENT\* – That concludes the question time session. I thank Marija Pejčinović Burić most warmly for being here today and for her close co-operation with us, which will continue in future.

### **3. Next public business**

The PRESIDENT\* – The Assembly will hold its next public sitting this afternoon at 3.30 p.m. with the agenda that was approved on Monday.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 1 p.m.)*

## CONTENTS

1. Joint debate: Regulating foreign funding of Islam in Europe in order to prevent radicalisation and Islamophobia/Radicalisation of migrants and diaspora communities in Europe

Presentation by Ms Fiala of the report of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy, Document 14617

Presentation by Ms Gafarova of the report of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons, Document 14625

Speakers: Mr Xuclà, Mr Gavan, Ms Pashayeva, Mr Munyama, Mr Coaker, Lord Russell, Mr Stroe, Sir Edward Leigh, Mr Efstathiou, Mr Csenger-Zalán, Mr Vallini, Mr Büchel, Mr Kiliç, Mr Fournier, Ms Jones, Mr O'Reilly, Mr Huseynov, Mr Psychogios, Mr Schennach, Mr Tornare, Mr Gonçalves, Ms Christoffersen, Lord Balfe, Mr Marques

Draft resolution in Document 14617, as amended, adopted

Draft resolution in Document 14625 adopted

2. Communication from the Committee of Ministers

Statement by Ms Marija Pejčinović Burić, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign and European Affairs of Croatia, Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe

Questions: Mr Ghiletschi, Ms Strik, the Earl of Dundee, Mr Jensen, Mr Kox, Ms Pashayeva, Mr Gattolin, Ms Aleksandra Tomić, Ms Eberle-Strub, Mr Howell, Ms Mónica Bartos, Ms Şupac

3. Next public business

## Appendix / Annexe

*Representatives or Substitutes who signed the register of attendance in accordance with Rule 12.2 of the Rules of Procedure. The names of members substituted follow (in brackets) the names of participating members.*

*Liste des représentants ou suppléants ayant signé le registre de présence, conformément à l'article 12.2 du Règlement. Le nom des personnes remplacées suit celui des Membres remplaçant, entre parenthèses.*

ÆVARSDÓTTIR, Thorhildur Sunna [Ms]	FILIPOVSKI, Dubravka [Ms] (OBRADOVIĆ, Marija [Ms])
AGHAYEVA, Ulviyye [Ms]	FOURNIER, Bernard [M.]
ANTTILA, Sirkka-Liisa [Ms]	GAFAROVA, Sahiba [Ms]
APOSTOL, Ion [Mr] (GHIMPU, Mihai [Mr])	GALE, Roger [Sir]
ARENT, Iwona [Ms]	GATTI, Marco [M.]
ARNAUT, Damir [Mr]	GATTOLIN, André [M.] (MAIRE, Jacques [M.])
BADEA, Viorel Riceard [M.] (PLEȘOIANU, Liviu Ioan Adrian [Mr])	GAVAN, Paul [Mr]
BALFE, Richard [Lord] (McCARTHY, Kerry [Ms])	GHILETCHI, Valeriu [Mr]
BALIĆ, Marijana [Ms]	GILLAN, Cheryl [Dame]
BARNETT, Doris [Ms]	GONÇALVES, Carlos Alberto [M.]
BARTOS, Mónika [Ms] (CSÖBÖR, Katalin [Mme])	GONCHARENKO, Oleksii [Mr]
BATRINCEA, Vlad [Mr]	GRAAS, Gusty [M.]
BAYR, Petra [Ms] (ESSL, Franz Leonhard [Mr])	GRIMOLDI, Paolo [Mr]
BECHT, Olivier [M.]	GUNNARSSON, Jonas [Mr]
BERNACKI, Włodzimierz [Mr]	GUZENINA, Maria [Ms]
BĚRZINŠ, Andris [M.]	HAIDER, Roman [Mr]
BEUS RICHEMBERGH, Goran [Mr]	HAJDUKOVIĆ, Domagoj [Mr]
BILDARRATZ, Jokin [Mr]	HALICKI, Andrzej [Mr]
BILLI, Simone [Mr]	HASANOV, Elshad [Mr] (HAJIYEV, Sabir [Mr])
BLONDIN, Maryvonne [Mme]	HEER, Alfred [Mr]
BOGDANOV, Krasimir [Mr]	HEINRICH, Frank [Mr] (VOGEL, Volkmar [Mr])
BÖKE, Selin Sayek [Ms]	HERKEL, Andres [Mr] (TERIK, Tiit [Mr])
BOSCHI, Maria Elena [Ms]	HONKONEN, Petri [Mr] (KALMARI, Anne [Ms])
BRENNER, Koloman [Mr] (GYÖNGYÖSI, Márton [Mr])	HOPKINS, Maura [Ms]
BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR, Rósa Björk [Ms]	HOWELL, John [Mr]
BÜCHEL, Roland Rino [Mr] (MÜLLER, Thomas [Mr])	HRISTOV, Plamen [Mr]
BUDNER, Margareta [Ms]	HUNKO, Andrej [Mr]
BUSHATI, Ervin [Mr]	HUSEYNOV, Rafael [Mr]
BUTKEVIČIUS, Algirdas [Mr]	IBRYAMOV, Dzheyhan [Mr] (HAMID, Hamid [Mr])
ĆATOVIĆ, Marija Maja [Ms]	JABLIANOV, Valeri [Mr]
ÇELİK, Sena Nur [Ms]	JANIK, Grzegorz [Mr] (MULARCZYK, Arkadiusz [Mr])
ÇEPEDA, José [Mr]	JENSEN, Michael Aastrup [Mr]
CHRISTENSEN, Jette [Ms] (MEHL, Emilie Enger [Ms])	JENSEN, Mogens [Mr]
CHRISTODOULOPOULOU, Anastasia [Ms]	JONES, Susan Elan [Ms]
CHRISTOFFERSEN, Lise [Ms]	KANDELAKI, Giorgi [Mr] (BAKRADZE, David [Mr])
COURSON, Yolaine de [Mme] (LOUIS, Alexandra [Mme])	KASIMATI, Nina [Ms]
COZMANCIUC, Corneliu Mugurel [Mr] (ȘTEFAN, Corneliu [Mr])	KASSEGGER, Axel [Mr] (AMON, Werner [Mr])
CRUCHTEN, Yves [M.]	KAVVADIA, Ioanneta [Ms]
CSENGER-ZALÁN, Zsolt [Mr]	KILIÇ, Akif Çağatay [Mr]
D'AMBROSIO, Vanessa [Ms]	KIRAL, Serhii [Mr] (BEREZA, Boryslav [Mr])
DAMYANOVA, Milena [Mme]	KIRILOV, Danail [Mr] (GROZDANOVA, Dzhema [Ms])
DOUBLE, Steve [Mr] (WILSON, Phil [Mr])	KLEINBERGA, Nellija [Ms] (LAIZĀNE, Inese [Ms])
DUNDEE, Alexander [The Earl of ]	KOBZA, Jiří [Mr] (BENEŠIK, Ondřej [Mr])
DURANTON, Nicole [Mme]	KOÇ, Haluk [M.]
EBERLE-STRUB, Susanne [Ms]	KOPŘIVA, František [Mr]
EFSTATHIOU, Constantinos [Mr] (KYRIAKIDES, Stella [Ms])	KORODI, Attila [Mr]
EIDE, Espen Barth [Mr]	KOVÁCS, Elvira [Ms]
EMRE, Yunus [Mr]	KOX, Tiny [Mr]
ENGBLOM, Annicka [Ms] (ÅBERG, Boriana [Ms])	KYTÝR, Jaroslav [Mr]
EROTOKRITOU, Christiana [Ms] (LOUCAIDES, George [Mr])	LABAZIUK, Serhiy [Mr] (BILOVOL, Oleksandr [Mr])
ESTRELA, Edite [Mme]	LANGBALLE, Christian [Mr] (HENRIKSEN, Martin [Mr])
EVANS, Nigel [Mr]	LEIGH, Edward [Sir]
FASSINO, Piero [Mr] (FLORIS, Emilio [Mr])	LEITE RAMOS, Luís [M.]
FIALA, Doris [Mme]	LEŠNIAK, Józef [M.] (MILEWSKI, Daniel [Mr])

LĪBINA-EGNERE, Inese [Ms]  
 LINK, Michael [Mr] (*JENSEN, Gyde [Ms]*)  
 LOGVYNSKYI, Georgii [Mr]  
 LOMBARDI, Filippo [M.]  
 LOPUSHANSKYI, Andrii [Mr] (*ARIEV, Volodymyr [Mr]*)  
 LOUHELAINEN, Anne [Ms] (*PELKONEN, Jaana Maarit [Ms]*)  
 LUPU, Marian [Mr]  
 MADISON, Jaak [Mr] (*ZZ...*)  
 MANIERO, Alvise [Mr]  
 MARKOVIĆ, Milica [Mme]  
 MARQUES, Duarte [Mr]  
 MASSEY, Doreen [Baroness]  
 MELKUMYAN, Mikayel [M.] (*RUSTAMYAN, Armen [M.]*)  
 MERGEN, Martine [Mme] (*HETTO-GAASCH, Françoise [Mme]*)  
 MIKKO, Marianne [Ms]  
 MILADINOVIĆ, Stefana [Ms] (*OBRADOVIĆ, Žarko [Mr]*)  
 MONTILLA, José [Mr] (*GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio [Mr]*)  
 MULLEN, Rónán [Mr] (*COWEN, Barry [Mr]*)  
 MUÑOZ, Esther [Ms] (*BARREIRO, José Manuel [Mr]*)  
 MUNYAMA, Killion [Mr] (*POMASKA, Agnieszka [Ms]*)  
 MURRAY, Ian [Mr]  
 NAUDI ZAMORA, Víctor [M.]  
 NENUTIL, Miroslav [Mr]  
 NISSINEN, Johan [Mr]  
 OBREMSKI, Jarosław [Mr] (*WOJTYŁA, Andrzej [Mr]*)  
 OEHME, Ulrich [Mr] (*KLEINWAECHTER, Norbert [Mr]*)  
 OHLSSON, Carina [Ms]  
 OOMEN-RUIJTEN, Ria [Ms]  
 O'REILLY, Joseph [Mr]  
 ORLANDO, Andrea [Mr]  
 PACKALÉN, Tom [Mr]  
 PANTIĆ PILJA, Biljana [Ms]  
 PASHAYEVA, Ganira [Ms]  
 PAVIČEVIĆ, Sanja [Ms] (*SEKULIĆ, Predrag [Mr]*)  
 PISCO, Paulo [M.]  
 POCIEJ, Aleksander [M.] (*KLICH, Bogdan [Mr]*)  
 PODERYS, Virgilijus [Mr] (*TAMAŠUNIENĖ, Rita [Ms]*)  
 PSYCHOGIOS, Georgios [Mr] (*TZAVARAS, Konstantinos [M.]*)  
 PUTICA, Sanja [Ms]  
 RAMPI, Roberto [Mr]  
 RAUCH, Isabelle [Mme] (*GAILLOT, Albane [Mme]*)  
 RIBERAYGUA, Patricia [Mme]  
 RODRÍGUEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Melisa [Ms]  
 ROJHAN GUSTAFSSON, Azadeh [Ms] (*KARLSSON, Niklas [Mr]*)  
 RUSSELL, Simon [Lord] (*PRESCOTT, John [Mr]*)  
 ŞAHİN, Ali [Mr]  
 SCHÄFER, Axel [Mr]  
 SCHENNACH, Stefan [Mr]  
 SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER, Elisabeth [Mme] (*FRIDEZ, Pierre-Alain [M.]*)  
 SCHOU, Ingjerd [Ms]  
 SCHWABE, Frank [Mr]  
 ŠEŠELJ, Aleksandar [Mr]  
 SIDALI, Zeki Hakan [Mr]  
 SIRAKAYA, Zafer [Mr]  
 SMITH, Angela [Ms]  
 SOBOLEV, Serhiy [Mr]  
 SOLEIM, Vetle Wang [Mr] (*WOLD, Morten [Mr]*)  
 STIER, Davor Ivo [Mr]  
 STRIK, Tineke [Ms]  
 STROE, Ionuț-Marian [Mr]  
 ŠUPAC, Inna [Ms]  
 TOMIĆ, Aleksandra [Ms]

TOMIĆ, Violeta [Ms] (*ŠKOBERNE, Jan [Mr]*)  
 TORNARE, Manuel [M.] (*MAURY PASQUIER, Liliane [Mme]*)  
 TRISSE, Nicole [Mme]  
 TRUSKOLASKI, Krzysztof [Mr]  
 TÜRKEŞ, Yıldırım Tuğrul [Mr]  
 VALENTA, Jiří [Mr] (*STANĚK, Pavel [Mr]*)  
 VALLINI, André [M.] (*LAMBERT, Jérôme [M.]*)  
 VAREIKIS, Egidijus [Mr]  
 VEN, Mart van de [Mr]  
 VOGT, Günter [Mr] (*WENAWESER, Christoph [Mr]*)  
 WASERMAN, Sylvain [M.]  
 XUCLÀ, Jordi [Mr] (*MATARÍ, Juan José [M.]*)  
 YEMETS, Leonid [Mr]  
 YENEROĞLU, Mustafa [Mr]  
 YILDIZ, Zeynep [Ms] (*GÜNAY, Emine Nur [Ms]*)  
 ZINGERIS, Emanuelis [Mr]  
 ZRINZO AZZOPARDI, Stefan [Mr] (*MALLIA, Emanuel [Mr]*)

#### Also signed the register / Ont également signé le registre

#### Representatives or Substitutes not authorised to vote / Représentants ou suppléants non autorisés à voter

ANTL, Miroslav [M.]  
 COAKER, Vernon [Mr]  
 CORREIA, Telmo [M.]  
 GOLUB, Vladyslav [Mr]  
 KATSIKIS, Konstantinos [Mr]  
 MANNINGER, Jenő [Mr]  
 MASIULIS, Kęstutis [Mr]  
 PALLARÉS, Judith [Ms]  
 RUSTAMYAN, Armen [M.]  
 SHEPPARD, Tommy [Mr]  
 VENIZELOS, Evangelos [M.]  
 VICKERS, Martin [Mr]  
 WALLINHEIMO, Sinuhe [Mr]  
 WHITFIELD, Martin [Mr]  
 ZAVOLI, Roger [Mr]

#### Observers / Observateurs

HARDER, Rachael [Ms]  
 WHALEN, Nick [Mr]

#### Partners for democracy / Partenaires pour la démocratie

ALAZZAM, Riad [Mr]  
 ALQAWASMI, Sahar [Ms]  
 AMRAOUI, Allal [M.]  
 BOUANOU, Abdellah [M.]  
 CHAGAF, Aziza [Mme]  
 HAMIDINE, Abdelali [M.]  
 LEBBAR, Abdesselam [M.]  
 MUFLIH, Haya [Ms]  
 SABELLA, Bernard [Mr]

**Representatives of the Turkish Cypriot Community (In accordance to Resolution 1376 (2004) of the Parliamentary Assembly) / Représentants de la communauté chypriote turque (Conformément à la Résolution 1376 (2004) de l'Assemblée parlementaire)**  
 CANDAN Armağan  
 SANER Hamza Ersan