



2017/2131(INL)

26.3.2018

AMENDMENTS

1 - 76

Draft opinion

Petra Kammerevert

The situation in Hungary (pursuant to the European Parliament resolution of 17 May 2017)

(2017/2131(INL))

Amendment 1
Milan Zver

Draft opinion
Paragraph –1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Recalls that according to Article 165 of the TFEU the Union shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Recalls that, in April 2017, following the adoption of the Act amending the National Higher Education Act in Hungary, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe asked the Venice Commission for an opinion and that in its conclusions the Venice Commission stated that the introduction of more stringent rules coupled with strict deadlines and severe legal consequences, for foreign universities which were already established in Hungary and had been lawfully operating there for many years, appeared highly problematic from the standpoint of rule of law and

deleted

Amendment 3
Milan Zver

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recalls that, in April 2017, following the adoption of the Act amending the National Higher Education Act in Hungary, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe asked the Venice Commission for an opinion and that in its conclusions the Venice Commission stated that the introduction of more stringent rules coupled with strict deadlines and severe legal consequences, for foreign universities which were already established in Hungary and had been lawfully operating there for many years, appeared highly problematic from the standpoint of rule of law and fundamental rights principles and guarantees.

Amendment

1. Recalls that, in April 2017, following the adoption of the Act amending the National Higher Education Act in Hungary, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe asked the Venice Commission for an opinion and that in its conclusions the Venice Commission ***acknowledged that, in the absence of unified European norms or models in the field, it belongs to the Hungarian state to establish, and periodically review, the most appropriate regulatory framework applicable to foreign universities on its territory, and to seek to improve this framework. Also, it is up to the Hungarian authorities to assess when and whether this framework needs to be updated and adapted to new challenges. The Commission also*** stated that the introduction of more stringent rules coupled with strict deadlines and severe legal consequences, for foreign universities which were already established in Hungary and had been lawfully operating there for many years, appeared highly problematic from the standpoint of rule of law and fundamental rights principles and guarantees.

Amendment 4
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recalls that, in April 2017, following the adoption of the Act amending the National Higher Education Act in Hungary, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe asked the Venice Commission for an opinion and that in its conclusions the Venice Commission stated that the introduction of more stringent rules coupled with strict deadlines and severe legal consequences, for foreign universities which were already established in Hungary and had been lawfully operating there for many years, ***appeared highly*** problematic from the standpoint of ***rule of law and fundamental rights principles and guarantees***.

Amendment

1. Recalls that, in April 2017, following the adoption of the Act amending the **2011** National Higher Education Act in Hungary, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe asked the Venice Commission for an opinion and that in its conclusions the Venice Commission stated that the introduction of more stringent rules coupled with strict deadlines and severe legal consequences, for foreign universities which were already established in Hungary and had been lawfully operating there for many years, ***might be*** problematic from the standpoint of ***freedom of education***;

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

1a. Points out, however, that the amendment to the 2011 National Higher Education Act adopted by the Hungarian Parliament on 4 April 2017 affects only six foreign universities established in Hungary and imposes on them certain obligations which are intended to enable the authorities to scrutinise the lawfulness and the quality of the teaching they provide, in particular by insisting on the conclusion of bilateral agreements

Amendment

*between the State of origin and Hungary
and the issuing of work permits for
teachers who are not EU citizens;*

Or. fr

Amendment 6

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

*1a. Recalls that, the Venice
Commission guidelines and opinions are
not binding and may, but need not be,
considered by the governments of the
Member States; notes that the Hungarian
Government is sovereign in its actions;*

Or. en

Amendment 7

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

*1b. Recalls that the Government of
Hungary was elected with a two-thirds
majority and continues to enjoy
increasing support; whereas the current
Hungarian Government has a strong
democratic mandate to pursue
educational reform;*

Or. en

Amendment 8

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Stresses that pursuant to Article 5 of the TEU, which lays down the principle of subsidiarity in areas which do not fall within its exclusive competence, the Union acts only if and in so far as the objectives of the intended action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities; ***notes, however, that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;***

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Petra Kammerevert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the *relevant* US authorities; *notes*, however, that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;

Amendment

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the US authorities *responsible for Central European University; deplores*, however, *the fact* that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;

Or. de

Amendment 11
Milan Zver

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to *some of* the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities; notes, however, that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;

Amendment

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities; notes, however, that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities; notes, however, that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;

Amendment

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher Education Act, ***which was the main obstacle identified by the Venice Commission in its decision of 7 October 2017***, and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities; notes, however, that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act ***and that it has no reason to do so, in particular in the absence of a definitive ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union***;

Or. fr

Amendment 13
Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher

Amendment

2. Acknowledges that the Hungarian Government has acceded to some of the demands in the Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 May 2017 on the situation in Hungary, notably as regards the suspension of the deadlines established in the Act amending the National Higher

Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities; notes, however, that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;

Education Act and the launching of a dialogue with the relevant US authorities; notes *with concern*, however, *that the agreement between Hungary and the government of the Central European University's country of seat has been ready since last year and still not signed by the Hungarian Prime Minister; notes furthermore* that the Hungarian Government has not rescinded the Act amending the National Higher Education Act;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Petra Kammerevert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Notes, further, that suspending deadlines is not conducive to planning certainty for universities, their teaching staff and students; points out, in that connection, that the Hungarian authorities called off at the last minute a visit to the US State of New York scheduled for 2 March 2018, the purpose of which was to have been to allay the Hungarian Government's remaining reservations about Central European University; calls, therefore, on the Hungarian Government to reschedule the visit for a date in the near future and to sign the cooperation agreement which has already been negotiated with the US State of New York so that Central European University can carry out its work properly;

Or. de

Amendment 15

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Regrets deeply *that* the Commission's attempts to settle the legal dispute with the Hungarian Government *have not met with success so far and that the Commission was forced to initiate proceedings* before the Court of Justice of the European Union, *since the Act amending the National Higher Education Act runs counter to internal market freedoms, notably the freedom to provide services and the freedom of establishment, and to the right to academic freedom, the right to education and the freedom to conduct business, enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;*

Amendment

3. Regrets deeply the Commission's attempts to settle the legal dispute with the Hungarian Government before the Court of Justice of the European Union;

Or. en

Amendment 16

Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Regrets deeply* that the Commission's attempts to settle the legal dispute with the Hungarian Government *have not met with success so far and that the Commission was forced to initiate proceedings before the Court of Justice of the European Union, since the Act amending the National Higher Education Act runs counter to internal market freedoms, notably the freedom to provide services and the freedom of establishment,*

Amendment

3. *Notes* that the Commission's attempts to settle the legal dispute with the Hungarian Government *have led to a constructive dialogue on* the Act amending the National Higher Education Act, *as the latter could undermine* the right to academic freedom and the *right to education* enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;

and to the right to academic freedom, the right to education and the freedom to conduct business, enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;

Or. fr

Amendment 17
Michaela Šojdrová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Regrets *deeply that the Commission's attempts to settle* the legal dispute *with the* Hungarian Government have not *met with success* so far *and that* the Commission *was forced to initiate* proceedings before the Court of Justice of the European Union, *since the Act amending the National Higher Education Act runs* counter to internal market freedoms, notably the freedom to provide services and the freedom of establishment, and to the right to academic freedom, the right to education and the freedom to conduct business, enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;

Amendment

3. Regrets *that* the legal dispute *between the Commission and* Hungarian Government *concerning the Act amending the National Higher Education Act* have not *been settled* so far, *leading to initiation by* the Commission *of* proceedings before the Court of Justice of the European Union; *Hungary has the right to have her own* education laws *but those must not* counter to internal market freedoms, notably the freedom to provide services and the freedom of establishment, and to the right to academic freedom, the right to education and the freedom to conduct business, enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Milan Zver

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. ***Regrets deeply that the Commission's attempts to settle the legal dispute with the Hungarian Government have not met with success so far and that the Commission was forced to initiate proceedings before the Court of Justice of the European Union, since the Act amending the National Higher Education Act runs counter to internal market freedoms, notably the freedom to provide services and the freedom of establishment, and to the right to academic freedom, the right to education and the freedom to conduct business, enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;***

3. ***Acknowledges that the Commission initiated an infringement procedure because according to the evaluation of the Commission the Act amending the National Higher Education Act runs counter to internal market freedoms, notably the freedom to provide services and the freedom of establishment, and to the right to academic freedom, the right to education and the freedom to conduct business, enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union; notes that the Hungarian Government does not agree with the evaluation of the Commission and that therefore the Commission decided to bring the case to the European Court of Justice; acknowledges that the legal procedure is ongoing;***

Or. en

Amendment 19
Michaela Šojdrová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Notes that in respect of the rule of law and appropriate procedures, it is advisable to await the CJEU decision on the Higher Education Act and then accordingly urge the Hungarian Government to find a legislative solution compatible with the EU Internal Market freedoms; notwithstanding the CJEU decision, calls the Hungarian Government to unblock and pursue the conclusion of agreement with the New York State on the Central European University;

Or. en

Amendment 20

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Expresses its regret, that the Commission often applies double standards for introducing solutions that are also applied in other Member States; therefore considers that the Commission's targeting of Hungary is unjustified and politically driven;

Or. en

Amendment 21

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Stresses, in accordance with the principle of sincere cooperation, that the Hungarian Government is engaging in exhaustive dialogue with the Commission on current reforms and is providing comprehensive explanations in this regard; stresses that Hungary has responded in a comprehensive and timely manner to all inquiries made by the Commission;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. Stresses that the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union applies to actions of the EU and the Member States when implementing EU legislation; stresses that Declaration No 1 concerning the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union stipulates that ‘the Charter does not extend the field of application of Union law beyond the powers of the Union or establish any new power or task for the Union, or modify powers and tasks as defined by the Treaties’;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Recalls that in February 2018, the Hungarian government introduced in Parliament the ‘Stop Soros’ package, a legislative proposal made up in the sphere of three bills that target civil society organisations working on migration;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. *Is deeply concerned that the proposed laws could serve as a model within the EU that will undermine the valuable work of civil society organisations fighting for the respect of human rights, a danger that the EU Fundamental Rights Agency has recently underlined;*

Or. en

Amendment 25

Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels, Nikolaos Chountis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. *Believes that the current situation in Hungary represents a clear risk of a serious breach of the values as referred to in Article 2 of the TEU;*

Or. en

Amendment 26

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Subheading 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

B. Segregation of Roma children

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 27

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 28
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

Amendment

4. Points out that the integration problems encountered by Roma children in education is a phenomenon which has long been observed in eastern Europe, in States with sizeable Roma communities and in particular in the Czech Republic and Hungary, and that this phenomenon could exacerbate the problem of the social exclusion of the Roma and could perhaps reduce their chances of integration in the labour market and in society, even though it affects only 45% of Roma children, and not the majority of them;

Or. fr

Amendment 29
Michaela Šojdrová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education in Hungary remains a **widespread** and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

Amendment

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education in **some European countries, including** Hungary, remains a **structural** and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society; **recalls that this problem has been subject of a number of recommendations from the European Commission to the countries concerned and encourages those countries to follow the recommendations in order to deal with this issue effectively;**

Or. en

Amendment 30
Milan Zver

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education in Hungary **remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon** which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

Amendment

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education in Hungary **is a challenge** which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Curzio Maltese, Liadh Ní Riada, Martina Michels, Nikolaos Chountis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Draws attention to the fact that the **segregation** of Roma children in education in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

Amendment

4. Draws attention to the fact that the **multiple forms of daily discrimination** of Roma children in education in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon, which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the **education system**, labour market and in society;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. **Draws attention** to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

Amendment

4. **Expresses concern** to the fact that the **discrimination and** segregation of Roma children in education in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society **as a whole**;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education

Amendment

4. Draws attention to the fact that the segregation of Roma children in education

in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society;

in Hungary remains a widespread and deep-rooted phenomenon which contributes to the social exclusion of Roma, reducing their chances of integration in the labour market and in society; *regrets deeply that the Commission's attempts to settle the legal dispute with the Hungarian Government have not met with success so far and that the Commission was forced to launch an infringement procedure in May 2016;*

Or. en

Amendment 34
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Notes that in 2012 the Council of Europe acknowledged that in all the countries where Roma children face 'school segregation' the phenomenon can largely be explained by the fact that some Roma parents prefer to remove their children from schools with large numbers of Roma pupils; points out, in that connection, that the attempt made by the Czech Government in 2012 to close down the 'separate' schools ran into opposition from a large section of the public, voiced in the form of a petition, with the result that the government was forced to rethink its proposal in part;

Or. fr

Amendment 35
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion

PE619.376v01-00

20/41

AM\1149431EN.docxx

Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. *Notes that as part of their accession process, and then as EU Member States, all the countries of eastern Europe which have sizeable Roma minorities have carried out significant reforms to support that community; notes, in particular, that since 1993 at the latest Hungary has recognised the Roma as a protected community and that a 2013 law bans people from making derogatory remarks about them; notes that many other States have taken practical steps to foster the integration of the Roma, in particular Romania, which has introduced a number of forms of pro-Roma positive discrimination in the area of access to higher education; notes that these measures have not led to the Roma becoming satisfactorily assimilated into the societies in question;*

Or. fr

Amendment 36
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. *Notes that the situation of the Roma minorities in both eastern and western Europe must be the subject of an objective and impartial assessment and that due account should be taken of the obstacle to assimilation into society in the States referred to above which the way of life chosen by most of that community may pose; notes that many eminent European politicians from across the spectrum have acknowledged this; points*

out, for example, that in 2014 former Commissioner Viviane Reding emphasised that Roma minorities must also make an effort to integrate in the Member States by adapting their way of life as required;

Or. fr

Amendment 37
Milan Zver

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Recognizes that Hungary has taken several steps to reduce and prevent segregation, in which Hungary has amended the Act on Equal Treatment and Promotion of Equal Opportunities as well as the Act on Public Education and several pieces of legislation aimed at enforcing these amendments. In addition, the government, in line with EU and national medium- and long-term strategies, has taken actions to promote access to quality education for Roma children. The implementation of these measures should be continued and the monitoring of their effectiveness is necessary to be ensured;

Or. en

Amendment 38
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Is of the opinion that the Commission when it was reviewing the media legislation of 2010 was not thorough enough and failed to take into consideration the values set out in Art 2. of the TFEU; recalls that in June 2015 the Venice Commission published its opinion on media legislation in Hungary, where it stated that several issues require revision as a priority, if the Hungarian authorities wish not only to improve the situation with the media freedom in the country, but also change the public perception of media freedom;

Or. en

Amendment 39
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Considers that the media law of 2010 with its insufficient cross-ownership rules resulted in a distorted and imbalanced media market; stresses that the Hungarian market has become more concentrated, plenty of independent local stations disappeared and the previously flourishing segment of community radios has also been losing out; believes that it is necessary to strengthen the transparency of media ownership, especially if the media outlet has been receiving public funds;

Or. en

Amendment 40
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. *Is of the opinion that media council (into which all the members could be delegated only by the governing party since 2010) actively helped the restructuration of the radio market in order to satisfy the prevailing political needs; is outraged by the fact that the media council has failed to guarantee even the minimum level of balance in the media;*

Or. en

Amendment 41
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4d. *Emphasizes that state advertising spending disproportionately favours certain media enterprises over others; points out that state spending was higher in 2017 than ever before and state advertisements are typically awarded to media that are loyal to the government, which are predominantly controlled by oligarchs;*

Or. en

Amendment 42
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4e. *Recalls that in May 2017, the Parliament of Hungary adopted a law raising the country's advertising tax from 5.3% to 7.5%, which raises worries about possible pressure on the remaining independent media in the country; is concerned that political party advertising is only allowed in public and private media if it is free of charge, which has raised concerns in terms of limiting access to information, since private media may not be willing to broadcast free advertising; believes that it is necessary to ensure that public advertising contracts are concluded with all media in a fair and transparent manner;*

Or. en

Amendment 43
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4f. *Emphasizes that the so-called public media broadcaster (MTVA) which includes all public radio and televisions uncritically disseminates the government's messages, in particular it continuously reflects the anti-refugee or Stop-Soros campaigns carried out by the government; stresses that the public television M1 as a 24-hour news channel offers more possibilities than previously for propaganda and for transmitting the messages of the government;*

Or. en

Amendment 44
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 g (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4g. *Points out that the public media broadcaster does not comply with transparency requirements, it provides no publicly accessible surface for tracking the spending of public funds, and unlike many European public broadcasters it has no annual report, nor is it known how it defines public service responsibilities or how it discharges those;*

Or. en

Amendment 45
Milan Zver

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. *Stresses, with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government’s intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 46

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses, *with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; deplores, in this connection,* the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, *one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government’s intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;*

Amendment

5. Stresses, *that* the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság *was a decision made by the owner based on unprofitability;*

Or. en

Amendment 47

Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses, with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; *deplores, in this connection,* the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, *one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government’s intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;*

Amendment

5. Stresses, with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; *emphasises that* the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság *was a response to the newspaper’s profitability problems;*

Amendment 48
Michaela Šojdrová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses, with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been *considerably restricted* in the past *year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government’s intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;*

Amendment

5. Stresses, with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) *and to the 2017 World Press Freedom Index by Reporters Without Borders*, that media freedom in Hungary has been *source of major concern* in the past years; *urges* the Hungarian government to *guarantee media freedom and pluralism as a key value of the European Union;*

Amendment 49
Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses, with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian

Amendment

5. Stresses, with reference to the ‘Democracy Index 2017’ published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom *and pluralism* in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once

Government's intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;

again revealing the Hungarian Government's intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;

Or. it

Amendment 50
Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses, with reference to the 'Democracy Index 2017' published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the *closure and* subsequent sale of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government's intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;

Amendment

5. Stresses, with reference to the 'Democracy Index 2017' published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the subsequent sale *and closure* of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government's intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Stresses*, with reference to the 'Democracy Index 2017' published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and

Amendment

5. *Is deeply concerned*, with reference to the 'Democracy Index 2017' published recently by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), that media freedom in Hungary has been considerably restricted in the past year as a result of State intervention and

increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government's intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;

increased State control; deplores, in this connection, the closure and subsequent sale of Népszabadság, one of the oldest and most prestigious newspapers in Hungary, once again revealing the Hungarian Government's intolerance vis-à-vis a critical press;

Or. en

Amendment 52
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that journalists of independent media are often seriously hindered while doing their job, media outlets are regularly banned from entering into the Parliament building, spaces are restricted in the Parliament for journalist to ask and interview politicians;

Or. en

Amendment 53
Curzio Maltese, Liadh Ní Riada, Martina Michels, Nikolaos Chountis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that media freedom and pluralism are fundamental rights enshrined in Article 11 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and constitute essential foundations of democratic societies;

Amendment 54

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. *Is concerned that, after Hungary's last independent regional newspapers were taken over by oligarchs close to the Hungarian Government, the latter has recently further extended its control over the media, with media concentration in Hungary reaching an unprecedented and grotesque level according to 'Reporters Without Borders';* **deleted**

Amendment 55

Milan Zver

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. *Is concerned that, after Hungary's last independent regional newspapers were taken over by oligarchs close to the Hungarian Government, the latter has recently further extended its control over the media, with media concentration in Hungary reaching an unprecedented and grotesque level according to 'Reporters Without Borders';* **deleted**

Amendment 56

Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Is concerned that, *after Hungary's last independent regional newspapers were taken over by oligarchs close to the Hungarian Government, the latter has recently further extended its control over the media, with media concentration in Hungary reaching an unprecedented and grotesque level according to 'Reporters Without Borders'*;

Amendment

6. Is concerned that, *according to 'Reporters Without Borders', the level of media concentration in Hungary has now reached too high a level, as is unfortunately also the case in many other Member States, even in western Europe and in France*;

Or. fr

Amendment 57

Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Is concerned that, after Hungary's last independent regional newspapers were taken over by oligarchs close to the Hungarian Government, the latter has recently further extended its control over the media, with media concentration in Hungary reaching an unprecedented and grotesque level according to 'Reporters Without Borders';

Amendment

6. Is concerned that, after Hungary's last independent regional newspapers were taken over by oligarchs close to the Hungarian Government, the latter has recently further extended its control over the media, with media concentration in Hungary reaching an unprecedented and grotesque level according to 'Reporters Without Borders'; *believes that it is necessary to strengthen the transparency of media ownership, especially if the entrepreneur has been awarded public contracts*;

Or. en

Amendment 58

Milan Zver

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. *Notes that the pro-government news website 888.hu recently published a black list of journalists working for foreign media, who are described as foreign propagandists for Soros, and that this clearly runs counter to the principle of media freedom;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

**Amendment 59
Michaela Šojdrová**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. *Notes that the pro-government news website 888.hu recently published a black list of journalists working for foreign media, who are described as foreign propagandists for Soros, and that this clearly runs counter to the principle of media freedom;*

Amendment

7. *Welcomes the fact that the Hungarian government decided in 2017 to end the highly criticized poster campaign depicting the U.S. financier George Soros with the caption “Don’t let Soros have the last laugh”, which was considered as anti-Semitic encouragement too;*

Or. en

**Amendment 60
Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. *Notes that the pro-government news website 888.hu recently published a*

Amendment

7. *Notes that the independent and privately owned website 888.hu recently*

black list of journalists working for foreign media, *who are described as foreign propagandists for Soros, and that this clearly runs counter to the principle of media freedom;*

published a black list of journalists working for foreign media;

Or. en

Amendment 61
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Notes that the pro-government news website 888.hu recently published a black list of journalists working for foreign media, who are described as foreign propagandists for Soros, and that this clearly *runs counter to the principle of media* freedom;

Amendment

7. Notes that the pro-government news website 888.hu recently published a black list of journalists working for foreign media, who are described as foreign propagandists for Soros, and that this *is clearly the personal opinion of the website's staff which is covered by freedom of expression, an assertion which may be tested in the Hungarian courts if the persons whose names appear on the list bring legal action; emphasises that trivial details such as this should not inform a serious analysis of the situation with regard to freedom of the press and freedom of expression in Hungary;*

Or. fr

Amendment 62
Curzio Maltese, Liadh Ní Riada, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. *Notes* that the pro-government news website 888.hu recently published a

Amendment

7. *Regrets* that the pro-government news website 888.hu recently published a

black list of journalists working for foreign media, who are described as foreign propagandists for Soros, and that this clearly runs counter to the principle of media freedom;

black list of journalists working for foreign media, who are described as foreign propagandists for Soros, and that this clearly runs counter to the principle of media freedom;

Or. en

Amendment 63
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Subheading 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Non-governmental Organisations

Or. en

Amendment 64
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Is worried by the shrinking space for civil society organisations, the attempts to control NGOs and to restrict their ability to carry out their legitimate work; regrets deeply the fact that Hungary adopted a legislation on foreign-funded NGOs (Lex NGO), which interferes unduly with fundamental rights as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, in particular the right to freedom of association; points out that the law also introduces unjustified and disproportionate restrictions to the free movement of capital and raises concerns about respect of the right to protection of

*private life and of personal data;
emphasizes that the Commission was
forced to initiate proceedings before the
Court of Justice of the European Union;*

Or. en

Amendment 65
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. Points out that despite the legal proceeding at the CJEU on the “Lex NGO” the Hungarian proposed another law the, so called “Lex Stop Soros”, which intends to further restrict the right of association and the work of NGOs; deplores the intention of the Hungarian Government to force-close all Soros funded NGOs and the aim to require a state permit for NGOs to work on the field of migration;

Or. en

Amendment 66
Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Urges the Commission to continue to deploy all means available under the Treaties, in order to uphold the Union’s common values and to conduct a political dialogue with the Hungarian authorities, the other Member States and the European Parliament in order to

deleted

guarantee the rule of law, in particular in the areas of education and freedom of the media;

Or. en

Amendment 67
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Urges the Commission to continue to deploy all means available under the Treaties, in order to uphold the Union's common values and to conduct a political dialogue with the Hungarian authorities, the other Member States and the European Parliament *in order to guarantee the rule of law*, in particular in the *areas of education and freedom of the media*;

Amendment

8. Urges the Commission to continue to deploy all means available under the Treaties, in order to uphold the Union's common values and to conduct a political dialogue with the Hungarian authorities, the other Member States and the European Parliament, *in particular as regards education and freedom of the media, while respecting Hungary's sovereignty and governmental freedom; insists that Hungary must not be stigmatised on the basis of very broad criteria, such as the situation of minorities or the media; notes that all these matters must be the subject of an impartial and objective debate in which both sides can put their case and must not be exploited to put pressure on Hungary*, in particular in the *context of its firm stance on taking in migrants*;

Or. fr

Amendment 68
Yana Toom

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Urges the Commission to continue to deploy all means available under the Treaties, in order to uphold the Union's common values and to conduct a political dialogue with the Hungarian authorities, the other Member States and the European Parliament in order to guarantee the rule of law, in particular in the areas of education and freedom of the media;

8. Urges the Commission to continue to deploy all means available under the Treaties, in order to uphold the Union's common values and to conduct a political dialogue with the Hungarian authorities, the other Member States and the European Parliament in order to guarantee the rule of law, in particular in the areas of education and freedom of the media, ***including by triggering Art. 7 TEU if necessary;***

Or. en

Amendment 69

Angel Dzhambazki, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Jadwiga Wiśniewska

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Urges the leaders of the EU institutions to regard the results of the referendum of 23 June 2016 in the United Kingdom as an important signal of wider discontent into the current direction of the EU; calls on them, for the benefit of the EU, to reflect on ways the Union should be reformed in order to bring the decision-making process closer to citizens and guarantee better compliance with the principle of subsidiarity;

Or. en

Amendment 70

Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Draws the attention to the fact that

the governing party has built a network of government organised NGOs, supported by public funds, whose main activity is to echo the governments messages and to organise demonstrations on the side of the government;

Or. en

Amendment 71
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8b. Believes that the situation in the field of Higher Education, Roma education, the situation in the media and the NGOs in Hungary represent a clear risk of a serious breach of the values referred to in Article 2 of the TEU and warrants the launch of the Article 7(1) TEU procedure;

Or. en

Amendment 72
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Calls on the European Commission to urgently finalise the infringement procedures steps, taking into consideration the declaration made by the Hungarian government which has questioned the ruling of the European Court of Justice concerning the infringement procedure which the

European Commission launched against Hungary for failing to implement the community's decision on the relocation of asylum-seekers, and warrants the launch of the Article 7 TEU procedure;

Or. en

Amendment 73
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8b. Calls on the Commission, to continue to closely monitor the unfolding legislative process and the extent to which the proposals breach EU law, including its Fundamental Rights and to make the evaluation promptly and publicly available;

Or. en

Amendment 74
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8c. Calls on the OSCE to set up an election observation mission to Hungary's parliamentary elections not only with a limited mandate, to closely monitor the misuse of the freedom of expression, the abuse of the administrative resources and the election campaign that continues to vilify civic organisations engaged in public interest causes;

Amendment 75
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8d. Calls on the Commission to increase funding for independent projects in the field of media freedom and pluralism such as the Media Pluralism Monitor among others, mapping violations to media freedom and supporting journalists under threat;

Or. en

Amendment 76
Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8e. Calls on the Commission to create robust funding instrument to support independent NGO-s to have their voices heard and to fulfil their missions in an increasingly hostile environment;

Or. en