MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

to wind up the debate on the statements by the Council and the Commission pursuant to Rule 123(2) of the Rules of Procedure on making relocation happen (2017/2685(RSP))

Auke Zijlstra, Lorenzo Fontana, Gilles Lebreton, Harald Vilimsky on behalf of the ENF Group
European Parliament resolution on making relocation happen (2017/2685(RSP))

The European Parliament,

– having regard to the statements by the Council and the Commission of 16 May 2017 on making relocation happen,

– having regard to Rule 123(2) of its Rules of Procedure,

A. whereas immigration and asylum policy is an exclusive competence of sovereign Member States;

B. whereas mass immigration encouraged by the EU from non-European countries has proven to be considerably problematic and politically, economically, socially and culturally disruptive;

C. whereas UNHCR figures show that only 2.65 % of the migrants who arrived in Italy in 2016 were granted asylum as genuine refugees and that 90 334 of the 181 436 migrants disappeared into the black economy without requesting or awaiting asylum;

D. whereas it has been empirically established by Eurofound that Europe’s youth has fewer opportunities for upward social mobility;

E. whereas mass migration policies enforced by the EU can under no circumstances solve the demographic challenges, as has also been proven by the CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis, which has stated that the influx of migrants will not solve the financial problems deriving from demographic issues of an ageing population;

F. whereas the IMF has advised the EU to provide ‘temporarily’ lower salaries to migrants; whereas social dumping has a disruptive effect on the job market, creating more competition between migrants and Europeans and leading to a deterioration in social security and to widespread poverty, especially among less skilled workers;

G. whereas Hungary has been very effective in managing and reducing the influx of migrants into its territory;

H. whereas the Australian approach has been increasingly successful in reducing illegal immigration to Australia and at the same time ending the deaths of migrants at sea;

I. whereas the EU relocation programme is a direct consequence of the failure of Schengen and the open borders policy;

---

1 http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4442910/Less-3-migrants-reached-Italy-refugees.html.
J. whereas as a result of mass sexual aggressions committed by migrants on European women in Cologne and dozens of other European cities, the safety of many women is being jeopardised;

K. whereas the compulsory relocation programme has no legal basis;

L. whereas the European Court of Human Rights makes it impossible for the Member States to manage migration flows and even fines those states, as illustrated by the fining of Italy in 2009;

1. Underlines the principle that it is part of the sovereignty of all states to determine their own asylum and immigration policy;

2. Takes the view that the EU open borders policy is an incentive that encourages more migrants to cross the Mediterranean Sea;

3. Rejects the principle of forced relocation and stresses that it is more effective to host refugees and people seeking international protection in safe parts of their country of origin or in their own regions;

4. Notes that any state can legitimately consider irregular entry and residence within its borders as an illegal action and that this can be punished and judged;

5. Condemns the unclear role played by some NGOs in the Mediterranean Sea;

6. Encourages the Member States to implement the Australian approach in the immigration field;

7. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, and the parliaments of the Member States.