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Subject: Double standards in dealing with different cases of discrimination

On 15 occasions, the Commission has stated in its written answers that cases of discrimination against traditional national minorities (relating to education, violations of previously acquired rights, hate speech etc.) fall under national competences according to the principle of subsidiarity. It has said that it therefore does not wish to address such cases of discrimination.

In a specific case when a whole minority community in Romania was targeted (‘expel the Hungarians from the country!’), the local prosecutor did not consider it to be hate speech, ruling that ‘the statements did not target a whole community and were not addressed to a defined minority group, such as people with disabilities or sexual minorities’. Regrettably, in its answer to written question P-004554/2020, which relates to this particular case, the Commission said that ‘national authorities, including their judicial authorities, remain however responsible to examine and rule upon any alleged individual case of discrimination, racist hate speech or hate crime’. However, in many other cases the Commission has been less shy, clearly interfering in subsidiarity issues that concern other minorities or certain Member States.

1. If all Member States should be treated equally without double standards, why has the Commission taken a different approach when applying the principle of subsidiarity to cases in other Member States?

2. Why does it treat other minority groups differently?