

Provisional edition

Monday 24 June 2019, afternoon

Official report of debates

Opening of sitting No 20

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The meeting is now in session.

The next item of business this afternoon is the presentation of and debate on the report by Ms Petra De SUTTER on behalf of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs entitled *Strengthening the decision-making process of the Parliamentary Assembly on credentials and voting*.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will give the floor to the Committee rapporteur, but I would remind you that we will have to finish examining this text – including the vote – at midnight. We will therefore have to interrupt the list of speakers at around 6.15 p.m. in order to be able to hear the Committee's reply and carry out the necessary vote.

Rapporteur, you have a total speaking time of 13 minutes, which you can divide at you see fit between presenting your report and replying to speakers.

You have the floor.

Debate: Strengthening the decision-making process of the Parliamentary Assembly concerning credentials and voting

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Dear Colleagues,

The report I have the honour to present today to the Assembly concludes a long reflection that the Rules Committee began exactly one year ago as part of a long process that the Assembly started more than three years ago. This has not been an easy process and I would like to thank the members of the Rules Committee for the confidence they have placed in me and for their support.

A whole train of thought has been going on now for three years. It started in the framework of a report by the Political Affairs Committee in Resolution 2186 adopted in October 2017, the Assembly expressed its concerns about the challenges threatening the European continent and its unity and it concluded on the need to preserve and further strengthen the pan-European project. In this respect, the Assembly considered that the overall situation in the organisation was counterproductive as it adversely affected its overall impact as a guardian of Human rights and democracy. It underlined the need for the two statutory organs of the Council of

In this report:

1. Speeches in English, French, German and Italian are reported in full in English.
2. Speeches in other languages are summarised from the interpretation and indicated by an asterisk (*).
3. Speeches in German and Italian are available in full on the Assembly's website.
4. 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.
5. Corrections should be handed in at Room 1081 not later than 24 hours after the report has been published.

Europe while fully preserving their autonomy to engage in a procedure aimed at harmonising jointly their rules governing participation and representation of Member States. This resolution led to the setting up of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Bureau on the Role and mission of the Assembly because in 2017 already, after the crisis the Assembly had faced, all of us present today were convinced that we should reaffirm the role of the Parliamentary Assembly in its relationship with the Committee of Ministers.

So the Bureau put in place this Ad Hoc committee in December 2017 and showed that all delegations and political groups were deeply committed to the Council of Europe's fundamental values and principles, their promotion, their protection and to the monitoring of the Members States' respect for them. There was a clear need to strengthen our position and our decision-making process. So the Ad Hoc Committee gathered during an entire year and it completed its work in June 2018 followed by the first report presented by the Rules Committee in October 2018 on strengthening the decision making process of the Assembly concerning credentials and voting.

And lastly, the report of the Political Affairs Committee on the role and mission of the Assembly, prepared by our colleague Mr Tiny Kox. Now the first report of the Committee on strengthening the decision making process concerning the credentials and the voting was presented to this Assembly in October 2018. It included proposals aiming to enhance the consistency of the procedures for challenging national delegations' credentials on substantive grounds, reinforcing the legitimacy of the Assembly and the authority of its decisions in cases where it decides on a challenge of the credentials of a delegation whether on formal or substantive grounds, restricting the scope of sanctions incurred by members of delegations whose credentials have been ratified but have had the exercise of certain rights participation or representation in the activities of the Assembly suspended.

However, although it was virtually unanimously approved at the Committee's level, this report was not supported by the Assembly. Following an intense, emotional and lively debate, the Assembly decided to refer it back to the Committee at my request. Given the divisions in the chamber and the absence of a calm atmosphere in which to debate the Committee's proposals. So the report came back to the Committee and it stayed there for a while. But then it was revived and in the Committee, we worked on a new version, respecting the Committee's position that the same report should not be submitted again, we've tried to identify some useful and relevant proposals dealing with problems of common interest to all Member states and national delegations of the Assembly and seek to ensure greater consistency in the action of the Assembly. The scope of the report presented today has therefore been substantially reduced to those points which could be supported by the Assembly, namely the limitation of the scope of the sanctions to be imposed on members of delegations whose credentials have been challenged.

Meanwhile, the report by Mr Tiny Kox on the role and mission of the Assembly, discussed April 2019, and Resolution 2277 and Recommendation 2153, made the Assembly's position quite clear on the stepping up of political dialogue with the Committee of Ministers including through the introduction and addition of the existing procedures of coordinated action when a Member State violates its statutory obligations or does not respect the fundamental principles and values of the Council of Europe. In Resolution 2277, the Assembly stressed that Council of Europe membership implies an obligation of all Member States to participate in both statutory organs and at the same time called on the Russian Federation in accordance with its statutory obligations to appoint a delegation to the Assembly and to resume obligatory payment of its contribution to the budget of the organisation.

At the 129th Ministerial Session in Helsinki last 17th May, the Committee of Ministers took into consideration this recommendation of the Assembly and it welcomed the call for an enhanced political dialogue as well as the proposal to set up a joint reaction procedure. Moreover, the Committee of Ministers recalled that all Member States shall be entitled to participate on an equal basis in the two statutory organs of the Council of Europe as long as Articles 7, 8 or 9 of the Statute have not been applied. Furthermore, the Committee of Ministers said that it would welcome that delegations of all Member States take part in next June part-session of the Assembly –this session– having regard to the importance of the elections of the Secretary General and the judges to the court. In doing so, the Committee of Ministers gives its assent to a derogation from the application of Article 25 of the Statute of the Council of Europe. Article 25 expressed wording requires a Member State to transmit credentials of its delegation at the opening of the Ordinary Session. Failing to comply with this requirement, a state would be in violation of the Statute. It seemed to the Rules Committee important to underline this fact in the text of the draft resolution. In order to take into consideration the Committee of Ministers' decision, as well as the exceptional context which led to it, the Assembly is asked to consider whether inviting the parliaments of Council of Europe member states, which are not represented in the Assembly to present credentials of their delegations at the June 2019 –this– part-session of the Assembly.

Taking into account the provisions of the Statute and its own Rules of Procedure which stipulate that the credentials of delegations must be transmitted before the opening of the Ordinary Session for ratification, the Assembly now must decide to derogate from the application of certain rules. In the past the Assembly has already taken such decisions *ad hoc*, which parted from the Rules of Procedure in exceptional circumstances, for instance, the reintegration of Greece in the Council of Europe in November '74 or the reintegration of Turkey in '84 and also during the enlargement period when the Assembly, on all these occasions, derogated from these conditions for the presentation of credentials at the opening of the Ordinary Session.

Now, the report presented today is about simply taking measures following up decisions that have been taken in a fully democratic manner, both at the Assembly and at the Committee of Ministers level. It does not aim to revise the rules of procedure concerning credentials of national delegations. It's certainly not the intention of the Rules Committee to present a report that would at last weaken the procedure for challenging credentials. We didn't touch this in this report which could be launched for the violation by a given Member State or of its statutory obligations and commitments towards the organisation. There is a need for strengthening the coherence, legitimacy and effectiveness of the mechanisms of the Assembly in order to guarantee and defend the principles and values on which the organisation has been built. This report, the present report, as well as the report in April from Tiny Kox, could prove useful and constructive to both the Assembly and the Committee of Ministers and be an opportunity to build strong and lasting bridges.

The Assembly couldn't be more appreciative of Committee of Ministers' recognition in Helsinki of the urgent need to develop these synergies and provide for coordinated action in order to strengthen the ability of the organisation to react more effectively if a Member State violates the Statutory Obligations or does not respect standards, principles and values of the Council of Europe. So in doing so, the Committee of Ministers explicitly recognised the mandate and the special assignment of the Assembly and acknowledged the value of our existing procedures. So we should be pleased with the positive assessment by the Committee of Ministers of our longstanding procedures with regard to strengthening the respect by Member States of their obligations and commitments.

In addition, the Rules Committee found that the change of approach was further required because of the need to enhance the consistency of rules applying to the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly regarding the representation and participation of Member States in both statutory organs. The Rules Committee suggests keeping the current rules governing the challenge or reconsideration of credentials of the delegations whilst at the same time elaborating on the rights of representation and participation of national delegations that may be suspended or withdrawn by the Assembly in this context. The Assembly's rule of procedure lay down no list of participation and presentation rights that may be deprived or suspended in the context of a challenge of credentials. This is important. Rule 10.1 of the Rules of Procedure sets out a description of the sanctions which may be imposed on the Members in general terms only. It is up to the Assembly to determine the extent of the sanction when it is called upon to decide by resolution on the challenge to credentials. The only basis for the Assembly's decision when determining restrictive measures against the delegation could be found in an opinion that the Rules Committee approved in 2014, which drew up a list of rights of participation and representation in the activities of the Assembly and its bodies that might be suspended or deprived in the context of a challenge to credentials.

I will try to finish here because the draft resolution submitted today proposes a way to reflect the Committee of Ministers decision in the Assembly's Rule of Procedure. It intends to clarify the list of rights of participation and representation of Members that may be suspended or withdrawn by the Assembly when deciding on a challenge of delegations' credentials and propose to remove the right to vote, the right to speak and the right of representation in the Assembly and in its bodies of PACE members from the catalogue of sanctions.

So I understand, there will be a lively debate also today, but I hope that this report, which is a very small part of a puzzle in a long story that is already here for a couple of years trying to solve a situation which cannot really last and I hope that the Assembly will understand that this report is really something to move forward and to solve the problems that we have today. So I hope for your support in voting for the report in the end. Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you, Mrs. DE SUTTER.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Olena SOTNYK has referred a preliminary motion to the Presidency under Rule 37(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure. The purpose of this motion contained in document 14917 is to postpone the debate on the report by Mrs Petra De SUTTER, "until an appropriate committee assesses democratic progress in the Russian Federation in order to ascertain the exceptional nature of the circumstances that may

justify a derogation from Rules 6.1 and 6.3 of the Rules of Procedure". If this motion is adopted, it will have the effect of postponing the debate until the conditions it sets out are met. In the absence of other items on the agenda, the meeting would then be adjourned. In the case of a procedural motion, only the mover of the motion, a person against and the rapporteur or the chairperson of the committee concerned may be heard.

I give the floor to Ms. SOTNYK to present her motion.

Ms Olena SOTNYK (Ukraine, ALDE): Merci, Madam President. Yes, in the draft resolution, there is - in the seventh paragraph - you proposed derogation from Rule 6.1 and 6.3, and such derogation puts forward the exceptional context by referring to a number of cases which took place in the past. Those cases concerned either exceptional political circumstances marked in the return of Turkey and Greece to democracy, or admission in the Assembly of national delegations of new Member States. Russia is not a new Member State and, therefore, the assessment of the democratic developments has to be done in order for the derogation to be in compliance with standard practices of the Assembly. Therefore, I ask the report - I ask you to refer the report to the Monitoring Committee in order to give analysis if there is any democratic progress for Russia in order to have an opportunity to derogate from the rules and procedures. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Does anyone wish to speak against this motion?

Mr. KOX, I'm sorry, I didn't see you.

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL): Thank you very much, Madam President. This report is the end of a long series of reports, decisions that we took, in accordance with also the Committee of Ministers. We now have come to the final moment, to take decisions so that this organisation and this Assembly again can function as it should function, as a human rights watchdog to oversee developments in Europe. So I urge the colleagues not to accept this proposal but to follow up on the decisions already taken by the Rules Committee. The report was adopted by the Rules Committee and we will have ample time to discuss it, so please keep the report on the agenda. It doesn't make sense.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What is Ms De Sutter's opinion on behalf of the Commission?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I am against. It would be the second time that report goes back, so I would really want to continue the debate today for the reasons Mr Kox has said.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The Assembly will now decide by a simple majority on the preliminary motion. Those who wish to adopt the motion vote yes, those who wish to reject it vote no.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The preliminary motion is rejected. We are therefore continuing to examine the report.

We will move on to the list of speakers, starting, as it should be, with the spokespersons for the groups, and I therefore give the floor to Mr POCIEJ on behalf of the EPP/CD group.

Mr Aleksander POCIEJ (Poland, EPP/CD, Spokesperson for the group): Madame President. Dear colleagues. The so-called Ms Petra De SUTTER report divided our assembly and I will not hide that in EPP Group we have also different opinions presented. Any decision for "yes" or "no" has some advantages and weaknesses. From one side, it is obvious that for the citizens of any country, even not - or maybe mostly not - democratic ones, it is a great chance to have the possibility to be covered by Council of Europe's institutions. Having access to the Commissioner of Human Rights to the monitoring of elections, monitoring of democracy, to the Court of Human Rights is priceless. Recognition of our institution by any new country, or coming back to our family, makes us, of course, stronger. On the other hand, there is no doubt that this is a very particular

case, mainly because of the time pressure. Many among us feel like jumping into the pool without knowing if there is some water in it. We are changing our rules - just temporary - for one particular case. We have many doubts whether we, instead of strengthening position, if we are not doing the contrary. If we are not sacrificing our position when we don't know whether the other side, the Committee of Ministers, will follow. We have nothing but promises. How dangerous is to change the procedure from one moment to another during the session we saw today. Our anniversary is under the shadow of this quarrel. This could be organised differently and in a much better way. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I call Mr SCHWABE, on behalf of the SOC Group.

Mr Frank SCHWABE (Germany, SOC, Spokesperson for the group): Thank you very much, Madam President,

I would like to thank all those who have really played a very constructive part in this debate. I would, of course, particularly like to thank Petra De SUTTER, who is the next member of the European Parliament, and who, so to speak, fled a little from these tasks, which she did, however, manage excellently, and helped us on this issue. Thank you Petra De Sutter, thank you very much for that.

I would like to thank the Committee of Ministers, because we have really worked very constructively under the Finnish Presidency, but now also under the French Presidency. To really deal with this question and at any rate to make attempts at a solution in the end also drives to come to a solution. I would like to thank the President Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER, who at the end, on behalf of this Assembly and the majority of this Assembly at any rate, acted accordingly and tried to enter into dialogue with the Committee of Ministers, but also with certain states.

I hope we can have a constructive discussion today. We have had a constructive discussion in our group, with different positions, in full respect, with a clear majority for the De Sutter Report, but quite different positions. We have managed to discuss the content, to deal with the content and in the end not to cover these questions with procedural questions and to cloud them.

I would very much like us to be able to do the same here, to talk about the substance. At the end of the day, to decide on the substance, and not in the end on 220 –or however many– amendments, and at the end the people who want to speak here no longer have a say.

We have a great challenge in this 70th year of existence of this organization. We need new answers to what we do when countries do not abide by the rules. We need to resolve the financial issues. We must ensure that we can prevent corruption in the long term. What we are discussing with Russia or about Russia is actually not about Russia at all, but about the whole organisation using Russia as an example. It may also be the case that other countries are very quickly affected by such questions and that we do not have the right answers. That's why we need to develop them now.

It is not a credit for any violations of Human rights in Russia, it is the chance to confront Russia again with what they are doing and what the worst violations of Human rights are in Russia. The situation is partly devastating and therefore we have to be able to fulfill our task; to monitor the situation there.

What we cannot do, even if we wanted to, is ultimately to decide about war or peace. If the UN Security Council fails so far because of this, then we will not be able to do it. We must concentrate on what we can do. These are Human rights issues, these are the red lines. The judgments of the Human Rights Court must be implemented and we want full monitoring with full access to the Russian Federation. If, then, we manage to develop new, functioning rules for the whole organisation and, at the same time, achieve full cooperation with Russia in the interests of the 140 million people and more in Russia and the so-called grey zones, then I believe we will have done a great deal. I would wish that the Petra De Sutter report would receive a great deal of approval and that all the amendments I have known so far would be rejected.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I call Mr GALE, on behalf of the EC Group.

Sir Roger GALE (United Kingdom, EC, Spokesperson for the group): Thank you Madam president. I congratulate my friend Ms Petra de Sutter on her report, which I'm now going to have to oppose and that saddens me, but I wish her well in her future with the European Parliament.

This morning, we narrowly avoided a premature celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Council of Europe. This organization was founded in 1949 by Winston Churchill and others, as an antidote to Nazism and communism and as guarantor of Human Rights. Sir Winston would, Madam President, I feel be horrified by the act of appeasement that we're being asked to support today.

In a blatant attempt to secure the finances of this organization under the guise of inclusion and democracy, we're being asked to change our Rules to accommodate the demands of one country that is in flagrant breach of the Convention on Human rights, has annexed the territory of other Member states, notably Georgia and Ukraine, has intervened militarily in the Donbass and continues to do so and has been, as we've had confirmed definitively this week, implicit in the murder of the 287 men, women and children on board flight MH17, shot down over Ukraine, that has committed murder and attempted murder on British soil, and that rides roughshod over the rights of minorities and journalists domestically. In return for 70 million euros of silver, in unpaid debts that is legally due to the Council of Europe, the Russian Federation is demanding to have its delegations credentials approved without sanctions and have the Assembly rules changed so that member states can be in breach of the convention with impunity.

That this assembly is even contemplating abject surrender to this crude attempt at blackmail, is a source of shame. That the Secretary General and the President are complicit in promoting this cause is a disgrace. If the Council of Europe and this Assembly endorses the proposals that this report put forward, then we shall be selling short not just the principles of our own but the endeavors of those who have given their lives in the cause of freedoms that we enjoy today, and the lives today of those who have relied upon us for protection.

Let us be clear Madam President, we want the Russians to take their seats in this Assembly, but not at any price. Before readmission, Ukrainian sailors imprisoned in Russia have to be released, the annexed land must be vacated, Human rights respected and, of course, debts paid in full. Then, and only then, will our Russian colleagues be welcome back. I hope that colleagues will support the substantive amendments today and if they are not carried, they will reject this report in its entirety.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr DAEMS has the floor for the ALDE group.

Mr Hendrik DAEMS (Belgium, ALDE, Spokesperson for the group): The existence of this report, as far as we are concerned, is basically to try to find an effective way of going after a country which does not comply with the rules or regulations, with the principles of this assembly. Some of us think that, until now, whatever we have done is not effective enough. This is why we had a discussion with the Committee of Ministers, indeed, on the initiative of the Finnish Presidency and taking over by the French one, of finding a joint way of taking action against such a country - Russia but not only Russia.

We came up, I think, with something which is potentially important because the procedure that is put on the table can be initiated by this assembly alone. So, basically, it gives this assembly more power than it has today, because this assembly alone, solely, can trigger a procedure which forces the Committee of Ministers, at the end of the day, to take a position, to take a decision, against such a country. As far as this is concerned, this is only positive because it does give more power to our assembly and it re-balances, if you wish, the relationship between the assembly and the Committee of Ministers.

However, there is a price to pay. It is some kind of a deal where, on the other side, is asked of this assembly to set aside the fact that, within the challenging of credentials, we can no longer touch the voting rights and other ones. So this is basically the deal that is on the table. Let's be clear on it. Our group doesn't like the deal. Our group does not like the deal in the sense that some of our group - part of our group - thinks that this price is too high to pay and another part of the group thinks that, although they don't like it, it is a justified price to pay in order to get this new procedure giving power to this assembly.

This is why our group will be voting in two parts: in conscience, one part who thinks that the price to pay is too high, is principally not done, they will vote against it; the other part who thinks that, although they do not like the report, they do not like the trade-off, but think it is, to some extent, justified to get the new procedure giving more power to this assembly, they will vote in favor. In the middle, we will have some amendments being

tabled and, we hope, that we can find a few amendments that we've tabled some of them ourselves in order to still ameliorate this report. It's not minor things - it's some of them are very important - but we will get to it once we get to the amendments.

As far as I'm concerned as a group's leader, respecting the fact that we have two portions in our group - one who thinks that the price is justified, the other one who does not think - I, as a group leader, out of respect for my group, at the end will abstain. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I call Mr Kox, on behalf of the UEL Group.

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL, Spokesperson for the group): Thank you Madam President. Last April this Assembly adopted by a three quarters majority the resolution or recommendation on *Role and mission of the Parliamentary Assembly: main challenges for the future*. Many of the adopted proposals are now already being implemented. The rest are waiting to be dealt with. We are on the right track colleagues.

One of the adopted proposals was to inform national parliaments of Member states that they all have the obligation, on the basis of the statute of our organisation, to participate in both statutory organs of the Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers and this Assembly. In order to end the situation that some parliaments do not fulfill their obligations in this respect, the resolution which is now on the agenda opens the possibility for those delegations to present their credentials as soon as possible during this week.

The proposal in the resolution of Madame De Sutter, supported by the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs, is therefore fully in line with the decisions we took earlier in April. And the resolution we discussed today is another proposal regarding the need expressed by the Ministerial Conference in Helsinki last May to assure participation on equal basis of all delegations in this Assembly. As this is a formal decision, the Assembly has to answer and the resolution exactly does so. It stipulates that to ensure an equal basis, the Assembly will not allow itself to strip any delegation from the right to sit, to speak, to vote and to be represented in the Assembly and its bodies.

This brings us, dear colleagues, in line with the decision of the Committee of Ministers as well as with almost all national parliaments and probably all inter-parliamentary organisations. Nothing more. And, dear colleagues, most importantly, as it is stated in the Resolution to this Assembly, for the first time ever we will gain the right, as Mr Daems said, to participate in a new and robust reaction procedure, together with the Committee of Ministers and the Secretary General, in the case a Member state violates its obligations under the Statute or under the Convention. This new joint reaction procedure strengthens in a very substantial way the power of this Assembly to act in the case of blatant wrongdoings by a Member state. It is already in the phase of development, as the French presidency told us here this morning, and I hope and expect it to be operational as soon as possible.

I think, dear colleagues, that we are talking about an offer you can't refuse if we really want to have serious and effective means which would help us to act when needed, instead of only having unilateral means of reaction which do not deliver. We have seen that in the past five years. Therefore Madam President, I wholeheartedly recommend this resolution to the Assembly and I thank the Rapporteur and the Rules committee for the excellent work done, and I hope, dear colleagues, some wisdom will come to those who proposed over 200 amendments to this resolution, to think whether that is the best way to serve democracy in this Assembly or whether there should be some more respect for those who think that this Resolution is the best thing that could be done today.

Thank you very much Madam President.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I call Mr ŠEŠELJ, on behalf of the FDG Group.

Mr Aleksandar ŠEŠELJ (Serbia, FDG, Spokesperson for the group)*: (*Microphone off : interruption by Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO, Ukraine*)

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I don't think I gave you the floor. I don't think I gave you the floor. Please, Mr GONCHARENKO, you have the floor later, since you are on the list of speakers and I find it particularly inappropriate to interrupt the speaker in this way while understanding very well that you do not agree with what he is saying.

Let him speak, please.

Mr Aleksandar ŠEŠELJ (Serbia, FDG)*: You will be able to speak when your turn comes. So, the Crimeans did not want to be repressed by their compatriots in Odessa. That is why they wanted to return to their homeland. Europe must stop being russophobic and being engulfed by anti-Russian hysteria. The enemy of Europe and the world is fascism. Russia has already saved us once around from fascism.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, you have the opportunity to respond immediately to the spokespersons of the groups or to do so only at the end of the general debate.

At the end of the general debate?

Thank you...

We will therefore take the list of speakers, which begins with Mr OMTZIGT.

Mr Pieter OMTZIGT (Netherlands, EPP/CD): Thank you. And thanks to Madam De SUTTER for all the work she's been putting in a report which, as a number of speakers have told us, brings us to a very difficult position as an assembly. This report is indeed about Russia. And we are a rule-based institution that is different from other international institutions.

Rule one: do not occupy part of another Member State.

Rule two: make sure you implement the decisions of the European Court of Human Rights. So don't approve any laws which allow you to go above it.

Rule three: cooperate with other countries. So if the UN Security Council says, in Resolution 2166, that you have to cooperate with the investigations into MH17, you cooperate. And you don't hide the radar data of that flight in which 298 people died.

So that's why I'm here with a heavy heart. Because yes, we like that there is a better system of Human Rights in Russia. But, is this going to help? I have my doubts. And I shall explain my doubts. The Committee of Ministers has not been very powerful, for they have the internal rule that if they are going to go against one country, they only vote by unanimity. If you ever try to read their written answers to our written questions, you see what it means. There's never any content in it. If they were to decide by the two-thirds majority, which you have to, they might take decisions which sometimes hurt a country. Not too often, but sometimes. That's why I have my doubts and that's why I wanted to ask the chairperson of the Committee of Ministers whether this is going to work. And I think that we should not take away all of the instruments we have. I think some points are well taken. I understand that, even if your credentials are challenged, you should have the right to vote for a judge or for the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights. But I think we should be able to take away other rights. That's why, together with quite a few colleagues from the Group of the European People's Party, I tabled Amendment 44 that says: no, we can't do everything we did in the past, but we can still take away some rights. But you have the inalienable right to keep on voting for Judges, High Commissioner and Secretary General. And I hope that will form some kind of compromise in this difficult situation. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I call Ms CHRISTOPHERSON.

Ms Lise CHRISTOFFERSEN (Norway, SOC): Madam President, first of all I want to thank the Rapporteur for her thorough and good work on this Report. Undoubtedly this has not been an easy task. On the contrary, weighing against each other numerous considerations almost impossible to combine. Firstly, to secure the aim of this organisation, which is to protect human rights, democracy and the Rule of law all over Europe. Secondly, to find a way to harmonise and coordinate the functioning of the Committee of Ministers and the

Parliamentary Assembly. Thirdly, how should we sanction Member countries who do not respect their obligations towards Human rights, as a fact, voluntarily accepted by all Member countries as we became Members of the Council of Europe.

These issues sit at the top of our agenda because of the Russian aggression against both Georgia and Ukraine, but also by the present situation in Turkey and the numerous breaches of Human rights in Azerbaijan. We have a strange situation concerning Russia. They were excluded from voting rights and do not participate in the Parliamentary Assembly. Therefore, Russia holds back its membership fee. Still, they take part in the Committee of Ministers. That does not make sense. Either you are in or out.

In my opinion the core question is what will serve Human rights for our 800 million inhabitants the best? We have received inputs from different Human rights organisations who want us to draw the hard line which probably will result in the withdrawal of Russia from the Council of Europe. 143.5 million people will then be excluded from our monitoring as well as from their access to the European Court of Human Rights. If the same should be the result for the Turkish and the Azerbaijani people, we will have excluded another 20 million people from their rights towards the European Court. Do we really want this?

My conclusion is that the Council of Europe should stick to our obligations towards the individuals. Economic, political and other sanctions are taken care of by other international organisations such as the UN and the EU. The Council of Europe has its monitoring procedure and the Court as our main tools. I think it's in the best interest of all European inhabitants to keep both Russia, Turkey and Azerbaijan as Members.

I will therefore vote in favour of De Sutter's report. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr ARIEV has the floor.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): "War is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength." That's George Orwell's reality of 1984 we have here. Strengthening the decision-making process of Parliamentary Assembly concerning credentials and voting are... Dear colleagues, have you seen a strengthening here? It's a weakening indeed, as well as, please tell me, in which member state does parliament voluntarily cut its power due to demand of the governmental branch and call it strengthening? I'm aware that we have here the festival of hypocrisy, I don't know another way to call it. What we really do here is fulfil demands in the sake to have an aggressor here and completely ignore the position of the state who we are told were targets of aggression or could potentially could be target of aggression. I don't want too much focus on the legal matters of the report but paragraph 7 of the draft resolution is completely in contradiction to the Statute and Article 5, Article 25 of the Statute, completely. And we have no legal opinions, no sending it to legal affairs committee, monitoring committee, other committee... just go through the decision on the base of political expediency. Sometimes I've heard here from *this* microphone that is in front of you the leaders of the European countries said that in the current situation it should be no winner, no loser, but now, we are moving very fast to the situation where we have a winner with red carpets and a loser that are going to be agreed with the triumphal returning of the aggressor to this world. And I don't know how to continue to work here as well as George Orwell's reality is going to be a reality in this hemicycle. "War is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength".

[APPLAUSE]

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr Goncharenko.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Dear colleagues, for me it's quite hard to speak now because I feel that today we can kill this organisation, because we asked the organisation will be the building, will be the place. We can sit here and make, in some way, that we are speaking. It's a dialogue platform but will it will be nothing, because what will be the authority? And, of our organisation, what people will say about our organization throughout the Europe? Since the beginning of the Russian aggression against Ukraine, we adopted seven resolutions with the demands to Russian Federation, seven of them. One question to all of you: how many of them are implemented by Russian Federation from 2014? I answer you: no one. No one! No one of them is implemented, and what are we doing in five years after this? We are changing our rules, our procedures, to let Russia the possibility to come back here and sit here! Tell me how it is enforceable? It's absolutely abnormal and we are doing it by our own hands! I just want to remind you: 1938, Munich. They said, "Hitler wants part of Czechoslovakia, Sudeten region." And he said, "It is our only territorial demand."

And Chamberlain, France said, "Okay, let's do it. Let's cut part of the other country and give it to him." And it - now we call it "Munich betrayal". What is going on here now? It's Strasbourg betrayal, Strasbourg betrayal! The same story and next year was Pact Molotov-Ribbentrop. What is going here now, it's a Pact Lavrov-Pasquier-Jagland. What is that? That's - that's true and everybody of you, my dear friends, who will vote for this will make your place, will find your place in the history, because you will give possibility to Russia to go further. There was war in Chechnya - no sanctions in Council of Europe. There was a war in Georgia - no sanctions from Council of Europe. Finally, aggression against Ukraine - sanctions, five years and, "Oh, sorry, we are coming back." I hear about 140 million Russians - yes that's true - but what is, how we call this tactics? This tactics is called "live shield". That's a terrorist tactics, when they're putting innocent people and said, "We are staying behind of them." That's a live shield tactics. It's a blackmailing. First, Putin blackmailed us with money; now he's blackmailing us with 140 million people and we're saying, "Okay, yes. Yeah, it's true and we need to speak about this." I think it's absolutely abnormal. One last thing: the day before yesterday, *Le Monde* made an article about Mr Levitsky, who was Consul General in Strasbourg, and who was sent from France one year ago. Why? Because he was a spy. And there's written - it's France, *Le Monde* - and it is written there that he had a direct access to the office of General Secretary of the Council of Europe. My dear friends, don't take part in this awful, awful attempt to kill our organisation! Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr EIDE.

Mr Espen Barth EIDE (Norway, SOC): Dear colleagues, first I want to commend Ms Petra De SUTTER for a very well elaborated report on a very complex issue. I think that everybody here, in this room, feels that this is difficult. I would start by urging everyone to respect that the views held by those having the opposite views of ones own, might also be based on good faith and good intentions, and commitment to rule of law, democracy and Human Rights. Which is the core principle of this organisation, but we read differently what is the right thing to do in this situation. So I suggest that, arguing that all the Members of the Council are succumbing to blackmail, or being Orwellian, or approaching terrorist tactics, is not a particularly constructive approach. But I also think that those of us who will vote for Ms Petra De SUTTER's report have to understand the emotional and difficult nature of this debate for some Members of this chamber. I think that would provide for a more mature and more healthy debate. When I end up voting in favour of the Report, and I hope to be able to vote for it exactly as it was elaborated, and not after having discussed 222 different amendments, it is because I think we have to remember what is the core purpose of this organisation. It is to promote the rule of law, to promote Human Rights and democracy through monitoring. It is about distinguishing between a government and the people of a country. It is to think long-term about the value of having Members continue to be present in the organisation, also when they err. So that we, through dialogue, through monitoring, through the means that we have at our disposal, can react to them and help the people in those countries to live better lives under the protection that the Council of Europe actually provides. This is a question for some people about Russia, and I very much respect that this is the reason we have it on the agenda. But I also want to say that this is the main question that might have to be applied to more countries, because we are entering rough waters. The world is in a different state than when the organisation was applied. We see the rollback of core principles in several Member States, and we need to agree on what the tools are by which to confront this. I believe that, just by believing that if countries leave the organisation the problem is solved, we are wrong. We have to continue in the long haul to uphold the pan-European nature of this organisation's principles. And I think that when I do that, it is not because I care about the money. I understand it's important, but that's not the purpose. It is not because I would give a vote in favour of Putin, if I could vote I would vote against. But because I do believe that the citizens of Russia also deserve the protection presented by the Council of Europe. So I really encourage everybody to really take seriously what the report says. I do believe it is an elaborate report, it's a mature report and it's a report that really goes to the core of what this organisation is all about. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr Mart van de VEN.

Mr Mart van de VEN (Netherlands, ALDE): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Dear colleagues, I'm against the illegal annexation of Crimea. I'm against the presence of Russians in East Ukraine and I am against the downing of airplane MH17. From January 2018, I have been involved in the work of the Committee on the role and mission of the PACE and in the follow-up work in the Rules Committee. With differing views, we work hard for the realisation of the De SUTTER report. I started my work unbiased

and with an open mind. Quite soon I asked myself the question: what the PACE would get in exchange for the return of the Russian delegation in a Parliamentary Assembly? In this respect, the De SUTTER report is disappointing, as Russia to date offers nothing for its return in the Assembly. On the other hand, the Committee of Ministers, in its meeting in Helsinki on 17 May, has undertaken to support a proposal in the Cox Report of 10 April, on a joint procedure of reaction that could be initiated by either our Parliamentary Assembly, the Committee of Ministers or the Secretary General, in case a Member State fails to live up at our core values, human rights, the rule of law and genuine democracy. So I'm not happy with the stance of Russia. I am of the opinion that there is now a window for our Parliamentary Assembly to start anew with our core business. Also, in the presence of the Russian parliamentarians, there exists great challenges in the field of the protection of human rights for citizens, women and children. In the final analysis, I will vote in favor of the De SUTTER report. Lastly, I congratulate this De SUTTER with a courageous perseverance to be able to present today her report. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr IELENSKYI.

Mr Viktor IELENSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear Madam President, dear colleagues.

Some of our colleagues call us to be more rational than emotional. Okay, I will go this way. What we have heard during our discussion, the situation with human rights in Russia is simply terrible. That is why we should return Russia back to Council of Europe. Russia invaded territories of Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova - okay, that is why we should have Russia back. As my colleagues remind you, since 2014, the Assembly has adopted seven resolutions about annexation of Crimea, about human rights in Russia and occupied territories, about minorities, about freedom of consciousness, and Russia didn't implement any of them. That is why we should have Russia back. Another point: we found in our papers reference to Greece case but I remind you that, after the Black Colonels, Greece made enormous, enormous progress in the way of democracy, human rights, freedom - Russia didn't. Now we have heard about the necessity to support Russian citizens, their rights and their freedoms, but just hear what human rights defenders said about this issue. The most authoritative human rights agency in Russia - Memorial - clearly, clearly asked Russians to address their concerns about human rights - not to Council of Europe but to Russian, and only Russian, authority. And last point: I would like to remind you that Russia confiscated billions and billions active in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine. Please be aware that probably Russia would pay their contribution by money stolen from Ukraine. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr. FOULKES, you have the floor.

Lord George FOULKES (United Kingdom, SOC): Madam President, like Lise Christoffersen, I would like to congratulate Petra on doing a very difficult job very well. This is not an easy topic, not an easy issue. I've seen colleagues on all sides tortured about trying to make up their minds on this particular issue. Now I've been as critical of Russia as any of my colleagues from the United Kingdom on the poisoning in Salisbury, and indeed, on their interference in our referendum when they want to see the breakup of the European Union. But I came here undecided about what to do, whether to support this report or not. But I've become increasingly concerned at the polarisation, at the standoff between the two sides. I do ask myself the question, and I asked those who are maintaining and wanting to continue the exclusion of Russia: will it actually help the people of Russia? Will they move out of Crimea and Ukraine? Will the sailors be released? If that was going to happen, I would certainly support it. If I knew that our actions could achieve that effect, I would certainly support it. But with respect to my colleague, Sir Roger Gale, accusing some here as he did today of appeasement is not helpful to this debate at all. And I hope he will take it back. And I know he will - some people will regret it. You know, it's easy fighting the fight against Russia here in the Council of Europe with 222 amendments. That's the easy option. Perhaps it might be better and more effective for Sir Roger to persuade his government to deal with the dirty Russian money laundered through the United Kingdom and our offshore tax havens. Stopping the purchase of property in the United Kingdom as an investment and keeping it empty while homelessness in the United Kingdom soars. That might make the Russians think again. My Lords - I was

thinking of saying my Lords. Colleagues, it is wrong in my view for Roger and others to use the Council of Europe which is... This Parliamentary is far too important to be used as a political pawn, and I hope he will think again.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr NICK.

Mr Andreas NICK (Germany, EPP/CD): Madam President,

Dear colleagues,

Today is the second time we have discussed a draft of the De Sutter report. Last October, we referred this report back to committee because we felt that there was still a need for discussion after all. Not only among us, but also between the institutions of the Council of Europe; between the Parliamentary Assembly and the Council of Ministers.

Let me remind you that we conducted a process of dialogue under the Finnish Presidency of the Committee of Ministers - whom I thank very much for this commitment - with the strong participation of our group chairmen, especially our President, whom I also thank very much for your efforts.

We have had a discussion process which has found expression here in the adoption of the Kox report in the April part-session week. We had a decision by the Committee of Ministers in Helsinki, with the agreement of 39 Member States, and today we have the opportunity of adopting the revised report by Petra De Sutter, whom I would like to thank warmly once again for your efforts to bring this discussion to a close.

As well as the great opportunity to avert the institutional conflict that has long threatened this organization. Let me remind you that 39 Member States agreed to this in Helsinki, irrespective of the political orientation, party or orientation of their governments: Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, Liberals, Conservatives. I find it quite astonishing that colleagues from certain parties should take a different view here, even though the governments which they themselves have in their own countries, such as Great Britain or Poland, take a different view here.

Of course, it's also about Russia. It is repeatedly claimed that the position on the annexation of the Crimea, on the conflict in the Donbas or in the Sea of Azov would be changed here. None of this is right. We're holding these positions. The European Union, too, just last week extended its sanctions against Russia and did so unanimously. What we can achieve here, however, is to secure access to the Court for Russia's civil society. We can also take Russia to task as a member with all rights and duties. The fact that the Russian Federation obviously attaches great importance to being and remaining a member of the Council of Europe is also an opportunity for development forward. I believe that the representatives of the Russian Federation, if they return here this week, will have to engage in a great many critical debates. We have a debate on the clarification of the murder of Boris Nemtsov this week on the agenda. This morning we talked about commissioning a report on the state of investigations into the crash of the MH17 aircraft. We have experienced recently that with Ivan Golunov, with Ojub Titiev releases have also occurred in the Russian Federation, which we might not have expected recently.

We should seize this opportunity together. We should discuss and decide this in a dignified, respectful atmosphere today, and we should not deny any of our colleagues here serious and honest intentions.

Thank you very much, sir.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr SEYIDOV.

Mr Samad SEYIDOV (Azerbaijan, EC): And first of all, I want to express my gratitude to the rapporteur, because this is really a very difficult task, to try to change the attitudes to this organisation by changing the rules and procedures. Because the question is not about the rules and procedures, even the question is not about the values which we unfortunately can see in a very difficult surrounding. The question is about the approach to the values. My country, also occupied, we lost 20% of our territory. And not only Nagorny-Karabakh, but seven regions around Nagorny-Karabakh. And since the accession to the Council of Europe, we said that the Council of Europe had to adopt sanctions against the occupying country, against Armenia. Nothing happened, and we said that in this case, the Council of Europe should do something. Nothing happened. Instead of that, both Armenia and Azerbaijan were invited to sit together and discuss, to find the way out from this situation. If this organization is going to invite everybody to think together and to discuss

their problems, in this case, why do we have this selective approach? Everybody should come. Everybody should discuss their own problems. I can say a little bit more. Today, we can see European games in Belarus, in Minsk. European games are in Minsk, but Belarus is not in the Council of Europe. We should invite Belarus to this assembly. We, all together, should find the way out of the difficult situation. But if the Council of Europe is going to do something, first of all, again, first of all, you should withdraw from your agenda this selective approach. In this country we have a violation of Human Rights, in this country everything is okay. In this country we have an occupation, in this country everything is okay. No! That is why we have today these problematic discussions. We have to have the same approach to the same problems and the same approach to all 47 countries. This is the only way out from these very problematic situations. And, from this point of view, of course, again I'm returning back to the report prepared by Madam De SUTTER. But this is not the answer to the question, because again, with rules and procedures, it would be very difficult to change the situation. We should change our approach to the organization. If we're thinking about this organization and for the future of this organization, we should do that. Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I call Mrs BLONDIN.

Ms Maryvonne BLONDIN (France, SOC): Thank you, Madam President.

I would like to thank Petra De SUTTER for her work. Her work today, the work she has done in this House all this time, on subjects that are always more difficult than others.

So, while Russia has not left the Council of Europe insofar as it still sits on the Committee of Ministers, it no longer sits in our Assembly, no longer pays its contributions and, in the meantime, freedom of the press, the rights of LGBTI people and freedom of assembly are regularly violated in Russia. This has led to numerous convictions by the European Court of Human Rights.

While the Court's judgments are not always applied by Russia, the Strasbourg Court remains the last of the walls against arbitrariness. I sincerely believe that Russian citizens must be allowed to defend their rights before the European Court of Human Rights.

Moreover, I also believe that the *raison d'être* of our Organisation is to provide a forum for pan-European dialogue so that conflicts can be resolved or, failing that, human rights violations in these areas can be reduced. Indeed, dialogue with Russia should enable Council of Europe bodies, such as the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, to visit these regions in which Russia is involved in conflict.

But Russian citizens, just like civilians caught up in conflicts to which Russia is a party, need the Council of Europe. This is the essential reason why, in my opinion, Russia must remain a member of our Organisation.

I approve this motion for a resolution and this new mechanism, which appears to be an extended hand, a bridge offered to this country, which must also learn to live in peace with its neighbours.

However, Russia's return to our Assembly should be followed by concrete actions demonstrating a willingness to cooperate further with the Council of Europe in the defence of fundamental freedoms and, as I said, allow for the CPT, the Commissioner for Human Rights and the Rapporteur to travel quickly to the Crimea to take stock and make recommendations.

Being a member of the Council of Europe carries obligations and requires that democracy be respected by all states, but also by all of us here as parliamentarians. If this is not achieved, certain conclusions can be drawn.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms. SOTNYK has the floor.

Ms Olena SOTNYK (Ukraine, ALDE): *Merci*, Madame Président.

All of this reminds me of the story –I know maybe all of you know this– Oscar Wilde's *The Nightingale and the Rose*. I will just remind you: the nightingale felt pain for the boy who was suffering from unexpected love and decided to help him to find a red rose. There weren't any red roses in the garden, just white roses and she performed a suicidal act while sinking with his heart on the thorn, giving her heart's blood to a white rose

which turns into a beautiful red rose. The nightingale dies and the girl rejects the rose by saying that it will not match her blue dress and someone else has brought her jewels that are worth more than a rose. The boy threw away this rose.

It looks like Europe is doing the same about Ukrainians. You know our people gave blood, gave their lives to your secure lives. They stopped the aggressor on the borders of stable and peaceful Europe and they still continue doing this. Our people made priceless presents to you. They fought for the values of Europe and they gave you an opportunity to show up with a new vision of Europe, with a new meaning of Europe. And you are going to throw this present away receiving a price from the aggressor, receiving money from the aggressor. I'm sure everything that is happening here is about some of you having double standards and fake values, fake principles. All of you who are going to give the way to the aggressor, you need to remember that you will need to answer to our widows, to children who lost their fathers, to mothers who lost their children, thousands of people who died in Donbass, thousands of people who died in other countries, Georgia, Moldova, Syria, many, many other MH17 victims.

Today, the *Le Monde* newspaper has a huge explosion article about Mr Lewinsky, he used to be a General Councillor in the Parliamentary Assembly in the Council of Europe and according to this article, he has special access to the Secretary General. I propose all of you to read this article. After this, everything is expected, everything is understandable. But please, I know that many of you realise what is the threat of the Russian Federation, what is the threat of behaving like this with a beast. That's why I urge you colleagues, that one who realises please, don't give opportunity to change the rules without any condition for the Russians. Don't vote for this resolution if it's not going to be amended and support those who died because of the Russian Federation. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I call Mr JAGLAND, Secretary General.

Thorbjørn Jagland (Secretary General of the Council of Europe): Madam President,

This is the second time I hear about this person that I don't even remember the name of, which is from an article in *Le Monde*. This person I have never seen, never met. If I met him on the street I wouldn't recognise him because I have never seen his face. So that part of that article is totally false. Slander. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We are continuing the list of speakers.

I call Mrs BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR.

Ms Rósa Björk BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR (Iceland, UEL): Thank you Madam President.

Dear Colleagues. The report we are debating and voting on today is a good and thorough report. But we stand before a difficult decision today. We are deciding on changes to our Rules of procedure that will narrow our possibilities to sanction delegations in response to the country's behavior. In some respects this can be said to weaken the Parliamentary Assembly.

We need to face this choice with open eyes and weigh the negatives of such action carefully against the benefits. Those benefits and our goal in changing our rules today is that we will be protecting the rights of Russian citizens for years to come. The benefits are also that we can diminish the time and energy that we have spent on the Russian issue here in the Parliamentary Assembly while neglecting other very important issues.

We have to move on dear colleagues. By doing so we are not accepting the annexation of Crimea or giving in to blackmail. I want to repeat this. The annexation of Crimea was done in violation of International law and should be reversed. However the Parliamentary Assembly is not the most efficient avenue for sanctions. The Assembly should continue to be a forum for dialogue. We should work together with the Committee of Ministers to streamline our response to violations of our norms and values so that our procedures conform to our statute and have a clearer effect.

We must however preserve the protection of the Council of Europe for all the citizens of our Member states. Reserve the monitoring to a rapporteurship of Russia, something that has been neglected for the last five years. Faced with this choice today, I choose to stand with the citizens of Russia and the Council of Europe. I choose to stand with dialogue and solution, with constructive solution for the benefit of the tireless fight for Human rights.

We will not all be one hundred percent happy with the solution here and the decision taken here today. But nevertheless, we have to stand with the principles and values of the Council of Europe and I'm proud to do so today.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mrs DURANTON.

Ms Nicole DURANTON (France, EPP/CD): Thank you, Madam President, dear colleagues.

After the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the Council of Europe brought all European countries together around common values centered on the respect for Human rights and the Rule of law. This is an undeniable success of our organisation, which has become a real forum for pan-European dialogue. Russia, for its part, joined the Council of Europe in 1996, thus demonstrating its desire to turn the page on the Cold War.

But today, as the Council of Europe celebrates its 70th anniversary, this unity is very fragile. Indeed, following the annexation of Crimea by Russia, our Assembly deprived the Russian delegation of its voting rights, which led to its voluntary departure. In 2017, Russia stopped paying its contribution to the Council of Europe, thus strengthening its disengagement from our institution.

Today we are at a crossroads. Either we can find a diplomatic solution acceptable to all to allow Russia to return to our Assembly, or Russia could leave the Council of Europe. Dilemma.

I strongly condemn the annexation of Crimea, which, let us be clear, is a violation of international law and the rules of our organisation. Will Russia's departure help to resolve the conflict in Ukraine? It is absolutely necessary to promote dialogue to enable a return to the rule of law in the Donbass and Crimea. If the Russian delegation returns to our Assembly, it must be accompanied by signals illustrating a desire for sincere cooperation. It would be inconceivable to reopen the doors to it without concessions. For example, Russia could release Ukrainian sailors captured in the Azov Sea, or allow the Human Rights Commissioner to travel to Crimea.

Membership of our organization implies respect for certain principles and a willingness to cooperate with its organs. If some consider that the sanction imposed by our Assembly on the Russian delegation is questionable from a regulatory point of view, it is necessary that in the future, the Council of Europe adopts a sanction procedure against a Member State that violates the principles of the organisation. This procedure should be implemented jointly by the Committee of Ministers and our Assembly, and the political dialogue between the two should be strengthened.

Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The next speaker is Mr CILEVIČS.

Mr Boriss CILEVIČS (Latvia, SOC): Thank you Madam President.

The issue we are discussing today is of special importance for me. Most of my voters are Latvian citizens for whom Russian is a mother tongue. Russian is also my first language and we speak Russian at home. My party is labeled as pro-Moscow by Latvian nationalists. Latvian Russian speakers are loyal Europeans, but naturally for them good relations with Russia, active involvement of Russia in European life, including the Council of Europe, is vitally important. But not at any cost.

It seems that it is the first time ever that I disagree with my good friend Ms Petra De Sutter. Yes, I am strongly in favour of compromise and dialogue with Russia. But is the suggested solution indeed a compromise which can facilitate dialogue? In my view obviously not. Frankly to us it looks like a surrender. I appreciate the concessions we are making towards Russia, but does Russia reciprocate anyhow? Unlike most of you, colleagues, I can read the Russian media and I see that the Assembly's good will is used only for propaganda purposes, presented not as an opening door for dialogue, but as a full endorsement of Russia's actions.

In fact, Russia has not followed any demands or recommendations of our Assembly. Just weeks and days before this debate Russian authorities committed new hostile actions against Ukraine as well as Georgia, trying to exert economic pressure on the basis of completely fake pretexts. Millions of Russian tourists visit Georgia every year and not a single incident has ever been recorded.

The draft suggested by Ms Petra De Sutter is indeed a good basis for further dialogue. However, I strongly believe that some amendments are necessary. Madam President, we are not just a round table for discussions, not a UN or OSCE type organisation. We are a club with clear criteria for membership based on respect to democracy and Human rights. If all the amendments are rejected, the adoption of the Resolution would undermine our Assembly's credibility, and in fact will turn it into a poor copy of the OSCE. I believe it is quite enough to have one OSCE in Europe.

Madam President, how are we going to criticise other Member states? And should we expect them to take our advice seriously when they see that we turn a blind eye on much more serious wrongdoings? Are we going to continue calling this Assembly a temple of Human rights? Doesn't this sound as a bitter joke?

Madam President, I'm not a diplomat. I am a Human rights defender. I do not believe that a purely diplomatic approach pursued by the Committee of Ministers can be effective, and I cannot accept that our Assembly drops its statutory functions and rights.

I very much hope that we will be able to find the proper compromise without undermining our core values, and call upon all Assembly Members to support the amendments aimed at achieving this. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr BEREZA.

Mr Boryslav BEREZA (Ukraine, EPP/CD)*: What Sir Roger GALE said today was one of the most striking statements I've heard within this hall. Sir Roger GALE has quite rightly noted that for 70 million pieces of silver we're prepared to have Russia coming back here. For 70 million pieces of silver we are going to close our eyes to the occupation of Crimea and The Donbass. For those 70 million pieces of silver we're prepared to pardon the crime of the killing of Ukrainians. Now, at the time of Jesus Christ, the price was only 30 pieces of silver. That was a small price for a treachery, but here, the price is higher. Now when someone says that Russia should come back simply because it's a danger to have Russia outside, and 140 million Russian citizens would no longer have access to the European Court of Human Rights. But that is hypocrisy. That is more than hypocrisy. Because there are decisions of the Parliamentary Assembly and of the Court to free Bakirov from a prison and move him to hospital for instance. That's an official judgement of the European Court of Human Rights, but the Russian Federation has completely ignored that. And Madam President, you also know that the decision to be taken today is a political decision. It is not a decision that would support the Rule of law. Think of Boris Nemtsov. Think of all of those Ukrainian hostages who are being kept in the Russian Federation, who are being detained, who are in Russian prisons and camps for decades. You are in fact allowing and agreeing to all of this being done by the Russian Federation in Ukraine. Well that, of course, is your right. But if the Russian Federation comes back here, then what is that going to mean? As Mr. Levintsky has written in Le Monde, there was a Russian diplomat with access to the office of the Secretary General. If after all of that, after all of the scandals of the Parliamentary Assembly with Mr Pedro AGRAMUNT and others, you are insisting today that the Russian Federation must return. Well, that would really mean a complete reduction to nought of the prestige, of the authority, of the Council of Europe to work in Ukraine and to resolve problems in Ukraine. There has been this decision for a memorandum with the office in Ukraine. But a country that is completely ignoring the decisions of this Assembly and other decisions of other bodies of the Council of Europe just can't be accepted. So to bring Russia back here is not an attempt to promote dialogue. It is simply an acceptance of the murder of Ukrainians, of the occupation of Crimea and The Donbass. If the Russian delegation does come back here, I really don't see how us Ukrainians could continue to work with the Council of Europe, with an organisation that is trampling on those principles. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr. RAMPI has the floor.

Mr Roberto RAMPI (Italy, SOC): Madam President, ladies and gentlemen,

I believe that today we really must put all our intelligence to work because this is a delicate step. I have great respect for the emotions that are brought to this House. Indeed, I believe that we must never leave emotions outside the door. But we must try to really understand what our role is and what the meaning of this institution is.

I don't think anyone can give lessons in democracy here, using words like "traitors" to those who think differently. The first rule of democracy is respect and recognition of the value of the different opinions that must continue to live. I do not think that we can give lessons on democracy with personal attacks against the rapporteur for this measure, who has done a very good job. Someone may not agree, but he must protect the honour and honourableness of our colleague.

I believe that the sense of the Council of Europe is that people who think differently, even in a very conflictual way, can sit in the same room and tell each other why their opinions are different. Israelis and Palestinians are sitting in this room at the moment.

I do not believe that if our colleagues from the Duma do not enter this room, we will restore justice to none of the victims of the annexation of the Crimea, to any of the victims in Ukraine, just as we will not return their homes to those people who cannot live there again today. If any of the colleagues who are against it can say in conscience that not having colleagues from the Duma, who can vote for the Secretary General, solves one of these problems that you rightly and emotionally listed, if you can say in conscience that this would solve it, then you are right to vote against this measure.

I will vote in favor, precisely because I am convinced of Winston Churchill's extraordinary intuition when he thought of this as a place of confrontation; when he decided that my country, Italy –which had been the enemy until a few years earlier and which had voted, with its free vote, Mussolini and had brought him to power– could enter here to discuss with its British colleagues. That's the magnitude of intuition, the value of soft power. I do. I understand that many people don't believe it anymore, but I still believe that ideas contaminate people and make them change.

I've been thinking about it a lot during these hours: most of us think that the value in school is the vote we give to the children. Well, the value of school is not the vote we give to children; that is the starting point. The value of school is the transformation we can produce within each person.

We are not here to judge by a vote who is good or who is bad, we are not the club of the good who must exclude the bad guys. We are the place of dialogue and confrontation where we grow together.

That is why I will be voting in favour and I call on everyone, in all conscience, to vote in favour. Thank you.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Mr MÖLLER.

Mr Ola MÖLLER (Sweden, SOC): Thank you, Madam President.

Democracy is about respect, cohesion, dialogue and showing each other respect. And when you use one hour to decide an agenda, when you throw out 222 amendments to a report that is very, very good, that is not to respect democracy in the micro way.

There are bigger and larger issues at stake, of course, but I don't think that people here should be that loud about democracy when we can't even have order here. So, start with behaving like true democrats and when you do, you don't accuse people with a different opinion of hypocrisy... we've even had people referring to the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, it's not democracy to do that and it's not democracy to stop talking to each other.

If we throw Russia out I can't ask the parliamentarians from Russia why they're doing what they're doing. I can't state my opinion to them and that is what democracy is about, breaking ideas, talking to each other, and trying to find a common ground which must be Human rights.

Honestly, we must have stringency in what we do in this assembly. It is not like we don't have countries here bombing sovereign nations against UN resolutions. We have countries here slaughtering Kurdish people in the region of Afrin and we had the Israeli-Palestinian raised by my colleague Rampi before. These countries are not thrown out, we talk to them, we tell them what they do is wrong, and to me that is what the Assembly of Europe is all about. I want to be able to accuse the Russians when they persecute LGBT people. Like a lot of countries here, you don't give gay rights, but I want to be able to tell you that you're wrong. So by throwing out Russia, you rip me of that possibility and please don't do that.

And since I came here I haven't heard one constructive suggestion –apart from Petra de Sutter's report– to solve this situation. This is the best. And to quote Winston Churchill, I can't say it exactly, but he said democracy is the best of all the bad systems we've had. It's not perfect but we must believe in it and dialogue, respect, cohesion is the way forward for democracy. Thank you.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Mr HUSEYNOV.

Mr Rafael HUSEYNOV (Azerbaijan, ALDE): Thank you, Chair. Dear colleagues, if an organisation that has reached the age of 70 tries to make changes to its Charter, to its principle of operation, it is good on one hand and on the other hand it causes concern. It is good because of the internal dynamics existing in the organisation. It shows that the organisation is able to critically approach its work, seeking to become more modern and more perfect. The less pleasant thing about the issue is why a prominent organisation directly connected to the socio-political fate of 47 countries has more rules and regulations that have functioned perfectly until now. It turns out that, still, in some cases, we have followed the wrong way. In principle, the trend towards innovation and attempt to make positive change is an acceptable course. But there is also the experience taught by similar reforms in Europe and around the world. Needless to say, such kind of change should not be aimed at restricting or expanding the rights and powers of certain groups or individual States. So let us all benefit from the changes that make these innovations better for everyone. Each member of the organisation, underwent certain procedures and assumed obligations. In addition to the individual obligations of various countries, the general and important obligation of all is to comply with the Charter, as well as to unconditionally implement the rules and requirements of the organisation as a prerequisite for membership. If a member does not comply with these requirements, if it demonstratively refused to do so and if it repeatedly does so, sanctions definitely should be applied and the organisation should put forward its position, at least in order to preserve its reputation. If not, the credibility of the organisation is also lost and its reputation falls. There are numerous examples, I will just recall one of them. In previous year's Armenia openly and systematically resisted the preparation of certain reports of the Parliamentary Assembly, neglected the adopted resolutions and, for many years, refused to implement them. The Council of Europe continues to endure and tolerate such contempt on behalf of this Members State towards its Charter, and then they wonder why the crisis in the organisation is not interrupted. Why one of the undesirable processes ends and another unfolds. The only reason is that there should be a Charter that fully meets the requirements of people, and there should not be efforts to change it in every new situation. Compliance with the requirements of the procedural rules should be the same for everyone without exception. Thank you.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Ms GERASHCHENKO.

Ms Iryna GERASHCHENKO (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you.

Since 2014, Ukraine has been under Russian military aggression. Among the victims: 13,000 people killed and 30,000 injured. Hundreds of hostages and political prisoners in the Kremlin. From the very first days, the Assembly adopted a number of resolutions condemning the illegal referendum in Crimea and Moscow's failure to implement the Minsk agreements.

The Assembly called for an end to the persecution of the Crimean Tatars, the establishment of a ceasefire regime, the release of all prisoners from the Kremlin, full access to OSCE missions, and the search for missing prisoners with international Red Cross missions.

Russia has not complied with any of these resolutions. Now, in Russia, about 100 Ukrainian political prisoners are imprisoned and about ten hostages are in the occupied Donbass, whose rights are being violated.

Neither representatives of the Red Cross mission nor other organizations have access to it. Moscow continues to illegally detain Oleg SENTSOV, Volodymyr BALUKH, Pavlo HRYB and others.

I would also like to remind you of resolution 2259 (2019), in which the Assembly insists that Russia unblocks the ships and releases 24 Ukrainian navies. But it does the opposite to the decision of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, and continues the illegal detention of Ukrainian marines.

Dear colleagues, these are the letters from our Ukrainian marine prisoners received from Lefortovo prison. They thank everyone who supports them and await their release. Marines write that their freedom cannot be limited by the walls of a prison. So why can we limit consciousness through the walls of this room?

We have asked the Russians many times to release our Ukrainian prisoners, as part of the Minsk Humanitarian Task Force. Russia is still showing destructive positions. Russia has ignored all Assembly resolutions. On the other hand, we are being asked not to punish it for all its crimes, for the destruction of the values, principles and decision-making mechanisms of the Council of Europe.

Ukraine will not vote for such a decision. We call on our colleagues not to be hypocritical, and to defend the fundamental values of the Council of Europe.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): Next speaker, Mr. BAKRADZE.

Mr David BAKRADZE (Georgia, EPP/CD): Thank you very much.

Dear colleagues, today we're discussing a decision which will have fundamental influence on the future of this organisation and which will shape the future of our work, and this is not a decision about procedures. This is a decision about the possibility for Russia to come back.

So what stands behind this decision? If this organisation is about money and power games, yes, I see the reason, but if this organisation is about values, is about principles and is about Human rights, I don't see a single reason why we should make a positive decision about Russia's return to this hemicycle.

Let's just look at plain facts. We are discussing the return of a country which violates the basic principles of European security by continuing occupation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia, by continuing the annexation of Crimea and Ukraine, by continuing the war in Donbass.

We're talking about the return of a country which deprives hundreds of thousands of internally displaced people and refugees from their basic fundamental human right to live in their families and their houses.

We are discussing the return of a country which continues daily and weekly abductions, kidnappings and torturing of peaceful civilians in my country, in Georgia.

We are discussing the return of country, which in these five years demonstrated total disrespect of all decisions taken by this Assembly, in this hemicycle. We have adopted more than dozen of resolutions about Georgia and Ukraine. Tell me a single example of what was implemented by Russia. Nothing! Total disrespect to this organisation.

We're talking about return of the country which, right now, continues to put pressure on its neighbours. Right now, just a few days ago, President Putin announced the new wave of economic sanctions against Georgia.

We're talking about this country and I have heard by some of my colleagues, "will sanctions help us to resolve these problems?". At least sanctions send a clear message that this is not acceptable and this goes against our values. By accepting Russia back to this organization we say "it's okay you occupy your neighbours. It's okay, you can come back", "You torture peaceful civilians? It's okay you can come back.", "You annex parts of your neighboring countries? It's okay you can come back".

There is a huge difference between opposing and supporting or endorsing. A return of Russia to this organisation will be supporting and endorsing all the crimes which Russia does.

Dear colleagues, my choice is clear. I don't want to be a supporter and co-sponsor of crimes done by Russia and I hope you don't want it neither.

Very lastly, since the great European statesman Winston Churchill was mentioned a few times let me read one of his quotes "The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion". Let's not throw our values and principles to the wolves because that would be a total delusion. Thank you.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Mrs TRISSE.

Ms Nicole TRISSE (France, NR): Madam President, for my part, I will be voting in favour of this reform proposed by the Committee on Rules of Procedure. I will not do so out of naivety or pragmatism. I will do so because I am convinced that this step can help to resolve the institutional and political crisis that has plagued the Council of Europe since 2014.

I have listened carefully to the various speakers, and I would like to ask them the following question: how has the 2014 sanction changed anything? How have we prevented anything in the last five years? Let us be clear: there can be no question of us, as PACE members, giving in to any budgetary or legal blackmail from a Member State. We must only put the purpose of the Council of Europe back at the forefront of our deliberations.

Our organization is not a collective security body. Nor is it a body for settling territorial or geopolitical conflicts. It is not within this organisation that the question of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of one of the Member States must be resolved and addressed. Moreover, this observation does not exclusively concern Ukraine or the Russian Federation: other Member States have also been involved in territorial disputes for many years while continuing to participate in our sessions.

Of course, like the highest authorities in my country, I want Ukraine to have to its territorial rights restored, and I really hope that discussions in the so-called "Normandy" format will be resumed.

However, I also hope that the Council of Europe does not engage in a spiral of exclusion of Member States that would weaken its authority and deprive millions of European citizens of legal protection and an absolutely major convention. Thus, the European Convention on Human Rights, the Istanbul Convention and –of course– the ECHR. In my opinion, the future is more likely to be built on dialogue than on silence or any other posture that would lead to indifference, because –you see– indifference is terrible, not for governments, but for people. That is why I think we need to adopt the regulatory adjustments proposed to us and I thank the rapporteur for her work.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Mr RAVALIA.

Mr Mohamed-Iqbal RAVALIA (Canada): It is a privilege to speak on the decision-making process of the Assembly concerning credentials and voting from an Observer State's perspective.

This is indeed an important watershed debate with compelling arguments on both sides.

Canada was granted official observer status to the Committee of Ministers in 1996. We share the status with the United States of America, Japan, Mexico and the Holy See. Since 1997, Canadian parliamentarians also have had an official observer status in the Parliamentary Assembly, a status that we share with Mexico and Israel.

As an observer nation, I would like to highlight certain fundamental principles that are at stake in this very important debate and in order to do that I will summarise Mrs de Sutter's report of June the 6th 2019. She recalled that by virtue of Article 1 of the Statute of the Council of Europe, the Parliamentary Assembly and the Committee of Ministers are responsible together for contributing to the achievement of the organisation's aim which is "to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress". This provision also specifies that the Council of Europe's aim "shall be pursued through the organs of the Council by discussion of questions of common concern and by agreements and common action in economic, social, cultural, scientific, legal and administrative matters and in the maintenance and further realisation of Human Rights and fundamental freedoms". Keeping that in mind, I know that the draft resolution proposed by her refers to the decision adopted by the Committee of Ministers at its 129th session in Helsinki in May.

The Committee agreed at that time with the Assembly on the need for an enhanced political dialogue between these two statutory organs for developing synergies and coordinating the action in accordance with their respective mandates. In particular, the draft resolution highlights support from both organs for the proposals to set up a joint procedure of reaction which could be initiated by either the Parliamentary Assembly, the Committee of Ministers or the Secretary General under certain circumstances.

While we as observers would welcome efforts by the two statutory bodies to work closer together, it would in our view be important that international organisations such as the Council of Europe preserve their ability to react strongly to violations of International law. In that context, we strongly hope that today's debate will not lead to a weakening of efforts to ensure the respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Council of European states. Thank you.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Ms GOGUADZE.

Ms Nino GOGUADZE (Georgia, EC): Madam Chair, dear colleagues, thank you so much.

I believe that what makes the Council of Europe a strong and effective institution and what will make the Council of Europe a stronger and more effective institution is its commitment towards its founding principles and its consistency in its actions and decisions.

In 2014, when Russia started to intervene in Ukraine and annexed Crimea, violating the fundamental principles of the Council of Europe, the Parliamentary Assembly took a very strong stance against the Russian aggression and imposed sanctions on the Russian delegation. That was a strong message towards an aggressive country: that Europe will not tolerate aggression and occupation.

Today it is very unfortunate that we are discussing the possibility to change the whole sanction system of the Parliamentary assembly only to accommodate the wants and interests of one particular country. More precisely to enable the Russian delegation to return unconditionally in the Assembly.

Dear colleagues, let me ask you, what has changed since this Assembly imposed sanctions on the Russian delegation for their aggression? What has influenced the Parliamentary Assembly to counter its own well-tested practice and get rid of the mechanisms which in many cases are the only instrument to respond to grave Human rights violations in Europe?

We have to remember that while we are discussing the possibility of unconditional return of the Russian delegation, the conflict in Ukraine is still going on, Georgian occupation is still in process and people in occupied Abkhazia and South Ossetia are still denied of their basic Human rights. Thousands of Georgian and Ukrainian citizens remain displaced from their historical home places. And let me remind you that those developments are not happening far away from your countries and your hometowns. They are happening in Europe. How many European countries have to be affected by Russian aggression to consider those conflicts as a serious threat to all the European countries?

Here, I would like to confirm that Georgia has a very consistent and strong position against an unconditional return of the Russian delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly. We firmly believe that Member states of this organisation should not allow the lowering of standards of the organisation or any downgrading of the common values in order to overcome whatever challenges there could be.

Lastly, what we really need today is a strong Parliamentary Assembly with strong powers to deal with the crisis and to respond to it effectively. Most importantly when Member states permanently breach core principles of the organisation, the Parliamentary Assembly should be very vocal without any reservations.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): Next speaker, Mr HONKONEN.

Mr Petri HONKONEN (Finland, ALDE): Thank you, Mrs President.

As politicians, our aim is to stand up for the common good, to accomplish good developments in our societies and in the whole world. For me personally, Human rights are always in the center.

For this organisation, for the Council of Europe, of which the impact to the history of our continent has been remarkable, universal Human rights are always the very foundation.

To create progress we have to compromise. All the time, we have to compromise. During the Finnish Presidency, our organs have managed to find a compromise, the results of which we can see in the report of Mrs Sutter. The aim is to find a balance, as we cannot close our eyes from the Human rights violations and we have to continue the monitoring of necessary obligations. The securing, the respect for Human rights on the whole continent: we must not forget the aim of our organisation, regardless of geopolitical pressures.

This is now my fifth year as a member of this Assembly. As a politician and as a European, I've been impressed by the work we do here. It is unique, it is universal and it is, indeed, necessary for our citizens on the whole continent. This organisation is for citizens, not for the States.

I would also like to underline the importance of this new cooperation between this Assembly and the Committee of Ministers, to start a joint procedure with regard to Members not respecting their obligations. Thank you.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): Next speaker, Mr KÖCK.

Mr Eduard KÖCK (Austria, EPP/CD): Dear colleagues,

The discussion is a very difficult one today, because the concern is also very different.

I understand the concern of colleagues from countries who have to live with the aggression of Russia. But sometimes there may be false expectations of the Council of Europe. It could solve such problems there like a judge, and could then ultimately execute them and we must recognise that. We could never do so in other areas in Azerbaijan, in Syria, or even in the occupied territories in the neighbouring countries of Russia. This has been mentioned a number of times. We are a forum for discussion here, and we should remain so. I am of the opinion, and that is what I would like to say here, that if this report is adopted today, then we can still be against Russia being aggressive in all neighbouring countries. As am I!

Thank you. I'll take care of it.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Mr WILSON.

Mr Phil WILSON (United Kingdom, SOC): Thank you Madam President.

I would just like to thank Ms Petra De Sutter for the amount of work she's put into this, which is obviously a very difficult and sensitive issue. But we are here to defend Human rights and the Rule of law, and that is the reason for this organisation's existence. We all agree with that, but sometimes you've got to stand up for what you believe in.

The Council of Ministers decision taken on May 17th in Helsinki said you have a shared responsibility for democratic security in Europe, ensuring respect for rights and obligations, principles and standards and values. That sentiment was reached by consensus, and therefore, there was no vote. But words are easy. And if you believe in those words you should examine your deeds. You don't therefore invade the territory of another Member state. You don't shoot down commercial airliners. You don't assassinate journalists because you don't agree with them. You don't interfere in the elections and referenda of the Member states. And you don't use chemical weapons on the streets of Britain. Russia is doing all of these things, and I do not know how we can accept Russia back in to our community of European nations without being very, very careful. Russia cannot return without something in return.

We need to be careful. The amount of Russian media I've seen outside of here today proves to me that they are looking for a propaganda coup. We cannot award Russia approval of their credentials without something back in return as I've said. We therefore need to put the ball back into Russia's court for them to make some decisions as well. For them to be back in we need to have a list of what we want in return. And I've got some ideas. This list isn't exhaustive:

- Release of the Ukrainian sailors.
- Admission of their involvement in the democratic processes of other Member states.
- Admission of their use of chemical weapons on the streets of the UK.

And then we can consider them coming back into this community of European nations. Obviously also we need to see them pay their whole debts to this organisation. If we have a shared responsibility for democratic security in Europe, it's the least we can expect.

Don't let say the principles of this organisation diminished and don't let us provide Russia with a propaganda coup. They want to report back to their own citizens that this Council of Europe has capitulated. Let us see what price the value Russia puts on to the membership of the Council of Europe.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr HUNKO.

Mr Andrej HUNKO (Germany, UEL): Thank you very much, Madam President,

Mrs Rapporteur, Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen,

I would first like to warmly congratulate you on this report, which is the end product of a long process, a long discussion process. I will also support this report. You just have to see, and there is no getting around the fact that the Council of Europe is in an institutional crisis on this issue. We have been discussing this for a long time, we have created a situation in which the Parliamentary Assembly is no longer in a position to discuss this together. Also with the Russian deputies, while on the other side in the Committee of Ministers things are going on as they have been going for years and years. It's a dead-end we're in. That is why it is right and proper to try to get out of this impasse. That in Helsinki this decision was taken in the Committee of Ministers with 39 of the 47 Member States and this report is basically the completion. It is not a question of being able to give in to Russian pressure, so to speak, but of creating a coherent mechanism between the Parliamentary Assembly and the Committee of Ministers to be able to respond coherently to similar challenges in the future.

Because the situation in which we only have sanctions at parliamentary level, but then not in the Committee of Ministers, as I said here in this House years ago, is not a satisfactory one. I also believe that those who now say that the Council of Europe is losing its credibility, that the Assembly is weakening... I think that's a pretext. I do not have the impression that the motives of the Council of Europe are always in the foreground here. That is why I support this report. I shall be voting in favour, and the 222 amendments that are now to be tabled are actually an obvious attempt to torpedo as far as possible a decision made by an obvious majority; to wear it down. I think these amendments should be rejected.

Thank you so much for your attention.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr. VAREIKIS has the floor.

Mr Egidijus VAREIKIS (Lithuania, EPP/CD): Thank you Madam Chairperson.

Today in the morning one Russian journalist called me and asked what will I think about Russia's victory. About Russia's great victory. I was surprised a little bit, and I said, is the Council of Europe the battlefield? He said yes, of course. Russia is fighting for its honour and place here. So probably today or tomorrow we will have Russia's victory. And I would like to reflect on that.

You know, in my life I experienced a few, even many Russian victories. Victory in Hungary. Victory in Czechoslovakia. Victory in Afghanistan. Victory in Syria, in Georgia, in Ukraine. There are many victories. But what happens after victory? After each victory we have less Human rights and more destruction. Russian victory comes generally with destruction and Human rights violations. Unfortunately. And now, Russian victory is coming to the Council of Europe. So you see this week we have a part-session and we speak very little about Human rights. We speak about Russia. The chairman of our political group, the Group of the European People's Party, said the group is divided. So there are distractions, political distractions. So the Council of Europe is facing, once again, Russian victory. And we will see what happens after, after this victory.

But I think the Russians are making a few philosophical and ideological mistakes. They have the idea that history is written by winners. It is not true. History is written by peacemakers. The famous war theoretician Carl Von Clausewitz said that victory is not the end of a war. The end of war is peace. And we really don't need winners, we need peacemakers and the statute and rules of the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe itself was established by peacemakers, not by physical winners.

And my dream, my mother's dream, is to have the Russian delegation in the Parliamentary Assembly. But Russians as peacemakers. Russians are always coming with problems but I am waiting for them to come with solutions. With solutions in Georgia. With solutions in Ukraine. With solutions even in Syria. The peacemaking Russia would really be a real lovely Member of the Council of Europe. So I wish Russians rethink their geopolitical and Human rights thinking. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr. MASŁOWSKI has the floor.

Mr Maciej MASŁOWSKI (Poland, EC): Madam President,

The Rapporteur, I've supported your reports many times but not this time. I think this report splits the chamber, splits the political groups, splits delegations and, finally, splits European countries. Today, we should celebrate together the 70th anniversary of the Council of Europe but as we could see in the morning, life is changing and is full of surprises.

Do you remember dear colleagues, do you know, why the Council of Europe was created? In 1949, few years after the Second World War, Winston Churchill and others decided no more war, no more terror, no more military aggression. All the problems we should discuss and solve at the table, in this chamber.

What we have today, Russian aggression against Ukraine, is a fact. Russia is still member of the Council of Europe. Don't worry. Still member of the Committee of Ministers. We just suspended their delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly. What happened? Russia didn't implement none of seven reports from this chamber for the last few years.

For the Council of Europe, the biggest problem is that Russia stopped money transfers, so we prepared reports, so-called changing rules and procedures and we invited Russia to participate in the election of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

I understand the importance of the European Court of Human Rights for Russian citizens, however, allowing the Russian delegation to return to the Parliamentary Assembly, the Council of Europe this week, free of sanctions, would send a negative signal regarding our shared commitment to imposing costs on Russia over its aggression.

With all due respects my dear colleagues I think we are weak. Delegates from 46 countries and we cannot speak with one aggressor who break the main rule from 1949 and at the end I read the book, the book contained the speech of Adlai E. Stevenson, the year was 1952. He remarked it's far easier to fight for principles than to live up to them. Please consider it when you start voting. Thank you

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I would like to give the floor to Mr Martin WHITFIELD.

Mr Martin WHITFIELD (United Kingdom, SOC): First of all congratulate the Rapporteur on an excellent piece of work which started, in her case, three years ago.

But the seed of this report goes back much further than that, which is why we find ourselves today divided between allegations and accusations against Russia for wrongdoings for which they have done nothing about and on the other side, the defense of Human rights and the need to protect the individual. Both these cases, both these claims are right and this forum is a place where above all else speech should be heard.

Today we have heard eloquent speeches requesting compromise and understanding. But we must, at some stage, draw a line because if we don't we will find ourselves in this position in probably but a few months time, asking what we are going to do with someone who is present that is unable to comply with Human rights. It is those Human rights that sit at the very basis of why we are here today.

I was going to discuss other matters but since we've been sat in this chamber, social media and journalists have laid attacks against the Rapporteur, against her as an individual. I find that deeply offensive in a challenging and problematic time, to try and pick on an individual rather than an idea, to try and pick on an individual rather than by a solution. So in the short time that I have I would like to share with Petra a letter that has gone around because I firmly believe in the contents of this letter and I think within this letter lie the seeds of the problems that we are with faced in this hemicycle today. Perhaps by understanding the individual more, we can move to Human rights, which apply to the individual more than anything else.

Dear Petra, you are a strong brave professional and kind person. Regardless of our political positions that may change and vary, I have the greatest respect toward you and to what you have done and what you are doing for PACE here today and for other organisations in the future. Thank you for your work over the past three years, thank you for this report. It is challenging for many people in this hemicycle but the work was essential. The compromise that you have sought was well-founded and I thank you for that.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr. ZINGERIS has the floor.

Mr Emanuelis ZINGERIS (Lithuania, EPP/CD): Dear President, dear Petra.

Congratulations with your new elections and your new next five years in European Parliament. I, and probably most of my colleagues absolutely sure about your integrity and your person and goodwill to make a report, but today is not about that. Today is not about you as a brilliant person and a brilliant politician but it's about a very key issue related to the key basic event that not one of our resolution has reflected. So, I would like to ask you all who were voting and voting for resolutions, specially about the last resolution: "the Assembly's calls the Russian Federation –it's about Oleg Sentsov liberation– to release without delay all Ukrainians detained in the Russian Federation and in Crimea on politically motivated and otherwise fabricated charges. To abandon the policy of imposition of Russian citizenship on Ukrainian citizens", and so on.

So, I've just cited one of those resolutions who become not any more important on Russian Federation, with no answer from Russia's side. Me, Pieter OMTZIGT mentioned to the Rapporteur and not to have access in the case of aeroplanes shot down by Russian military. I am asking about why I proved right to visit Russia in the case of Boris Nemtsov himself who granted before Mr Putin and he was candidate to be a president of Russia in '89. He was leading pro-European Russian Democratic movement. And it was a question how he was killed in front of Kremlin when he was surrounded by democrats... surrounded by FSB people every day, every hour, like a leader of a Russian Democratic opposition?

Tell us please how to vote in favour of this moment... of the part of your report related to inviting members of the Russian Parliament who voted in favour of occupation of Crimea. Tell me please how to vote for those guys who are on the European Union sanctions. We are European Union countries, twenty-eight countries. We impose personal sanctions on especially active people in Parliament of Russia who were active against the Ukrainian state during the time of Russia aggression and occupation of their territories. They are included, so what we have from Russian side? They included the sanctioned people. How to accept such behaviours? You are trying to say that it's good to build behaviours to include sanctioned people in the Russian delegation?

Now, from my point of view, I would like to say that even Andrius Kubilius that will be tomorrow with us, prime minister of Lithuania, was not included in the Secretary General elections, it was part of very questionable procedure by the Committee of Ministers side. From my point of view, I would like to congratulate our good friend with her report but I would like to encourage you not to vote on some parts that are related to the Russian delegation. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr Le NAY.

Mr Jacques LE NAY (France, ALDE): Madam President,

The motion for a resolution before us today consists of an amendment to the Rules of Procedure of our Assembly. The objective is to provide a framework for its power to impose sanctions when it decides on a challenge to a delegation's credentials. The Assembly could no longer deprive a delegation of its right to vote, to speak and to be represented in the Assembly and in these various bodies. This amendment to the Rules of Procedure should ensure compliance with the Statutes of the Council of Europe, by ensuring that each Member State can be represented both in the Committee of Ministers and in the Assembly.

Of course, it is also a question of allowing the Russian delegation to return to our Assembly. While I think we need to have a dialogue and work with Russia, I also think that this amendment to the Rules of Procedure is necessary. Last year, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe publicly referred to a note from the Council of Europe's Legal Adviser which stressed the need for clarification of competences. In an Organisation like ours, which is based on law, it is necessary that the rules be respected, even if many of us have been perplexed as to the advisability of issuing this note just before a part-session and several years after the facts.

However, while I am in favour today of this motion for a resolution to settle the dispute with Russia as soon as possible, I have three reservations.

The first is that our Assembly must ensure that a joint sanction procedure with the Committee of Ministers is effectively put in place in the event of a breach by a member state. The credibility of our Organization depends on it. Indeed, the challenge of credentials on substantial grounds will therefore become a joint procedure which can only be concluded with the assistance of the Committee of Ministers. Such a procedure must exist.

Secondly, the power of sanction of this House in the event of a challenge to credentials on formal grounds must be maintained. To give meaning to this procedure, it is necessary that it leads to sanctions. This may include, for example, not allowing a member of the delegation to be a rapporteur. Finally, establishing a procedure for challenging the credentials of individual members requires great caution. The Assembly should not become a court of law, having to settle disputes between national political parties. Indeed, the referral of an individual matter to the Assembly should be strictly regulated, and the grounds for sanctions clearly specified. This procedure should be complementary to the existing one.

These are the comments I wanted to share with you, ladies and gentlemen.

As I said, I will vote, despite these reservations, and I congratulate the rapporteur on her excellent work.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I give the floor to Mr ANDERSON.

Lord Donald ANDERSON (United Kingdom, SOC): Madam President, the report is good in parts.

On the constitutional issues, who can be against closer relationship with the European Union? But there is, of course, the obstacle of the judgment of the European Court of Justice. Who could be against greater alignment with the Ministerial Committee? But again there is, as Pieter Omtzigt mentioned, the point of unanimity. And our position as an Assembly, as parliamentarians, need not be the same as ministers who want, effectively, a quiet life. It is rather in respect of Russia that I take issue with its own conclusions.

Let us recall two matters. First, Russia was sanctioned because it had invaded a Member State. Indeed, not just Ukraine, earlier Georgia, about which we did firstly nothing. Has anything changed since that time? Not at all. That Russia has this question of passports. Russia has imprisoned the sailors from Ukraine. And, indeed, it has done worse in that way, and therefore, effectively, we've been saying, "Well, there is no change, but we will give in it." It is, as no doubt the Russian journalists will say, a remarkable victory for Russia and for President Putin.

Secondly, the question arises: are there any boundaries beyond which we shall say that you as a country should be sanctioned? Clearly, it is not having invaded the territory of another country - Ukraine, Georgia, perhaps tomorrow the Baltics. This is not enough. It is not shooting down a civilian airliner. It is not, in respect of the European Court of Human Rights, having a device to override the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights. It is clearly not interfering or having a cyber attack on other Members of the Council of Europe. It is clearly not assisting in the most horrendous atrocities on civilians in Syria and using chemical weapons against those members. It is not sending a spymaster, in fact, two spymasters as shown yesterday in *Le Monde*, with no doubt evidence from the French intelligence services, to be the Consul General here in Strasbourg. And it is, of course, not poisoning civilians on the streets of the UK. That this - yes, of course, we all want dialogue. But are we to say to Russia now, "I'm terribly sorry we impose sanctions, but we were wrong and we admit that we were wrong"? Do we have a clearly... that... Let's be really realistic. This is a victory for Russia, and critics of the Council will say that we are in danger of selling our principles, our very soul, from mess of pottage or, indeed, a pile of roubles.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Dear colleagues, I announced that we would close the list of speakers at 6:15 p.m.

However, since the compendium with the amendments in both languages – in French and English – is not yet ready, we cannot start dealing with the amendments, and that is why, for the moment, we are continuing the list of interventions.

I therefore give the floor to Ms TOMIĆ.

Ms Aleksandra TOMIĆ (Serbia, EPP/CD): Madam President, Madam Reporter, allow me to congratulate the rapporteur of the report to regain PACE's commitment to dialogue, representation, and participation as fundamental principle of the Council of Europe. My strong belief is that this is the step forward in fortifying the position of our organisation, since it is our common obligation to maintain the visibility, relevance and reputation of the Council of Europe as an institution. Serbia fights for every MP's rights as national elected representative to represent its citizens. By denying voting rights to any MP, this assembly directly excludes the citizens of the country in question. We warned in January 2015 that taking away voting rights to Russian delegation will diminish the significance of the aims, principles and goals of the Council of Europe, especially promoting democracy and human rights in the spirit of open dialogue. It is crucial that our organisation has the authority necessary for the implementation of its mandate as the leading human rights organisation. In the year when Council of Europe celebrates its 70th anniversary, we commend PACE for the courage to maintain the relevance and reputation of our organisation by dealing with the not avoiding difficult situation, by defending the MP fundamental rights to speak, vote and represent its citizens, thus verifying once more key ideas and goals of the Council of Europe. I welcome the decision that I am confident will be made today, and I express my hope that the Assembly will stay committed to open dialogue. I will vote for this report. I invite all members not be lead by their personal feelings when voting but vote as a responsible politician in the line with the Council of Europe's interests. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr HOWELL.

Mr John HOWELL (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President. In this, the 70th anniversary of our creation, I want to ensure, as I said this morning, that we are fit for another 70 years, and to do that we need to be true to our common values that are summed up in the three expressions: human rights, democracy and the rule of law. But these values do not include holding this Council to ransom. They do not include invading another Member's territory or falsely arresting and imprisoning sailors from a neighbouring country. Neither do these values include trying to kill individuals on a Member country's soil, downing a civilian aircraft or coming forward with a complete hash on human rights. In Russia, there is no respect for rights and obligations. No respect for principles, standards and values at all on the part of the Russian Federation. Now electing a Secretary-General, electing judges to the court are important, but I cannot justify - and I hope nobody else will justify - specifically bending the rules to allow a country that has broken them all to come back to us. I'm not in favour of changing the rules to allow ratification. It's important to remember that Russia has not been excluded, it has excluded itself. So what concessions have we got out of this? Money? Well, there is still a great uncertainty about the money and when it will be paid. There is even more uncertainty about whether Russia will pay the interest on that money that has been accrued. The Crimea? No change. The sailors? No change. An end to spying here? No change. Now, the French foreign minister this morning said that the common values that we have were about trying to protect Russian citizens to make sure that they have access to the Court of Human Rights. Russians still have access to the Court of Human Rights! Now, she may have meant that if Russia chose to leave, people would not have access to the Court of Human Rights, but that is a choice for Russia to make, not a choice that we should have to take into account. It should not weaken our ability at all to take sanctions against Russia when we think that is appropriate or, indeed, sanctions against anyone else when we think that is appropriate.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I give the floor to Mr Vlad BATRINCEA.

Mr Vlad BATRINCEA (Republic of Moldova, SOC)*: .Thank you very much Madam President. Dear colleagues, there has been a lot of emotion in this hemicycle. We've heard a lot of harsh words. But I think that the rapporteurs have done a very hard job to give the right answers. After 70 years of existence, will the Parliamentary Assembly be able to preserve the unity of the organisation and the unity of its values? Let us remember, first and foremost, that this is a parliamentary forum. No one has the right to exclude parliamentarians from participating in a democratic process. I mean, if you exclude parliamentarians, you are excluding the voices of those who have voted for those parliamentarians. And can we, as democrats, accept that? I would like to express here the important role played by the Secretary General, Mr Thorbjorn JAGLAND. He has deployed very wise policies for Europe in this 70th anniversary of the organisation. Let us hop back to the decision of the Committee of Ministers. 39 ministers have voted in favour of the unity of Europe on the 70th anniversary of the organisation. So I think the proposals advanced by our rapporteur do give the right answer. If we don't end up with a Council of Europe with 47 Member states and a Parliamentary

Assembly with 47 national delegations, we will then turn into a club of individual interests. That will simply mean an undermining of democratic parliamentarianism. That will mean a rejection of our principles. Yes, we must have parliamentarians representing the Russian Federation. Here we must all have the opportunity to exchange with one another. And if we don't have the force, if we don't have the strength and the wisdom to discuss with one another, then what kind of parliamentarians are we? We must all be prepared to listen to others. So yes, let us support the report. There are no ideal reports. But this report does put in place, if adopted, the mechanisms that would make it possible, as called for by the Committee of Ministers... That would make it possible for all 47 Member states of the organisation to participate in all the bodies of the organisation. For those who state that we are not a court, well... In Nagorno-Karabakh, in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict... Those are very complex issues. You need to have enough imagination and wisdom to find the right solutions. I think we've had them proposed today.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mrs SCHOU.

Ms Ingjerd SCHOU (Norway, EPP/CD): Thank you Madam Chair.

First, a big thank you to our Rapporteur Ms Petra De Sutter. You have done a tremendous job with this report and I think we all know how demanding it has been. It has required the utmost of political skill and patience. Thank you.

Dear colleagues, in its 70 years, the Council of Europe has found itself in deeply challenging situations. It has suffered from internal divisive conflicts. At the same time, there is a rise in nationalism, populism and repression in Europe. The internal difficulties have for too long prevented us from focusing on the mandate given to us, which is to monitor and safeguard the Human rights of 800 million citizens in the Council of Europe Member states. This is what we are supposed to do. We are not supposed to engage in conflict resolution between Member states.

After five years of internal conflict it is now time to stop. If not, we risk damaging the credibility and integrity of the organisation.

Dear all of you with whom I disagree but respect all the same in this difficult question, when I cast my vote today it is not because I think it's right to give in to pressure from Russia. It is because I don't want to give away the possibility to put pressure on Russia. Just as I don't want to give away my chance to put pressure on any of the Member states in the Council of Europe. The citizens of Russia need access to the European Court of Human Rights just as much as Norwegian citizens. We owe it to them to come to a solution to this internal conflict today.

Dear colleagues, there can be no lasting peace and stability without respect for the Rule of law and Human rights. And there can be no true democracy without the protection of minorities. We need the Council of Europe now more than ever. And, dear colleagues, we need to be pan-European to include all states and all of the 800 million citizens. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mrs ÆVARSDÓTTIR.

Ms Thorhildur Sunna ÆVARSDÓTTIR (Iceland, SOC): Dear Colleagues. First of all, I would like to say that debating very conscientious issues like this is made much more difficult if people that oppose your view call you a traitor, and make it up so that if the opposition of their opinion is the equality or equals being a traitor to the organisation that you belong to. Being somebody that wants to destroy Europe, somebody that wants to destroy this organisation that we belong to. That is not a good foundation for constructive and democratic dialogue. This is not how we should speak to each other about the very important and very concrete questions that we are facing today. Because, if you come from the standpoint that your opinion can be the only true opinion, and that everyone else's opinion is that of traitorship, is that of defeat or betrayal of the organisation that they belong to, then you have gotten to a very dangerous place where you feel that the end justifies the means in any event, because everybody else is a traitor. This is not a democratic mindset. And I would encourage you to not think of people that have opposite opinions to your own, in terms of what is best for the future of this organisation, as traitors or as complicit in war crimes of Russia, or wanting to destroy this house of democracy. I do not think it will bring us anywhere. That said, I support this report. I support the work of it's rapporteur, which I believe has done her utmost to reconcile different the viewpoints. To reconcile all the

different views of all the different groups in this Parliament, and also in the different political groups, with a lot of painstaking work that builds on a much longer process in the *ad hoc* Committee and more. This is our solution now. I would say to you that we are not giving in. We are responding to a situation that occurred after the Committee of Ministers was not willing to sanction Russia like we were. Now we have, as you say, sanctioned Russia for five years. What has come out of it? What is the sanction? That they are not here in this house listening to how critical we are of their practices? Is that the sanction? What would come out of this report? There's a possibility for this Assembly to start a procedure by itself. When the Committee of Ministers lacks courage to do so. We are giving ourselves a tool to truly hold Russia to account in opposition to what we've had before. We've not had a proper tool to hold Russia to account before this Assembly. We are only punishing ourselves by continuing this way. Let us instead get a proper tool to hold Russia to account, because I definitely feel it should be held accountable. and I think that this report and its acceptance is the best way to that end. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr SOBOLEV.

Mr Serhiy SOBOLEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you.

Russia decided to withdraw their troops from occupied territories of Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine. Russia decided to withdraw all their troops and start the process of demilitarization of the Crimean Peninsula. Russia decided to free all political prisoners. Tomorrow, Russia decided to stop all aggressions in Europe and all over the world. Russia decided not to violate Human rights. Russia, Russia, Russia! It's not report about Russia. It's a report *only* about Russia.

What are the propositions? We decided if any country will violate a rule of death penalty, it can't be a member of this organisation, but in two days or, maybe tomorrow, you, not me, will be sitting together with the members of Russian Parliament who voted to kill Ukrainians, Crimeans, Tatars, Russians, Jewish people, on the territory of sovereign state of Ukraine. They voted for this, all of them! Who will you congratulate in this building? You want to sit with them? You want to ask them questions? About killing children? Women? You'll ask these questions to them? Please? You want to sit them on the presidium? You want to allow them to be their leaders of the committees and political groups? It's your answer for all their actions.

I think it's not a history for today, it's a history for the future. When you keep silence, you keep silence, on the aggression of Moldova of Georgia and even Ukraine. It was the last fact, when we have seven resolutions against Russian aggression, now we are allow to do it all. Please, you are welcome, do everything! I think it's only the start of a big process and if Czech leaders can't understand two hundred thousand people on their streets, if Armenian leaders, who play games, dirty games, with Russia, can't understand 70 percent of those who came to the new Parliament, if Georgians protest now, it is no answer for this Russian aggression. If the last events of bribes in Austria, Austrian Parliament, it is not answer for this. I think it's only the beginning and each of you who vote for this resolution will be on this desk and you will remember this forever.

It's not about Ukraine, it's not about Georgia and Moldova, it's about your countries. It's about the peace in Europe. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr BALFE.

You have the floor.

Lord Richard BALFE (United Kingdom, EC): Madam President,

Can I begin also by congratulating the Rapporteur. As someone who lives part of the time in Belgium and knows the European Parliament well, I can only say she's a distinguished citizen of that country and I know that her career in the European Parliament would also be of great distinction. We are lucky that she's here to do this report.

I think it should be twinned though with Theresa May because it's a very good example of kicking cans down the road until you reach the very end and we are, of course, at the end of the road, we have to take a decision and I believe this decision should be on the basis, "How can we do the best for the people of Russia?" and I

think that this report shows us the way that we can. I think it's a sound report. It's not a slavish report, but it's one which points a sensible way forward and equates with a principal I've held in my life, thanks to Lyndon Baines Johnson, "It's always better, if you can, to have them inside the tent rather than outside the tent".

Of course, as Ms ÆVARSDÓTTIR said, the Council of ministers is not exactly showing a lead and the British government, which went along with the ministerial decision, has since been briefing, "Well it's up to you, as members of the sovereign Assembly, to decide what to do", in other words, they've been trying to move away from the very decision that they supported.

Now, I prefer to have countries in this chamber that I can talk to. If you look at this week's agenda we have a report that is quite critical of Malta but the Maltese delegation has defended itself. We frequently criticise other countries, Azerbaijan comes to mind, but the Azerbaijan delegation is here to put their side of the case and my belief is, that if the Russian delegation was here and we could actually deal with them in detail, on the things we think they're doing wrong, and my goodness me the list is quite long, that is far superior to shouting at the door, shouting names through the door, through the letterbox and not getting heard.

I believe this report shows us a way to have a dialogue which is not tainted by the excessively negative attitudes I've heard from some points around this chamber. I congratulate my Nordic colleagues, who are in support of this, and I think it is a way forward. It is a mistake for us to keep on playing the same tune. If nobody sings to the same tune you need another tune and another hat to collect your money in.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mrs CHRISTENSEN has the floor.

Ms Jette CHRISTENSEN (Norway, SOC): Thank you, Madam Chair and *réporteur*. Ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, a politician that is concerned about Human Rights is obligated to fight for the people who have politicians that don't respect them. For the people that are occupied, for the people that are thrown in prison just for believing what they believe, for the people in Ukraine, for the people in Georgia, for the people in Russia. During this debate, we've been told that Russia has no values, that Russia has no sense of democracy and that Russia doesn't respect Human Rights. Russia is my neighbour, and that is not true. Russia is a great country with great inhabitants who is run by politicians who don't respect Human Rights. And we need to have those politicians here to tell them what we think about that. This debate has also been regarding a few arguments that are simply not true, and I need to address them. This is not surrender to blackmail. This is not selling our values. This is standing up for our values. And this is not closing our eyes to what happened in Crimea. Last time we were together, we voted over one more time that we, as an Assembly, think and believe that the declaration of Crimea is illegal. Because it is. But it is not standing up for our values, and not standing up for what we believe in, not to have Russia here. Because this is not a club of countries who fully and truly respect all the Human Rights. Being here does not mean that you're a perfect country. But when you are here, it means that your inhabitants, your people are protected by someone. Protected by us, and also protected by the law system that we are here to fight for. So please, do not think that voting for this report has anything to do with anything else than standing up for our values, fighting for human rights and being able to go into our next century as a pan-European organisation. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you.

Dear colleagues.

Today we can witness a historical moment. The day when the Council of Europe died. Because if you vote for this resolution, that means that there is nothing left from our Parliamentary Assembly. Nothing except the label, this building, money for some events, but not the principles and values that created our organisation. They will disappear. Because of your will, your votes, your decisions.

I have heard the argument that the return of the Russian delegation will ensure Russian citizens' access to European Court of Human Rights and help protect their rights. But Russia is an authoritarian state. It has already been made official by their Constitutional Court, stating that it can refuse to implement decisions of European Court of Human Rights.

Furthermore, Russia on more than one occasion has just ignored the decisions of European courts. The latest example is the refusal to comply with the order to hospitalise Ukrainian political prisoner Edem Bekirov. Lifting sanctions in the light of Russians' bold disregard for past decisions will not help strengthen international security and peace but it will rather promote impunity and encourage others to violate international law.

I would like to note that Ukraine is not the first country to suffer from Russian aggression and unfortunately probably not the last. Our voting will show that either we support international law and human rights, or impunity and acceptance of military expansions in the 21st century. I hope you will make the right decision and remember that human lives depend on your decision and you can save them or kill them. Your choice.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mrs. GOLUBEVA.

Ms Marija GOLUBEVA (Latvia, ALDE): Ladies and gentlemen,

I have heard many arguments today in favour of supporting this report because, as many of my colleagues have said, they think that if we support this report then Russian citizens will still be able to have recourse to the Court when human rights violations happen, and we will be in this way able to protect them. I'm skeptical about this given the fact that the Russian Constitutional Court has basically passed a statement saying that only if in the Court's opinion those judgments coincide with Russian Constitution, will they consider those judgments as valid.

But let's for a moment even believe that this is going to have effect on the Russian Federation. That, for me, does not give sufficient grounds for basically proposing to reduce very substantially this Assembly's right to sanction a country that does not adhere to the core values and principles of the Council of Europe. If you are indeed looking for compromise, well, why not just give the right to let the Judges of the Court?

Instead, what we have proposed in the name of dialogue and engagement is to basically reduce our right to sanction a country for those violations: a country that has not done anything to implement our previous requests and requirements in order for them to exercise full political rights in this Assembly. To warn you against this, I would like to quote the journalist Maxim Eristavi, a staunch defender of human rights, who writes today "at a time when the merits of democracy are increasingly being questioned all around Europe, such weakening of the Council's powers to sanction countries that gravely violate its fundamental principles sends a horribly wrong signal and will only encourage other member countries to engage in similar violations". I suggest you listen to his words.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mrs KATSARAVA.

Ms Sofio KATSARAVA (Georgia, SOC): Thank you Madam President.

As much as I would like to understand the arguments presented here during the debate, I would like for you colleagues to look at this issue from the perspective of those countries who have suffered and continue to suffer from the Russian pressure and aggression. Yes, we represent the public here, and precisely because we do so, we care about the security, well-being and prosperity of those who for decades have been living under illegal occupation.

We have heard some of our colleagues today referring back to some historical facts and episodes. But today, in the 21st century, we still witness occupation, families divided with barbed wires, people deprived of basic and fundamental rights, Human rights severely violated in the occupied territories and hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons still waiting to return to their homes.

If Russia ever wanted to follow any recommendation or meet any international obligation, we would have seen some, even a little progress. But there has been none.

Dear colleagues, we have spoken enough on the violation by Russia of international agreements, resolutions, Human rights, Rule of law, occupation and annexation. Please do not disregard this when making the judgment and the decision, as we all want security in Europe. Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr KANDELAKI.

Mr Giorgi KANDELAKI (Georgia, EPP/CD): Thank you. The arguments have been repeated over and over. Just a couple of days ago, we had pro-European demonstrations in Tbilisi, which still go on. People are angry with our own Government. It's our internal thing. Russia's reaction? They imposed - they forbade - Russian tourists to visit Georgia, interfering in internal matters of a neighboring State. I'm sure many Russians will defy this and will still come to Georgia, and many others will come. But the point is simple: Russia understands what we are doing here today as weakness, and as an invitation for further aggression. There will be more trouble. I promise you, no matter what you say, no matter what some Ministers of Member States say, what the Russian Government will declare if this happens, is that the reasons for which the voting rights were taken away in the first place have been forgiven. The reasons, which are enshrined in the resolutions after which the voting rights were taken away, are still there. Nothing has been implemented. The EU-brokered ceasefire agreement has not been implemented in Georgia, and the annexation of Crimea has not been reversed. 12,000 people, dear colleagues, have died in Ukraine. 12,000! That's a lot of people. That's a lot of lives. Are you really willing to forgive that to Russia? And to tell Russia that it's OK? Are you really willing to do that? Please, think about this, because when you push the yes button, that will mean that you are forgiving Russia the murder of 12,000 people. That will mean that you're forgiving Russia the downing of the MH17 flight. That will mean that you are OK with all of this. Finally, in today's *Le Monde*, we read a very important piece of information that has already been mentioned. Last year, when many European countries - most of your countries - expelled Russian diplomats after the poisoning of Mr Skripal in Britain, some diplomats were expelled from France as well. In today's *Le Monde*, we read that the Consul General from Strasbourg, Mr Levitsky, who turned out to be an officer of the GRU, was expelled because the French government judged that he was engaged in illegal clandestine activities in the Council of Europe. And, specifically, in the office of the Secretary General. He had unlimited access to the Secretary General, and the article refers to the French Government - French Government! French counterintelligence. This is a bombshell! This is very serious information, and the Secretary General has to respond to this. And, if I was him, I would resign. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The Secretary-General replied earlier to this accusation.

I give the floor to Mr. LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: Many Ukrainians are told that the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe is a temple of democracy. What are we seeing today? You refuse to consider the issue of those responsible of shooting down an aeroplane where 300 people died. The whole of this day is wasted in order to capitulate before Russia and open the door for its victorious return to the Council of Europe. The marking of the 70th anniversary is difficult to imagine under these conditions. Members of parliaments from strong democratic countries are talking about dialogue and compromise. They try to justify that there are citizens of Russia, from Norway and other countries. Now is part of Maltese or Norwegian territory occupied by Russia or not? But in Ukraine, part of our territory is occupied. People are dying. Servicemen are dying on a daily basis. These attempts to bring back the Russian delegation is not going to contempt 13 000 people that have died. Ukrainians are shedding their blood. You are trying to sell your values for money. You're deceiving yourself, your voters and Europe. You want Russia to be here because you want to protect the rights of Russians to address the European Court. Maybe you have forgotten that the constitutional court in Russia has decided that the decisions of the European Court of Human Rights means nothing to them. We don't need Russian rights. You need Russian money. Instead of cutting costs, you want to bring Russian money here and sell the principles on which this organisation was founded. You, dear friends, are either silly or rotten at heart. You don't see what's obvious. Appeasement of the aggressor will not stop the aggression. On the contrary, he'll become more arrogant. The Russians are now applauding you because they think they are victorious, that they have defeated us and the Council of Europe. The return of the Russian delegation will not help to defend the rights of the Crimean Tartars, or to free the Ukrainian sailors or political prisoners that have been lingering in prison for years. By voting for the return you will be betraying yourself. You will feel ashamed of looking into the face of your children or into a mirror. Please don't come to Ukraine. Don't tell us how you want to help us. If you want to help us, don't betray yourself and don't betray your voters.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr DOUBLE.

Mr Steve DOUBLE (United Kingdom, EC): I for one, was disappointed that we did not get to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Council of Europe this morning because since its inception by the great Sir Winston Churchill, this Council has a proud record of working for peace, for the Rule of law and the rules-based international order, for Human rights, for freedom of speech and for equality, and should be very proud of the contribution it has made over that time to making our continent a safer, more prosperous and more equal place to live. But we should be at no doubt, that this week, this Council stands at a crossroads, a crossroads that will determine whether it continues to be a beacon for these values into the future or whether it will now compromise and dilute and diminish its place in the world.

We should be under no doubt that, if we vote for this resolution as it stands unamended we will be meeting the demands of the Russian Federation for them to be able to continue to be part of this Council. But it should not be for us to meet Russia's demands, it should be Russia that is meeting the requirements of this Council for it to belong to this Council.

It is quite clear that recent actions by Russia have violated the very principles that this Council is established on. Its actions in the UK, in Crimea, in other parts of the world, have demonstrated that it does not share the values and the principles that we have established this organisation on, and it is also quite clear that there is no evidence that if Russia is allowed back into this Assembly that they will change their ways. There is no evidence that they are willing to change their domestic policy. There is no evidence that they are prepared to change their International relations and so I would say, "What evidence is there that allowing Russia back into this Council will in any way achieve the things that we hope to achieve?"

I believe that we should ask ourselves a question. "What message would our action send to the rest of the world?" It has been argued by some that allowing the Russian delegation to return to this Assembly would give us a chance to engage with them directly, perhaps even criticise them for their actions. But, what sign is there that they've listened to anything that this Assembly has said so far?

I wish for Russia to be able to return to this Assembly, I wish to see Russian delegation back in this chamber playing a full role, paying their share of the money that is due and playing by the rules and engaging in the discussions as we work to continue for the peace and prosperity of our great continent. But it should not be us that change our rules to allow Russia back in, it should be Russia that changes its ways to rejoin this Assembly. I will not be able to support the resolution as it stands this evening.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr KILJUNEN.

Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN (Finland, SOC): Madam Chair, thanks to Ms Petra De SUTTER for this compromise minded report. Dear colleagues, this is my first speech here in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. I'm proud to be present at the world's leading parliamentary forum to discuss Human rights. I am also very pleased to listen to the discussion today that has been useful and of course has had opposing views on the item we are discussing. But I think that we all share something. All of us share something. First of all, the value of defending Human rights, Rule of law and democracy in our territories, in the world. Secondly we also share the views of wanting to protect Human rights in all our Member states, including Russia. Including Russia. Colleagues, the Human rights situation in Russia will not improve by leaving them out of the organisation. Colleagues, the rights of the Russian people, not to speak about Human rights defenders in the country, will surely not be improved by leaving Russia out. We are better defended when Russia is a Member here, when the people in Russia can appeal to the European Court of Human Rights, when we can monitor the Human rights situation in the country. And lastly, of course, when the Russian colleagues are here we can debate with them and check how they are behaving and also, in that way, improve the overall situation. Thank you very much Madam Chair.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr FOURNIER.

Mr Bernard FOURNIER (France, EPP/CD): Madam President, ladies and gentlemen.

Following Russia's annexation of Crimea, our Assembly decided to deprive the Russian delegation of its voting rights, which led to its voluntary departure. As a result, we have found ourselves in a paradoxical situation where a representative of the Russian Federation sits on the Committee of Ministers, while the Russian parliamentary delegation no longer sits in our Assembly.

The Council of Europe's pan-European vocation as a forum for dialogue promoting conflict resolution has therefore been called into question, as has the credibility of our organisation. That is why I am pleased that, at its 129th session, the Committee of Ministers decided to work together with our Assembly to set up a joint sanction procedure against states that do not respect the principles of our organisation. This synergy should help us to be more effective in defending the rule of law and fundamental freedoms.

The motion for a resolution before us today should contribute to the return of the Russian delegation and its participation in the election of the Secretary-General, conditions of an undeniable legitimacy. This would put an end to a crisis that has been going on for too long and is weighing on the functioning of our organization.

Indeed, in 2017 Russia decided to suspend the payment of its contributions, which has consequences for the financing of the Council of Europe's activities. In addition, it is essential that Russian citizens can benefit from the protection of the European Convention on Human Rights.

I therefore hope, as we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Council of Europe, that relations with Russia can make a new start.

Beyond the Russian case, I hope that the Council of Europe as a whole will benefit from a new impetus. Indeed, recent years have not been easy and the credibility of the organisation has been called into question, particularly as a result of corruption cases that have affected some members of our assembly. However, at a time when populism is invading the political arena, the role of the Council of Europe as a guarantor of the rule of law in Europe is more essential than ever. I am counting on the French Government, which holds the Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers, to make the Council of Europe once again a genuine pan-European organisation capable of promoting the rule of law, democracy and fundamental freedoms throughout Europe. This will necessarily require a resumption of dialogue with Russia, which, for its part, will have to make the necessary efforts to revive the principles of our organisation, because any unilateral approach is to be prohibited.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is for this reason that I will vote in favour of this motion for a resolution.

Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr FASSINO.

Mr Piero FASSINO (Italy, SOC): Thank you, President.

First of all, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms Petra De Sutter, because she has conducted all this reflection, leading us to difficult and difficult decisions that offer a solution.

Now I believe that we must say very clearly to our Ukrainian friends and those of other countries, who reproach us for wanting to bring Russia back here, that we are all aware that Russia has great responsibilities. Nobody wants to give Russia discounts; it's exactly the opposite. We ask that Russia comes back to this Assembly in order to influence the behaviour of the Russian Government, so that the rights that today are very often compressed or suffocated are respected.

Let us ask ourselves: if Russia does not return to this Assembly, are we stronger? Do we have a better chance? In fact, if Russia does not return here, the Council of Europe will be penalised for reducing its representativeness; it will have no means of influencing the decisions of the Russian Government, and it will not allow Russian citizens to have recourse to the European Court of Human Rights. In short, we will not benefit in any way from our work or from the aims of this House; we will simply allow Russia to continue to do what it wants to do without us having any chance of conditioning and influencing it.

The many sufferings that Russia has produced in Ukraine, Moldova or the Caucasus have been mentioned here. But Churchill was also mentioned here: well, when Churchill proposed the constitution of this Assembly, he was well aware of the sufferings of the Second World War, he was well aware of all the disasters that had occurred in those years as a result of that war and he had no hesitation in proposing that an Assembly be made in which nations and countries that had fought until a few months before could sit together; he had proposed that Assembly precisely so that what had happened up to that moment could no longer happen. He was not afraid to propose an Assembly in which even representatives of Germany or Italy or of those countries that had inflicted incredible suffering on England and the other democratic nations could sit. He did it so that those sufferings might cease.

That is what we are fighting for today: to bring Russia back to this Council, to have the opportunity to influence and protect the rights of Russian citizens and to promote the fact that the aims, rights and values of this Council can be recognised and respected in Russia, where they are not today. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr LOPUSHANSKYI.

Mr Andrii LOPUSHANSKYI (Ukraine, ALDE)*: Dear Madam President. Dear Ms Petra De SUTTER. Dear colleagues.

Today we are considering an extremely potent issue that may jeopardise the existence of democracy and Rule of law in Europe. If a positive vote is taken, the aggressing country will be able to participate in decision making processes that will have an impact on the entire region. In this context, I ask all colleagues for whom European values are not empty words, not to allow revenge.

Here are just a few facts that there is no place for an aggressive country like the Russian Federation. Last week, the international investigation team established... Investigating the causes of the disaster of MH17 in the Donbass in the summer of 2014, named the first four suspects involved in the downing of an aeroplane. Three of them are citizens of the Russian Federation. We all understand that behind them were high officials who gave the criminal orders and rules to have the opportunity to find out their names. Relatives of MH17 victims demand that Russia's return to PACE shouldn't be allowed. They understand that the Russian Federation will use this international platform to avoid responsibility for the tragedy. Today, in fact, we want to regularise the activities of a terrorist country.

I would also like to remind that the 10th of April of 2010 became a black date not only for Polish calendars, but also for the international community. In one moment we lost our true friends and partners. Russian Smolensk became a tragic symbol of these Polish elites for the Polish people. In 1940, the representative of Polish military elites was destroyed.. In 2010, political elites were killed in the same area. I believe that Poland is confident in the position of rejection of Russian aggressive policies.

These two facts presented by me suggest Russia's flagrant violations of international law and reluctance on peaceful coexistence in the family of European nations. Today is the fifth year of the Ukrainian-Russian war, and everyday Ukraine remembers the annexed Crimea, Luhansk and Donetsk, sea attack and the seizure of seamen in Azov. Considering the importance of the issue under discussion, as well as in accordance with international legal norms, the delegation of Ukraine demands the Russian Federation to implement all peace resolutions and to respect international law.

Today Russia has no right to be with us here. We're telling that Human rights protection of Russian citizens needs their participation in the Council of Europe. Today Russia has the possibility to work in the Council of Europe to protect Human rights. But Russia is not here. They do not want this. They do not need a place for dialogue, but they need a place to have voting rights and manipulate all of you. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr CHOPE, you have the floor.

Sir Christopher CHOPE (United Kingdom, EC): By its actions and words the Russian Federation government continues to show its utter contempt for the values of the Council of Europe, which we all hold so dear. But can I just concentrate on one of those particular issues, because the most important value that we have is respect for human life. The fundamental human right, the right to life. Belarus is not a member of this organisation solely because it supports judicial capital punishment. In other words, the death penalty imposed according to the Rule of law in Belarus. We reject Belarus because it is fundamentally at odds with our values.

But the Russian Federation carries out extrajudicial capital punishment. In other words, death penalties in breach of the Rule of law and carried out not only on Russian territory but also overseas. We need only to think of Boris Nemtsov or the victims of the Salisbury poisonings or many other people in the United Kingdom who have been murdered by Russian agents. And the same is happening all over Europe if not further afield as well. We deny 10 million Belorussians access to the European Court of Human Rights because we think that to stoop to the lowest common denominator and allow Belarus in despite their support for the death

penalty would be going too low. Why should we allow back in the Russian Federation when they go even lower by supporting extrajudicial capital punishment. The consequence is bad for 440 million Russian citizens perhaps, although they currently continue to have access to the European Court of Human Rights.

But why don't we get some consistency in our approach here. If we want to reduce our values to the minimum and accommodate within this organisation countries that are committed to capital punishment, whether through judicial process or not through judicial process, let's do so but then let's bring back a Belarus and welcome all citizens of the whole of the geographical parts of Europe.

But if, like me, you believe that actually there are some values which are so important that we should uphold them in this Assembly and not allow members to flout them with impunity, then join with me and vote against this resolution today, and tell the Russian Federation in so doing that we will not tolerate their inability to live up to the values which we in this organisation so respect.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms. PANTIĆ PILJA, you have the floor.

Ms Biljana PANTIĆ PILJA (Serbia, EPP/CD): Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, when I became a member of the Serbia delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, I was convinced that this was an institution dedicated to the protection and promotion of democracy and Human Rights. I quickly realised that the injustice and double standard policy, which leads to the crisis in the domain of international law, the implementation of the policy that spreads russophobia and blames Russia for everything, is unacceptable. It is hypocritical to refer to international law only when it suits individuals. The rules must be the same for everyone. International law was not respected when Serbia was bombed 20 years ago and when a certain number of countries gave support to the illegal secession of Kosovo and Metohija. You sanction Russia even though Crimea belonged to Russia for centuries. You have taken away the right to vote from Russia, but you still want Russia to pay millions of Euros. Russia must be returned to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, but with full rights. If the Russian delegation does not participate in the election of judges of the European Court of Human Rights, the question arises why Russia would respect the decision of this court. Europe without Russia cannot exist, we must be aware of that. Give the Russian delegation the right to vote. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr Gavan.

Mr Paul GAVAN (Ireland, UEL): Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I just want to make four or five brief points. The first thing I want to do is just commend Ms Petra De SUTTER for an excellent report. And indeed, in my time in this Assembly, I have to say she's always been an absolutely outstanding parliamentarian. I want to hold Russia to account in this chamber and that's why I will be supporting this report. I don't endorse any of the abuses that they've carried out, but I want them in this chamber. And the idea that we can lock them outside the door is nonsense. I speak as someone from Ireland, where we've had a peace process. And I can tell you, for all its faults, it's made significant progress. And it hasn't been through locking one party outside the chamber. I want to acknowledge and welcome the voices of moderation here this evening. We've heard too much extreme language. Talk of a Strasbourg betrayal, acts of appeasement, killing our organisation. None of those are accurate. The changes we are going to make here will extend the powers of this Assembly, and that's what all of us should support. I do want to respectfully take up a couple of points made by some of my conservative colleagues from Britain. I gather now that Britain is against the annexation of one country by another country, and I really want to welcome that. I know my colleagues in Belfast will certainly welcome that revelation. I have to take up the issue of the murder of children though because, let's be clear about this, two hundred and thirty three thousand people have died in Yemen. 67% of all civilian deaths, by the Saudi-led coalition airstrikes on homes, hospitals and schools. All the bombs have been supplied by Britain. So let me ask the question: are those children of a lesser God? Are we okay with murdering Yemeni children, but it's not okay if Russia does it? I mean, seriously, the amount of hypocrisy we've heard this evening is absolutely shocking. And the irony is that people citing democracy are now trying to defeat democracy by blocking a democratic vote in this chamber, this evening. I support this motion. I support the voices of moderation, and I call on all of you to support this report.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Next speaker, Ms Doris FIALA. Over to you Ms Doris FIALA

Ms Doris FIALA (Switzerland, ALDE): Mrs. President. Ladies and gentlemen. Dear friends, this today is about intercultural awareness. Did you hear each other speak together and how different the intercultural awareness is? A common saying in German says, not very elegantly, but going to the point: "Who resists someone or something, who defends himself, will be respected and honoured. Who will duck down or cover will be spit at. Luckily, we are more elegant. We try to act with caution. Ms Petra De SUTTER did. But there is a difference between acting with indulgence and making allowances, or to sell our values, betray our interests and common goals, state of law, Human Rights and democracy. This is a report from an intelligent woman. And I thank you for your report, Ms Petra De SUTTER. If I vote against your report, it's not against you. Not against the report as such. It is about our common credibility and values and our self-respect. Yes, unfortunately, it is about Russia, and to send a message to other countries that don't respect our common values. This is about whether money rules the Council of Europe or our common values. This is not just about teaching Russia a lesson. This is about the Council of Europe's right to exist. Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr LEIGH.

Sir Edward LEIGH (United Kingdom, EC): Madam President. Normally, when somebody stands up, you just have to look at what country they come from and their political grouping, and you can probably work out before they open their mouth what they're going to say. So you would expect me as a British conservative to follow some of my colleagues. I'll say something a bit different. I suppose I got to declare an interest because of my wife's Russian blood. I was married in the Russian Orthodox Church. I have not... I've always sought to understand Russia. Understand its culture, its language. This is not to approve of the present government, but to understand some of its history. Certainly the history of Crimea is complicated, and there are two sides of this issue. Equally, I've heard all the arguments that we made very eloquently today: that this is not a an executive Parliament, this is an inter-parliamentary union; it's good to have people here we don't agree with so we can hear their point of view. I've heard the arguments which, you know, may not be as strong as they sound at first sight: that it's good that Russian citizens should have access to our courts, although some doubt about that. All these arguments, ladies and gentlemen, I accept. But what we are doing here, frankly, stinks. It stinks, because we are not actually engaging these arguments on their merit. We're not having an open discussion about whether or not to admit Russia, because people here fear that on a simple majority Russia will remain excluded. We are changing the rules in the middle of the football match, ladies and gentlemen. We're changing the size of the goal posts! This is not the way that the Council of Europe, which was founded to support Human rights and democracy, should act. All this, we know, is about money. We are being bought. Does anybody, for a moment, think that if the Russian government had not refused to pay its money, which it should have done for these last years. Does anybody think that we will be having this discussion? No. We are being bought. And what sort of message does this give to the citizens of the world? For the first time the people are taking interest in us! For the first time I'm receiving emails from all over the world, asking what does the Council of Europe stand for? Make a stand! So of course there are perfectly good arguments for letting Russia in. Although don't, for a moment, think their behavior will change. Don't for a moment think that these people are genuine parliamentarians who are going to talk to us, listen to us, change their behaviour. They're all creatures of the State! But if you believe that, have the courage to say so. Don't change the rules, don't bend the rules, and don't subvert what we should believe in! Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr. LOMBARDI has the floor.

Mr Filippo LOMBARDI (Switzerland, EPP/CD): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Dear colleagues, I fully understand the emotions, the reactions, the comments of our colleagues from Ukraine, Georgia, the other countries and I'm absolutely convinced, if I would be in their position, I would say the same, but I'm not in this position and most of us here have another duty, the duty to think about the future of the Council of Europe and the future of 800 million people, who are depending on the protection of Human rights of the Council of Europe.

I have listened carefully to the declaration of our colleague Seyidov of Azerbaijan, remembering me one of the most emotional moments of the *ad hoc* committee, which led to Nikolaidis Report and, later, to the De Sutter Report we're discussing today. In Paris, in our meeting, Mr Seyidov and his Armenian colleague were sitting next to each other, saying practically the same thing: "we have an open territorial conflict. We are not ready to give up our respective rights and claims but none of us believes for one second that sitting together in the Parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe could mean in any kind of way recognition of the territorial claims of the other side. We are in the Council of Europe for other purposes" Something like that by the way, I could hear this morning in our group meeting by Stella Kiriakidis about the situation in Cyprus.

So, dear colleagues, I will vote in favor of De Sutter's Report, not because I recognize the territorial *fait accompli* between Russia and Ukraine or Russia and Georgia and so on. Clearly these conflicts have to be solved in respect of international law but in the right place and the right place is unfortunately not the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

One more thing, a couple of hours ago, I got an email from the American Embassy in Bern, urging my government and my PACE delegation to issue a public statement calling on Russia to implement its Human rights commitment as a Council of Europe Member State. Dear American friends, be reassured, I don't need any similar instructions to call upon Russia upon, the responsibility to respect international law, to stop violating territorial integrity of other countries, to stop cyber-attacks or intelligence and covert actions. But, dear friends, I expect this from all Member states of the Council of Europe and also from some Observer States, sometimes.

I expect that every state stops using double standards and start respecting fully every United Nation Security Council resolution, implementing full representative democracy, granting full freedom of press and of opinion and ideas, ensuring pluralism in the political life and ensuring Human rights for all its citizens. This I expect from Russia and also from all other Member states. I ask you to support the De Sutter report.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr LOGVYNSKYI has the floor.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear Madam President, dear colleagues, dear friends,

I would like to thank everybody for everything. For your support of Ukraine. For helping us to know what is Europe. Because we are young Europeans. For us it's important to make the right way. We chose the right way several years ago. Some of you sometimes call us aggressive. Now we are not aggressive. We are soldiers on the border of Europe. We are defending you. This is why sometimes, like Mr Filippo Lombardi said, for us double standards are incomprehensible.

You know what? Let me tell you several things. I would like to put several thoughts about our general position. We are in favor of dialogue. We would be glad to solve all of the Council of Europe's problems. But such a dialogue includes not only compromise discussions, but also that tasks can be performed. Today you propose to cancel all the sanctions against Russia. But let's remember the reason for the sanction and the pledge of Russia. The main sanction had a three round resolution: 1990, 2034, 2063. It means to ensure the rights of minorities in Crimea. In particular, that the Crimean Tartar people's and the Ukrainians' are not violated. Is it done? No. The reverse of the Crimean Tartar television shutdown. Is it done? No. Refrain from putting pressure on Crimean Tartar institutions and industries which are prohibited on Russian territory. So if today you would like to cancel sanctions, tomorrow, the billions that Russia saves on it will be spent on weapons and war against Ukraine. And in the future against all of Europe.

How can we support this initiative? As a lawyer I would like to say that annexation and occupation is an international crime. I assure that the time to start an investigation of this crime will come very soon. In these cases I will be glad if you can support us and bring the Russian leader to the International Criminal Court. Friends, where is the Russian money? Russian money is sometimes in Switzerland, some times in Spain. But we have two million internally displaced persons. Ten thousand people died. Maybe you can help us raise money and show that aggression should be stopped in Europe. For the aggressor, all illegal annexation should be very expensive. We are waiting for help on this question. I will ask you not to support this report. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr CHRISTIANSSON.

Mr Alexander CHRISTIANSSON (Sweden, EC): Madam President,

For two years now this Assembly has had to function without the voice and contribution of the biggest and most populous among the Member states: Russia. This happened as we were scrambling for a way to react to a major breach by that country against a cardinal principle in international relations. Namely, that a state cannot take territory from another state by force. In the end we chose to apply a restriction in certain membership rights of the country concerned, especially its voting rights. Russia responded by simply not attending our sessions any longer and by halting its obligatory financial contribution to our organisation's budget.

As we know from our own continent, national borders often do not fully respect ethnic or linguistic realities. Instead they are often the result of wars such as after World War I. But what countries have then try to do, especially since World War II, is to make the populations feel that the nation borders that may separate them from their kin may not matter so much if wise policies are followed by all sides. In terms of the language they want to use, in traveling to see their loved ones or in settling across a given border.

In the report before us today we are encouraged to no longer make it possible to restrict certain membership rights, and especially voting rights, as part of an otherwise approved accreditation. But if we do that, if we abandon a position that we have held for so long, how will it be perceived by the public? And in that case, will our credibility, our reputation and our ability to act on similar violations by countries in the future be affected?

Well, at the same time there are arguments in favor of what the report proposes. They include that all parties to a dispute should be allowed to make themselves heard at all times and that all Members of the Assembly must be in a position to elect various office holders in the organisation, such as will happen this week.

In conclusion there are all serious considerations and we should reflect carefully as we approach them.

Madam President, as a child I was taught by my parents to be nice to other children. And here we stand today, in the midst of adults, and if the bully is allowed to stay in the class and the victim has to leave, something's wrong. Therefore, we will vote against this report. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I don't see Mr IGITYAN.

Mr EVANS.

Mr Nigel EVANS (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President. I've been a member of this organisation for a few years, but rarely have I heard such a powerful debate from so many people from all over the Council of Europe countries - particularly those who've experienced some of the aggression from Russia. And they speak with authority and they speak with experience and they speak with passion. Those who've had parts of their country partitioned or occupied, those who reflect on the shooting down of MH17 with almost 300 people on board - a triple seven, Boeing, shot out of the sky - with the death of so many people, leaving behind them hundreds of families grieving still. It's only five years ago when that action happened. And when I say these things, it's no reflection on the Russian people. I've been to Russia several times. I like the Russian people, but it is a reflection on the current state of the Russian government and what they do. And we, after all, represent an organisation that believes in human rights. What about the right to life? We believe in democracy. We believe in the integrity of borders. And that is something that, clearly, is not being respected by the Russian state. And yes, I've heard the argument about that the - we don't want to deny the Russian people rights to the Human Rights Courts. But they've got that already at this moment in time. And as Christopher Chope pointed out, Belarus is not a member of the Council of Europe. Do we not really care too much about Belarus? But the answer is clearly... There is one. We're talking here of double standards. Yes, there is money owed to us by Russia, but they owe us much more than money. They owe us an apology. They owe us frankness and honesty. They owe us a change in their attitudes so that they stop killing people, they stop invading other people's countries. They start to respect the ideals of the organisation that we're all proud to be members of: the Council of Europe. After all, let's think about the legacy of this organisation as we go into its 70th anniversary. It is one of human rights. It is one of democracy. It is one of respecting the ideals of this institution. And when we think of the fact that, at this moment in time, we are going to allow all of that to be put to one side whilst a check is written. Is that the sort of legacy we wish to leave behind? I, like my colleague, Steve Double want to see Russia back in the Council of Europe. But where is our leverage? What price has been paid for what they have done? The answer is nothing. So now is not the right time.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I call Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Madam President, thank you very much indeed. I'd like to slightly follow-on from my colleague Nigel Evans. Nobody here doesn't think the Russians should come back. But the reason that we have had this problem in the first place is because the Russians didn't respect what we stand for. Now, the Russian delegation was part of our group. They were part of the EC group. They left the EC group and they left this place. And I will tell you, colleagues, all of you, that they did what they wanted to do, they wanted to take part, they took part. If they didn't want to support us, they didn't support us. And if they didn't like what we were saying in here, they ignored it. It didn't matter if it was the Court of Human Rights or this place. They didn't do what we would like them to do, which was to support the parliamentarians of this place and to stand up for democracy. So when they left, there wasn't a great change in the group because they hadn't actually been part of what we were trying to do in the first place, which was to stand up across Europe. Now, lots of people have said we need them back in so they come under the Court of Human Rights. Yeah, absolutely, no problem with that. But we've got to presume that they will actually listen to what happens within the Court of Human Rights. Well, there's no evidence of that, never has been. We've also got to presume that when they come back, they will be part of this organisation. They never actually played in the way that we expected anyway. But I would say this to you all, colleagues, that the future of this place is in an interesting place. The thought of the United Nations changing the rules to get a country back - because they felt it was important or they needed the money - is just not going to happen. The thought of the International Parliamentary Union, which is considerably bigger than this, doing the same... It wouldn't happen! The thought of the British Commonwealth 54 countries doing it, it wouldn't happen. Yet here we are as parliamentarians sitting in this chamber, 70 years after it was started, for the reasons that we're talking about now. After a debilitating war, we said we have to stand above the norm to defend the people. But are we achieving that? Is this going to be the outcome? I very much doubt it, colleagues. Yes, all right, we need the money. Not the best reason for doing this. Yes, all right, we actually do want people to vote for the SG. Yeah, but not a great reason for doing it either. What we actually want, ultimately, is for the Russian nation to play within the rules - Crimea, shooting down of aircraft, poisoning people in other countries - if they stopped all that, this conversation wouldn't be happening. The De SUTTER report would not be necessary. But they haven't done that. And therefore, ladies and gentlemen, you must ask yourselves: are we making the right decision for the right reasons? I think not.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): I call Mrs OZOLA.

Ms Linda OZOLA (Latvia, NR): Madam President, dear colleagues. While approaching the end of our debate session, let me start my intervention by expressing my sincere respect for the people of Russia who fight for genuine democracy in their country, for genuine protection of the values that we hold so dear here at the Council of Europe. However, the way every effort is taken to get official Russia back to the Parliamentary Assembly, even at the cost of the core values of the Council, that the Council is based on, is entirely unacceptable to me. A week ago, I met Russian political opponents and learned about their experiences in their homeland, and the reasons why they had to seek political asylum in the Baltic countries, my country being among them. And they presented a report to me on political persecution in modern Russia in the first half of 2019, including through legislative amendments, criminal and administrative codes, but not only that. Well, having read this report, I'm obliged to ask myself if Russia wants to adhere to our core values at all. There is an argument about maintaining the access to the ECHR for Russian citizens. Dear colleagues, please be aware that it is not the Council providing this access, it is solely the choice of Russia and its ruling political power that grants or denies access to ECHR for its citizens. As Russia can choose to contribute financially for its participation in the court, and it does not need our involvement in that. We want the Russian citizens to have this access, and encourage Russia to act accordingly. You all might know that Vladimir Putin signed a law that effectively banishes International legal Norms from the Russian territory, thus denying Russian citizens access to European Justice. Well, Russia has chosen not to implement certain court rulings by calling them unconstitutional. And it is not us denying this access. I think we can be sure that Russia will continue the practice of involuntary selection of the core judgments to be implemented in their country. Then, I would also like to stress that the decisions of the Committee of Ministers taken in Helsinki, do not require the assembly to go as far as this draft resolution provides. The Committee asked for the possibility for all delegations to elect the highest officials of the Council, which does not at all mean that we should uncritically

renew full voting and participation rights for Russia, without having them implemented the recommendations of assembly resolutions. Well, dear colleagues, this will be a very personal vote for each and every one of us present here, and I appeal to every MP's conscience, for demonstrating courage to stand up for those most vulnerable. For those whose land has been occupied, who have had to flee their country. For those whose family members died in the downing of MH17, and not the perpetrators of these crimes. I appeal to you for not deceiving the values that form the very basis of our one and only Europe.

Ms Elisabeth SCHNEIDER-SCHNEITER (Switzerland, EPP/CD, President of the Assembly): Next speaker: Lord Tandy. He's not in the room, I think. So, next speaker: Mr Hebner.

Mr Martin HEBNER (Germany, NR): Ladies and gentlemen,

The discussion is largely going in the wrong direction. The fact is that Russia's quasi expulsion from the Council of Europe is a wrong decision. With the expulsion of Russia from the Council of Europe, the correction of the annexation of the Crimea was never achievable. That was just the wrong thing to do. So this is all about correcting the use of wrong means. Means that, first and foremost, harm us here in the Council of Europe.

Because the primary means of the Council of Europe are to enable coordination, communication with Members and delegates from all countries of Europe. The sanctions have thus harmed us as delegates, and the Council of Europe as an institution in particular. Because necessary corrections are omitted. The necessary communication is therefore not taking place in Europe. By re-authorising Russia, we are not promoting Russia, but correcting a wrong decision; and we call on Russia's delegates to engage in controversial discussions here in this body.

Another weakness of this decision was the inconsistency. Turkey, for example, attacked and occupied the Kurdish territory in northern Syria. Was there an analogous reaction against Russia? No! That didn't happen. This made the sanctions against Russia, not only inappropriate, but also untrustworthy. None of us are closing ourselves off to the problems in, and with, Russia. Only let us discuss them publicly here, and together with our Russian colleagues, before this body. This is also in the interest of the citizens of Russia, as well as other countries with the possibility to appeal to the European Court of Human Rights. This is in the interest of the citizens of Europe.

Thank you so much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you, sir.

The list of speakers is thus exhausted.

I call on the Committee to reply. Madam Rapporteur, you have a total of four minutes left, since you are also the Chairperson of the Committee.

You have the floor.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC, Rapporteur): Thank you, Chair. Thank you all for contributing to this debate. I heard a lot of colleagues speak with passion, with emotion, but with honesty and integrity, and I think we all want the same thing. That is, to uphold our values and fight for Human Rights. We may differ on the ways to get there, and I want to stress that we don't have to have seen this debate as pro-Russia or against Russia. And everybody who expressed him or herself, did this really with honesty and from their deepest conviction. I'm completely convinced of this, and this was a civilized debate because we remember the debate in October. I thought it was much more emotional and polarized. This was a good debate now, in my view.

But, are we giving into Russia? Are we lifting sanctions or giving in to their blackmail? I don't think so. Why? Because, actually, what the demands were, was to simply delete the possibility to challenge credentials on substantive grounds. That would be unconditionally lifting sanctions. We don't do that. There is still the possibility of opposing credentials and keeping sanctions. Yes, we are changing the sanctions that we're talking about, for good reasons. And we have given the argument that parliamentarians should be able to express themselves, that we should have this dialogue and hold them accountable for what Russia as a State is doing. And, of course, I will not defend all the bad things that we've been hearing about Russia, and that have been happening all over the last five years. This is not what this report is about. This is not trying to say

that we don't care and that we forgive, of course not. This is about looking for a way out, because the sanctions that we have installed five years ago, and it has been said over and over again, have not changed a thing. So you can look at it from that side as well. Why should we change our rules? Because they didn't do anything. You can look at it from the other side. We should change the rules because what we did as sanctions was not effective. Let's look for mechanisms that are effective, and this report is not only about the changes in the sanction system, in the challenge of credentials.

It is also part of the exercise, where the two statutory bodies of our organisation should harmonise their views if they want to sanction Member States. And the Committee of Ministers has not been doing it, and we have heard in the debate why and how it comes. And, maybe, it's even understandable. But this report is part of an exercise where this joint reaction, this joint mechanism that we will install as soon as possible, will give us exactly more possibilities to ask for sanctions and force the Committee of Ministers to react on that.

So I honestly believe, I honestly believe, that this report is the way out of the dead end where we have been for the last five years. And I want to end because my time is not moving, so I can continue for another hour if you want. But I will end with the citation of Mr VAREIKIS - I'm not sure if he's still here -, who will oppose my report, and that's his good right. But he said something extremely important, and I want all of you to think about that. He said "it is not the victorious in battles that really write history, it is the peacemakers". And, in my view, this report is a very small step on the way towards peace. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you very much, Mrs De Sutter, for this excellent work, which you have done with the round trips to the Commission and the various successive requests, which have been made and which have made your work as President also difficult.

My dear colleagues, the first part of the Compendium of Amendments will be...

(Interruption by Mr Goncharenko)

If you let me finish my sentence perhaps... Yes, then I give you the floor.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Thank you, Madam President. On a point of order, and I refer to Rule 37.1.d, I would like to move reference of the report back to the Committee. I know this has been done before in different circumstances, but we literally now received a very lengthy list of amendments. More than half of them have not been considered by the Committee, and therefore the Committee would not be able to express its view on it. The political groups did not have a possibility to walk through these amendments and to consider them. Does it, therefore, make not sense to give the Rules Committee and the political groups the opportunity to work with the amendments, and to maybe find a compromise on this issue? Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you, Mr. GONCHARENKO.

As you said, this is a point of order. You have explained the reason for your proposal to refer back to committee.

Does anyone wish to speak against referral back to committee?

MR. SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): Thank you, Mrs President. I think this is a part of the game not to discuss, and we discussed this report and the previous report from Petra Sutter, several and several times, always with a big majority in the Rules Committee. Also, this report had a big majority in the Rules Committee, and that the amendments are not on the table is in the responsibility of that who sent a lot of amendments, which has no substantial basis, only to waste time.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I would like the opinion of the Chairperson and Rapporteur of the Committee.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, speaking on behalf of the Commission of the Committee, I think there is not the wish to refer it back to the Committee for a second time, and I would propose to continue our work.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will therefore proceed to vote on the request for referral back to committee by a simple majority.

People who wish to refer the report back to committee vote “yes”, and people who want to deal with it today vote “no”.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The motion for referral back to committee was rejected.

I propose, dear colleagues, to allow everyone to have the amendments to be discussed, to suspend the sitting for five minutes, but I give the floor to Mrs SOTNYK for another point of order.

Vote: Strengthening the decision-making process of the Parliamentary Assembly concerning credentials and voting

Ms Olena SOTNYK (Ukraine, ALDE): Thank you. It's also a point of order. I have another reason to refine this Resolution and this Report to the Committee and it is very, I think, obvious. Before we vote on the Draft Resolution, just you, as a speaker, mentioned that there is a scope of sanctions that the Assembly would retain in the Resolution, but there is no clear list of sanctions in this Resolution and if we go to the 2014 opinion of the Committee on Rules and Procedures, you have this list of particular sanctions. That's why I think we need to clarify it, what kind of sanction we're going to retain in the resolution, and it should be clarified by the Committee. That's why I'm insisting that the Committee should decide on this and we should know what particular sanctions we are withdrawing. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mrs Sotnyk, I have taken note of your request. However, as stated in Rule 37 of our Rules of Procedure, a motion proposing referral back to committee –whatever the reason for referral– may only be moved once during the same debate.

We have just voted on the referral back to committee and we cannot add new reasons to vote again. We voted, the majority refused to refer it back to committee: we are not, therefore, going to refer it back to committee today.

Mr. Wilson, you have the floor.

Mr Phil WILSON (United Kingdom, SOC): I understand, just to further to that point of order that has just been raised.

I can understand what you're saying Chair but can I just add to that point of order to say that we are now going to be faced with all the 200 amendments that none of us have seen, that none of us know the content of, that the Rules Committee hasn't got a definite view on.

Just to say that I think that's completely undemocratic and although that original point of order may be lost I do not think that this fits in well with what this Council stands for.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I have taken note of your remark and the enthusiasm that this remark has generated, but it does not change anything - neither our Rules of Procedure nor the decision we have just taken.

It is not the first time – much to my regret – that a Committee has not been able to deal with all the amendments that have been tabled, but it is also, of course, because – as we will see later – a number of its amendments have only been tabled to try to block the process.

In any event, in order to allow everyone to have the amendments before them at the time of the vote, I suspend the meeting for ten minutes. This will give you all a chance to freshen up and we will resume work with the amendments, the 220 amendments, in ten minutes.

(Interruption of sitting)

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): My dear colleagues, we are resuming the meeting.

My dear colleagues, the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs has presented a draft resolution to which 220 amendments have been tabled.

You have received the first part of the Compendium of Amendments, which only covers the first two paragraphs. During our discussions, you will receive the following two parts. The parts will be distributed to parliamentarians sitting in the Chamber. Of course, the others can pick them up outside, but first and foremost both parts will be distributed to parliamentarians participating in the debate.

The amendments will, of course, be called in the order in which they apply to the text as published in the collection of amendments, and I would remind you that the speaking time for each amendment is limited to thirty seconds.

We are therefore starting with Amendment No. 3. If adopted, amendments 133 and 4 fall.

Mr GAYE, you have the floor for this amendment..., or Mr LIDDELL-GRAINER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINER (United Kingdom, EC): I'll be doing some of them to start with, if that's all right. This amendment basically is to replace the word "strengthening" with the word "weakening". If you read the amendment it says very clearly that we are looking to strengthen. We are actually saying this is going to weaken the whole reason we're here and therefore we'd ask colleagues to support us in adding the word "weakening" following the word "strengthening". I would thank the colleagues. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment?

Mrs. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm against because it of course reverses completely the idea of what we have been doing, so I don't agree with the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

So we also have, I imagine, the opinion of the Commission and we will pass..., that's right, that's the Commission's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No this was speaking against and also being rapporteur but there is a position of the Committee on this amendment: eight in favour, 16 against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to the vote on Amendment No. 3.

Those who support the amendment vote yes; those who oppose it vote no.

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 3 is rejected.

Amendment number 133.

Mr YEMETS.

Yes, you have the floor.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Madam President, dear colleagues.

We want to change in the title of the Draft Resolution, replace the word "strengthening" with the word "revising". The same reasons as the previous amendment. We have talked about ours, why it's not "strengthening", and we want to give you tolerant vote revising.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment?

Mrs. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm against this amendment because, again, this is weakening the idea of strengthening, so I prefer the original wording.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): There is no opposition on this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

No position on amendment 133.

We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 133 is rejected.

Amendment number° 4.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Madam President,

Thank you very much indeed, before the words "decision-making" we'd like to insert the words "absence of". In our view this isn't technical because it actually strengthens it. It's using English, sorry, as a first language to try and strengthen the report, so that is why we've actually asked to change this because we just feel it is strengthening the report and in the absence of any other word we can think of we'd ask colleagues to support us on "absence of".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment? Mrs. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, again, this is simply reversing the meaning of what we wanted. It's a funny amendment, but I'm against it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): There is a position: 7 in favor, 17 against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to the vote on Amendment 4.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 4 is rejected.

Amendment number 5.

MR. LIDELL-GRAINGER?

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed. If colleagues read this, we are celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Second World War. We are also paying tribute to the founding fathers of the Council of Europe. We actually say in pledges never to betray the trust invested upon their successors, by respecting and upholding, at all times, the statute of the Council of Europe. This is to celebrate why we are here, what we stand for, colleagues, and why we should celebrate the Council of Europe.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment?

Mr KOX?

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL): This does not add anything to the essence of the report. Furthermore, I would remind colleague LIDDELL-GRAINGER that it was the citizens of Eastern Europe, themselves, who liberated them and not the Allied Forces. So it's an extra reason to vote against this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As a Rapporteur, I'm against, but the Committee as well: 14 against, 10 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against amendment number 5, the ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 5 is rejected.

Amendment number 154.

Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): We propose in the Draft Resolution, Paragraph 1, to replace the first sentence with the following sentence: "Celebrating the 70th anniversary of the Parliamentary Assembly, the Member States reiterate their commitment to resolutely promote the aims of the organisation, as set forth in the Preamble 2, and Articles 1 and 3 of the Statute of the Council of Europe."

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment?

Mrs. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I think, in essence, it doesn't change anything to the meaning of what was written there, so I'm against it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No position.

We will now proceed to vote on Amendment N° 154.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 154 is rejected.

Amendment number 149.

Mr. YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you, Madam President. We want to change in the Draft Resolution, Paragraph number 1, the first sentence. Replace the words "as it celebrates its 70th anniversary" with the words "after 70 years of its well consolidated work". The reason is to express that it was "well consolidated" work. It's especially important today when we are divided on such an important question, Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): OK. There's absolutely no need to replace the word in the original text and, therefore, I'm against. I don't know why we should accept this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As Rapporteur, I am against, and the Committee has no position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to vote on Amendment N° 149.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 149 is rejected.

Amendment n° 212.

MR. GONCHARENKO?

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Yes, we propose to change the words "as it celebrates", with the following words: "taking into account". The reason is clear, it is a very sad celebration of the 70th anniversary, with such decisions like the ones being proposed to us. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I don't think this is necessary and I'm against the amendment for this reason. There's no position on behalf of the Committee.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No Commission position.

We will now proceed to vote on Amendment N° 212.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 212 is rejected.

Amendment N° 6.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President. The word "celebrates", we have a view that that is not the right word in this case, but the word we'd like to replace it with is "holds". So it would read, "As it holds its 70th anniversary, the Parliamentary Assembly reiterates its commitment...". We feel this is a better word to use in this case because, again, in English it shows that we are collectively holding. That is the reason that we're here. We are a collective, and I'm very proud of that fact so, therefore, I'd urge you to support it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against amendment number 6? Mrs. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I still prefer the original wording "celebrates", as it's been written in the original text, so I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The committee was against 17, and 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The Commission is opposed to Amendment N° 6, which I am putting to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 6 is rejected.

Amendment n° 192.

MR. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): When I became a member of this organisation in 2015, I had a dream that we have unanimously reiterated our commitment as a statutory organ of the Council of Europe. I have a very big doubt about that today but, anyway, I remain my amendment to replace the word with "unanimously", but I see that unanimity is not in the hemicycle today. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): We took into account that some amendments are only in this text to be an amendment and to waste time, so democracy has to do with majority and not only with an anonymously, so absolutely against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm against and the committee has no opinion on this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The Commission has no position.

We will now proceed to vote on Amendment N°192.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The Amendment is rejected.

Amendment 218.

Mr. GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): This is quite a technical amendment, but I would like to tell you that Russian TV channels already announced that it's not Russia who wants to come back, it's the Council of Europe who asks Russians to come back and that's because of the money.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I didn't understand the argumentation of Mr Goncharenko, but I'm against inserting the word "readily" after "Parliamentary Assembly".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. What is the committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No position.

We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 218 is rejected.

Amendment 7.

MR. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President. The first line where it says "reiterates", we feel the much stronger word is "confirms". Now this is because, if you read the bit, it said: "the Assembly reiterates commitment to... the Assembly confirms its commitment as one of the

statutory organs of Europe, the Council of Europe... ". That is a much, much stronger word in this case and, therefore, we feel that it was very much more poignant, which is what we're trying to do. We're trying to celebrate, and therefore the word is a much better word in our position, so I'd ask colleagues to support.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, I didn't know that we wanted to celebrate now Mr Liddel-Grainger, so I think we should confirm and not reiterate.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What is the committee's opinion ?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The Committee was against: 18 against and 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to vote on Amendment N° 7.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N° 7 is rejected.

Amendment N° 181.

MR. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I see there is no reason to celebrate here something, especially after the decision of the Committee of Ministers in Helsinki. So my amendment is to propose to change one of the statutory organs into a deliberative organ as Committee of ministers wants to see us not as an equal but as deliberative. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, yes, this is downgrading our mandate, so I'm absolutely against this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. I believe the committee has no opinion.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No opinion.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to the vote on Amendment 181.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 181 is rejected.

Amendment 8: Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER?

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President, I'll try and get it right this time. Where the word "statutory organ", we also feel it'll be much stronger to add the word "main". So, where we are actually saying: "and its commitment as one of the statutory organs of the Council of Europe", we are saying it should be: "as one of the main organs of the Council of Europe". Again, it's a word that would strengthen this and I know the Rapporteur is against it but, actually, this would make a much stronger report and, therefore, we would urge colleagues to support on the word "main". Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm not sure, but if there's only two, I think "one of the main" doesn't make a lot of sense, so I would be against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. What is the committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The Commission, the Committee - sorry - was: against 14, 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N° 8 is rejected.

Amendment N° 9.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): The word "resolutely" doesn't actually give anything here. It isn't really... you look in the English dictionary, it's a very odd word. What we're saying is delete it, so it would actually then say is: "one of the statute of the Council to promote the aims of the organisation". "Resolution" doesn't actually mean a lot, therefore, we are just saying, could we drop it? Because, actually, it just doesn't add anything or take anything away. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Does anyone wish to speak against the Amendment?

Mrs. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well it expresses the resolve that we have. So the conviction... I would prefer to leave it in the text as it was.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

What is the Commission's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Against 14, and 6 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 9 is rejected.

Amendment number 10.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Very much indeed. Again, we feel that the strengthening of this report to replace the word 'aims' with the word 'core values' . That is what this place is. We have core values, it doesn't matter if it's democracy. It doesn't matter if it's Human rights or whatever, but they are what we believe in and that is absolutely the reason we're here. So instead of having just the 'aims' – which is meaningless in many ways – we would like to just say that this is what we hold dear. This is why we're here. This is why we should be here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the Amendment, Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): This is one of the typical amendments to make an amendment, so you have an amendment, then you can announce that have been made 150 amendments. The original text is perfect and we don't need this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

What is the Commission's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): So, as Rapporteur, I'm against and the Committee is also: 15 against, 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N° 10 is rejected.

Amendment N° 209.

MR. GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): We feel that our amendment to replace the word "aims" with the word "gains" is something which makes the text stronger and more appropriate to the goal which this text has.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Is there anyone who wishes to speak against the amendment?

Mrs. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, it's rhyming that's nice but I think I prefer the original "aims".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I do not think there is an opinion from the Commission.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The ballot is closed.

Amendment N° 209 is rejected.

We will now proceed to Amendment No° 217.

MR. GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Our amendment proposes to replace the words "set forth" with the words "formulated in" and it's much better, if you can read the text, because we are speaking about the part "to resolutely promote the aims of the organization formulated in the Preamble to and Articles 1 and 3 of the Statute of the Council of Europe". It's much better.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Anyone against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I think they're perfect synonyms. So I would prefer the original.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

No opinion from the Commission?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No opinion.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 217 is rejected.

Amendment number 11.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed. In this resolution it says paragraph 1, third line, replace the words Article 1 and 3 with the Articles 1, 3, 8 and 9. The whole idea of this is so we have a strengthened report. I haven't got time to go into what 8 and 9 are, but it would strengthen immeasurably this report to make it actually more pertinent to what we're trying to talk about today. That is why we're actually very keen to see the 1, 3, 8 and 9 included in this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment?

Mr KOX.

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL): If my colleague Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger had found the time to read the statute instead of only drafting amendments, he would have read that the aims of the organisation are in Articles 1 and 3, and not in the other Articles, that he probably did not read because he was too busy with other things. So that's respect to statute. To say that this amendment is totally improper.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The Committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Sorry, as Rapporteur, I'm against and also the Committee: 18 against, 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 11 is rejected.

We move on to the amendment 151, Mr Leonid YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you Madam President.

So, in this amendment we want to change in Draft Resolution, Paragraph number one, first sentence, replace the word "articles" in each instance with the word "article".

I think it gives us a possibility to clarify the technical situation. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): Madam President. This is a typical destiny of an amendment with the number 151. If you have no content, then you can't produce such an amendment. So we don't need this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I guess there's no opinion from the Committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, and I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 173.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Amendment number 173 we have proposed in the draft Resolution, paragraph 1, after the first sentence, insert the following sentence: "Among the other provisions of the Parliamentary Assembly specifically emphasizes that the aim of the Council of Europe is to archive a great unity between the Members with the purpose of safeguarding and releasing the idea in principle which are their common heritage". So the main goal of this amendment is to propose the amend to remind the delegations that the main aim of this Assembly is the promotion of democracy and Rule of law.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Anyone against the amendment?

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL): Sense at my idea, Madam President. To quote the Statute, because the Statute is already there and it is a Statute for us all, does not add anything and so it's not a very useful amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.
The Commission?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm against, for the same reasons, but the Committee has no position on this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No Commission position.
We proceed to the vote, the ballot is open.
I request the display of the result.
Amendment N° 173 is rejected.
Amendment N° 174, Mr LOGVYNSKYI .

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): So amendment number 174. I think it's very important.
I cannot agree with Mr Tiny KOX because we can remind again and again this is one of our values so in this amendment is the same the draft resolution paragraph now replaces the second sentence with the following sentence: "It recalls a large number of resolutions that had been implemented over the last few decades to strengthen its ability to conduct in this field, as well as to point out its position concerning the failure of signed Member States to obey the statutory obligations that were entered into force by them, upon joining the Council of Europe."

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.
Anyone against this amendment?
Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I read this. This is a rewriting of the original text, so I don't see the necessity to accept this amendment. I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No Commission position?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position, no.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

We will now proceed to the vote.

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 174 is rejected.

Amendment 123. Ms SOTNYK?

Ms Olena SOTNYK (Ukraine, ALDE): Madam President,

This amendment is dealing with the Parliamentary Assembly which exists for 70 years and if you are analysing our experience and analysing our work during this period we need to mention, I think, all the resolution and all our ethics that we had during this several decades, mainly seven decades.

Also I want to mention that it is always devil in the details, of course, it's maybe for somebody very funny but you know, when somebody is trying to undermine the rules and then criticise somebody who is following, it's not right. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment?

MR. SCHENNACH?

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): Again, there is no real content in this amendment and it's very unclear, over the last 70 decades, go back in your own history. So I think this brings nothing this amendment and please vote with no.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The Commission's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm against and the Committee has no position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N° 123 is rejected.

Amendment N° 12.

MR. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed. After the numerous resolutions I insert the words "and recommendation". Because after our resolutions we do tend to have recommendations at every level. So I don't think this is changing anything materially, but it is just saying that we are a rules based organisation and we recommend this is what you should do or what you might want to do. So all we're doing is adding two words just to follow on with our own procedures.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Who would like to speak against the amendment?

MR. SCHENNACH?

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): This is an amendment the report not really needed, because it's very clear numerous of resolutions. So I think that it makes no sense to accept this amendment. It's an amendment that is an amendment. This is the only reason.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

What is the Commission's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, as a rapporteur I thought this was a good amendment. I'm sorry. So I accepted it and the committee followed me on that. 15 in favour and 5 against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to the vote.

On Amendment N° 12, the ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N°12 is adopted.

Amendment N° 13.

MR. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you Madam President.

Can I just say I'm chancing my arm with Ms Petra De SUTTER to insert after those. Also because actually we do have "in particular resolution" and I do wonder if we could look at adding on the fourth line after the numerous resolutions "in particular resolution" because we doesn't do generality, we do the specific so this organisation will look at a broader picture but we'll also look at something very tight indeed. That's why I'm hoping we can include it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against Amendment No. 13?

Mr KOX.

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL): It is no improvement, so stick to the original text, I would advise.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

What is the committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, as a Rapporteur I was against and the Committee also: 12 against, 8 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The committee is against it.

We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 13 is rejected.

Amendment No. 208. Mr GONCHARENKO?

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Yes we propose to replace the words “last few decades” with the words “years of fruitful work”.

Just imagine “it recalls the numerous resolutions it has adopted over the years of fruitful work both to strengthen its capacity to act in this area and to state its position on the failure of given Member States.”

We need to emphasise that our work was fruitful because I'm not sure it will be fruitful in future.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against amendment number 208?

Mr. SCHENNACH?

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): To say the “last few decades” is very neutral and the use of “fruitful work” is happiness and joy or what else. I think we should stick with the original wording.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No opinion from the Commission?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As a rapporteur I'm against, no position from the committee.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 208 is rejected.

Amendment 150. Mr YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Madam President,

Dear colleagues, so in the draft resolution in paragraph one, second sentence, replace the words “over the last few decades”. We count the decades of adopted resolutions and we have a number, so we propose changing this to “over the last seven decades” just to clarify, it is necessary.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Is there any opposition to this Amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. It's the same amendment as 123 that we rejected with the same argumentation: that this is not a clarification and not necessary, so I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No position to the committee. We will proceed to vote.

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment No. 150 is rejected.

Amendment No. 14, Mr Liddel-Grainger.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed.

Instead of having “the last few” which in other words is ambiguous, we're talking about the past seven, we're talking about seven decades. So we'd like to put in “the last seven decades”, it is how long we've been going to celebrate this organisation. Also to make it clear we're actually slightly bigger and bolder than just saying the last few, so we'd like to add “the past seven”. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. Anyone against the Amendment?

Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, same argument as the previous. It's exactly the same thing.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The Commission?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Here, there is a position: 15 against, 8 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 14 is rejected.

Amendment 175.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear Madam Chair,

Amendment 175. In the draft resolution, paragraph 1, second sentence, replace the word “to act in this area” with the word “to act in social and political area”. I think it's right words and you can more stably explain what this means is paragraph.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): As Chairman of the social committee, I love the word “social” but here it is not necessary. In all areas, we act in a social and political way and in a human rights way, so don't vote for this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

No opinion from the Commission?

No.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 175 is rejected.

Amendment 15.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much.

It's on paragraph 6 to say, "it is capacity to act and state its position". We feel "firm position" so it would say "act and state its position –firm position– on the failure to give Member States to honour the statute obligation". Which is a much more forward-looking word, instead of just having "state its position". Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): This is a good example for the working group creative - working group of Sir Roger GALE and LIDDELL-GRAINGER. This is, by the way, and in the very polite from nonsense, so let's stay by the original text.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What is the opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As Rapporteur, I'm against and the Committee as well: 16 against, 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Opposite

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 15 is rejected.

Amendment 16.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed. After the fifth line, after the words "Member States", we'd like to insert the following words, which is "such as Greece in '69, Turkey in '81 and the Russian Federation in 2000, 2014 and 2015", to lay out what Member States do and don't do and, again, to show that we are serious about our intent and the countries that we deal with.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against amendment number 16?

Mr FOULKES.

Lord George FOULKES (United Kingdom, SOC): I'd like to hear a different voice. I've been sitting down for too long. I need the exercise. But above all, I don't know why these three are being picked out. There are many others, even the United Kingdom on one occasion.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What is the opinion of the Committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The Committee is against, 12 against and 18 in favour, and I was against as well.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 199.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I think in this situation we are going to propose a more appropriate word that's in the draft resolution, paragraph 1, second sentence.

Replace the words "to honour" with the words "to respect".

We'd really like to act in this area and to state the position of the feral member states to respect the statutory obligation they entered into upon joining the Council of Europe, as this would respect the obligation we usually used to have in our documents.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

No one?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): Madam President,

For an amendment to be an amendment for the press at home, but it really has nothing to do with the content of the report, so please recheck.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As Rapporteur, I reject. No position of the Committee.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment No. 199 is rejected.

Amendment No. 147. Mr Logvynskyi.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear Madam President,

I think a real simple amendment is to add only one word: "all". I don't think this is a political question, I think it is a balanced question that we can all support the word "all".

Thanks.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against Amendment N° 147?

Mr. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, I think if we say "these statutory obligations", then we mean all of them. I don't see the need to be explicit about that, so I would be against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The voting is opened.

The voting is closed.

The amendment is dropped.

Amendment 145 Mr Leonid YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you, Madam President.

Dear colleagues, in this Amendment, we want to change in the draft resolution, paragraph 1, the second sentence. To replace the words "into upon joining the Council of Europe" with the words "before the entrance to the Council of Europe".

I think this sentence becomes more clarified with this amendment.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I think these are perfect synonyms, and so, the amendment is irrelevant in my view.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 145 is rejected.

Amendment 17.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President.

After the end of paragraph 1 we'd like to insert: "the Assembly particularly repudiates the repeated obstinacy of the Russian Federation to comply with the statute of the Council of Europe."

We see numerous times, and times and time again, where they have not complied. Even when they were here, they didn't comply. Now we're saying that we would like to make sure that they do comply with everything that we stand for and what we believe in.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Is there anyone against the amendment?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): This text, this lines at the end, make a critical moment for the whole thing. It is very clear that the Statutes of the Council of Europe have to be respected by all so we don't need this amendment at the end.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): So I'm against and the Committee: 16 against eight in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Rejected.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 17 is rejected.

Amendment 157.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I would like to give the floor to Mr LIASHKO because he will present the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No problem, we're listening.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: So, we would like to pause on this particular amendment. We feel that indeed there is an issue of violation of sovereignty by Russia.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. Is anyone against this amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. I am against for the same arguments that Mr SCHENNACH just gave because it is a similar amendment. There is no position of the committee.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 66.

Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): We propose to replace the words "as it has done regularly in the past" with the following words: "in the measure never given before".

I think it would be much better. Just listen: "In the measure never given before, the Assembly intends to constructively analyse the consistency, relevance, effectiveness and legitimacy of its procedures and mechanisms in the light of the goals it has set itself."

I think it's super.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Is anyone against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I don't like it. It doesn't have any meaning in my view.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, no position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will proceed to vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 18.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER. I give you the floor.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Mr President. This is a simple amendment to delete the word “regularly” from the draft resolution, in Paragraph 2.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mr. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yeah, I don't think it is necessary to skip that word. I think it is perfectly in place in that first sentence.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The committee was against 15, and 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 130.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): My proposal in the draft resolution, paragraph 2, first sentence: to replace the words “intends to constructively analyse” with the words “constructively analyses”.

This means, it will be mentioned that the Assembly is constructively analysing the consistency, relevance, effectiveness and legitimacy of its procedural mechanisms.

We are doing it every time, but not with intent. But, we are in the process, in the last few years.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms ÆVARSDÓTTIR.

Ms Thorhildur Sunna ÆVARSDÓTTIR (Iceland, SOC): Madam President,

I think there are few members here who could sit together over a thesaurus and a dictionary and form the club of the grammar division of the Parliamentary Assembly and get us some assistance on how to phrase things but this is not adding anything substantially to the report. Perhaps they should apply to be in the linguistic session of this Assembly instead of holding us all here for no good reason.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No. I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. We will proceed to vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 131.

Mr GONCHARENKO...

Mr ARIEV, you have the floor.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Madam President,

I would like you to call not to allow to estimate the amendments which other members of the Assembly have tabled because if someone thinks it's not substantive another thinks something else. We are all equal here and we all have the same rights. So please not to allow to deprive us of that right or not to allow to make our amendments not substantive as well.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I think all our colleagues have heard your call.

Amendment 131, Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): I think with our amendments we're giving you the unique opportunity to reconsider and not to make a big, big, big mistake. And you should not say that we are not right. You should say... You should understand that we just want to help all of you because we want... We're seeing you come, you know? Like a bad thing, but all together singing a song. So that's why we have one more amendment to take out the word relevance, because I think it's absolutely insufficient in this text.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, taking out the word "relevance" would mean that you think that the work of the Assembly in the past and now is irrelevant so I cannot accept that.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no position of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): So I cannot accept that.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no position of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): So I cannot accept that. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The Commission?

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 131 is rejected.

Amendment 158.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): We are asking to change one word, to replace the word "legitimacy" with the word "impact" but again I think it's a technical amendment and I think this is democracy when everybody can defend their rights in any way, in any right possible way. In this way, our values in our hemicycle. Thanks.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Mrs. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I fully appreciate the right to propose such an amendment, but I think I can have the right not to accept it.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

No opinion from the Commission?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 158 is rejected.

Amendment number 19.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINER?

No, Mr HOWELLI.

Mr John HOWELL (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you Madam President. This is a simple amendment simply to provide additional explanation to the word procedures by adding the word "rules" before the word procedures.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

No one.

The committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): There is a position from the Committee because I'm against as a rapporteur. 16 against 9 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Mr John HOWELL (United Kingdom, EC): This also is to provide an additional explanation and to remember that we are keen to make sure that we have focus on our standards. So it merely means to add the words "and standards" after the word "goals".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against amendment number 20?

Mrs BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR.

Ms Rósa Björk BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR (Iceland, UEL): I know the devil's in the details but this evening is starting to feel like a socialist collective spelling reading night out.

I urge you to withdraw amendments that do not have any meaning to the report and stick to the text adopted by and agreed upon by the Rules Committee today.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you, what is the committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The committee was against 16, and 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

I will put the amendment to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 20 is rejected.

Amendment No. 210, Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): I think this is a very important amendment. You see how it's written now: "As it has done regularly in the past the Assembly intends to constructively highlight the consistency, relevance, effectiveness and legitimacy of the procedures mechanism in the *light of the goals it has set itself*". We think that it is not in the light of the goals it has set itself but in the light of the Statute of the Council of Europe and I think everybody should support this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. Anyone against the amendment?

That is not the case.

Mr. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, then I will speak against it because I think that the Statute of course it's important and it will be part of the goals that we have set ourselves but it's broader than just the Statute so I would not want to limit it just to the Statute, so I'm against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): There is no committee position?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position for the committee.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 210 is rejected.

Amendment 134.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): So if it doesn't want to mention the Statute of the Council of Europe in the text, I would like to delete in paragraph 2, the first sentence, the words "it has set itself". And you can write: "procedures and mechanisms in the light of the goal", so unnecessary words might be deleted without any damage to the report.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): Madam Chair, this amendment is really not necessary and so please recheck.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no opinion of the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): And I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 134 is rejected.

Amendment 215, Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): We propose in the draft resolution, paragraph 2, to replace the second sentence with the following sentences: "Any changes to its practices and adjustments of rules, where a revision of its machinery and procedures to prove indispensable, shall not cause harm to the effective guarantee of the principles and values that are the common heritage of the peoples of Europe and resolute support to the Council of Europe's fundamental values of democracy, the rule of law and human rights."

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): It's about a similar framing but it is a bit more negative, so I would not like it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no opinion from the Commission?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 215 is rejected.

Amendment 129. Mr. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): So I would like to propose in the draft resolution, paragraph 2, to replace the words “it may find it” with the words “the Parliamentary Assembly may find it”. We would like to precise to call “Parliamentary Assembly” as “it” so that it could be more precise, I think, in this paragraph.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N° 129 is rejected.

Amendment N° 21.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Amendment 21. The word “machinery”. Where it says “were a revision of its machinery procedures”, we actually think a better word would be “internal functioning”. Machinery is ambiguous, internal functioning is very specific to what we do within committees and within this place, so it is a tightening of it but not changing it in any material way whatsoever.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment, Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I consider this amendment as changing one wording with another and I have no preference, so I would leave it to the original text.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The Commission's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The committee was against: 13 against, 8 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Opposed.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 135, Mr YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Madam President, dear colleagues,

We are all trying to make this resolution a little bit better but in different ways, of course. So, in this amendment, we are proposing the draft resolution, paragraph 2, second sentence, to replace the word "machinery" with the word, which I think is better, the word "technique".

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, for the same reason as the previous one. And there is no position on this one from the committee.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 22.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Again, where it says "to prove indispensable" we feel it stronger to insert the word "necessary", so it would read "with the revisions of its machine and procedures to prove necessary to guarantee more effectively the principles and values."

We feel this strengthens the sentence as we can't change "machinery" we feel "necessary" would strengthen it in the right way.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I feel it's the opposite. I think "indispensable" is stronger than "necessary" so it would weaken the text, so I would not agree.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What about the Committee's position?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The committee was against 15, and 7 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 22 is rejected.

Amendment 216, Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Thank you, Madam President.

In draft resolution, paragraph 2, we propose to replace the words "guarantee more effectively" with the words "effectively protect". We think it's much better and it gives much more sense to paragraph 2 of this resolution.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against amendment 216?
Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. Here I feel, also, that it would weaken the text, so I would not accept it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No position for the Committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position, no.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment number 23.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): This is to insert the word “basic” before the word “principles” in line 6.

So we'd have more effectively “the basic principles and values of a common heritage to the people of Europe”.

We feel again this would actually strengthen the word, because the word “basic” is what we use.

It is: the basic principle of law and order, the basic principle of democracy, the basic principle of human rights.

That's why we just think this word would actually strengthen this immeasurably.

Thank you, Madam.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Mr LOMBARDI.

Mr Filippo LOMBARDI (Switzerland, EPP/CD): It doesn't strengthen the meaning. It weakens the meaning.

Probably Sir LIDDELL-GRAINGER doesn't remember Soviet traditions.

In those times, when you said “basic human rights”, it meant less than human rights.

Just a part was basic, and not the rest.

So I am against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

What is the position of the Committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. I'm also against and the committee as well: 15 against, 6 in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 23 is rejected.

Amendment 128.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Mr LIASHKO will present this amendment.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: We suggest that you refer to principles and values. I understand the colleague from Switzerland. What do you want? Today's events will go down in history just like the Munich betrayal. It will be called the Strasbourg betrayal. You want to adopt a decision were you betray your principles and values. And you don't want to hear the truth. You have to tolerate it. You will hear this because you deserve this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

What is the position of the Committee?

There isn't a position?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm against as reporter, but there is no position. No.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): There is no Committee position.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 128 is rejected.

Amendment 137.

Mr SOBOLEV?

Mr FASSINO, point of order, go ahead.

Mr Piero FASSINO (Italy, SOC): I shall speak on the order of business.

I would ask my colleague, Mr Oleh LIASHKO, to refrain from using a language such as the one he used a few seconds ago.

I have nothing to teach my colleague Mr Oleh LIASHKO, just as he has nothing to teach me and everyone else here. It is essential, in order to continue to respect one another, to have a language that keeps to the substance of the issues, without raising political invective and moral judgments about each of us.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We come back to Amendment N° 137.

I give the floor to Mr. SOBOLEV.

Thank you Mr FASSINO.

Mr Serhiy SOBOLEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you.

Only time will show the reality of this resolution.

About my amendment, I think that each word, when we try to say that we respect values, when we try to say that we respect our statute, we respect our main obligations, I think it's only words.

So the main thing of this amendment, is that we need the human heritage of the nations.

Because the heritage is the answer to this question.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Mr SCHENNACH.

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH (Austria, SOC): Yes, that is right. Everyone can make amendments but it is also the right of the majority to feel if there's a provocation and the content is - it's a nonsense amendment, so it's like a provocation.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As a rapporteur, I can say this is a reference. It's a citation between brackets. You can't change citations, so I'm against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 137 is rejected.

Amendment No. 24.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER?

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President.

This is merely to strengthen this by using commas. It is the most important part of the common heritage of the peoples of Europe.

We want to strengthen it by increasing the commas, which is a grammatical change as opposed to a material change.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Actually, for the same reason. It's a citation, it's a reference and "of Europe" is added. You can't put "of Europe" within the citation, so I am against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The committee?

Opposed.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Was also against: 15.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 24 is rejected.

Amendment No. 25.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madame President. This is to insert after the paragraph 2, line 5, after the words "Europe", insert the following: "paying tribute to the founding fathers of the Council of Europe". And that is really setting what we are, and why we're here 70 years later as parliamentarians in a democratic organisation. So we're saying to them, "Well done, thank you. You've set us on the road after a devastating war." That is the basic principle of what we are. We have a lot of people to thank. And I'd like, possibly, to add that.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Is anyone against the amendment?

Ms ÆVARSDÓTTIR .

Ms Thorhildur Sunna ÆVARSDÓTTIR (Iceland, SOC): Madam President.

I think we are excluding a portion of the population with this amendment and I would also suggest that the founding fathers would not be very proud of all these amendments here right now. They are not very democratic in spirit or fatherly when it comes to that.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I am against and the committee as well. Against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 168.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Amendment No. 168.

In the draft resolution, paragraph 2, after the last sentence, insert the following sentence: "The Assembly should determine the extent of the sanction when it is called upon to decide, by resolution, on a challenge to credentials."

I think this is fair as one main point of our values and our way in this hemicycle. I think this is very important and can support this report the right way.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, if credentials are challenged then that is part of the evaluation of that challenge.

This is not something that we need to add in the report. It is common practice.

So I don't accept the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): There is no opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open,
The vote is closed.

Amendment 168 is rejected.

Amendment No. 169.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you Madam President.

Amendment 169. Draft Resolution paragraph 2. After the last sentence, it says the following: "Collective measures against a Member or state cannot be lifted by the Assembly unless they have totally fulfilled their statutory obligations". So I think we should add this because in our situation we can show the meaning of our report more correctly.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Mr KOX.

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL): I don't think it does improve the text, so I am against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I am against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 169 is rejected.

Amendment 170.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI?

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I think this is one of the main amendments about rule 4. This amendment changes the Rules of Procedure stating that rules are not retroactive. So they understand it's impossible to make new laws and use them to things that happened before. I think we should add it, and I'm sure that this is one of the main subjects and main points of Rule of law. We can add this amendment as well.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Ms ÆVARSDÓTTIR.

Ms Thorhildur Sunna ÆVARSDÓTTIR (Iceland, SOC): The ban on retroactivity of laws is fundamentally thought for not punishing people under criminal laws for offences that were not criminal before that.

It is also a general rule of law that should a rule be beneficial it can happily be retroactive so I think that we should reconsider this amendment and not accept it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, but I am against it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): We will now proceed to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 170 is rejected.

Amendment 178.

Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): We proposed in the draft resolution, paragraph 2 after the last sentence, to have the following sentence instead: "There is in the rules of procedure, no autonomous sanctions procedure with respect to a delegation or a member of the Assembly". We think it strengthens paragraph 2 in general.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes this is a statement that doesn't express any wish or activity or whatever, so I don't see the relevance of putting such a statement in this resolution.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 179.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear colleagues,

In the draft resolution after the last sentence in paragraph 2, I propose to insert the following sentence: "The Assembly may decide to take collective measures against its members by the deprivation or suspension of the exercise of a number of participation and/or representation rights, based on a breach or a violation of the provisions of its Rules of Procedure of the Statute of the Council of Europe, in the context of a procedure, that of the challenge or reconsideration of the credentials of national delegations for procedural or substantive grounds."

I think it could be useful for that.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well it's a nice sentence but I don't think it is useful in this resolution.

It doesn't have any added value to put it here.

So I am against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There is no opinion from the committee?

The ballot is open.

The ballot is closed

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 180.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): In the draft Resolution, paragraph 2, after the last sentence we have proposed to insert the following one:

"Changes to the Rules of Procedure, that contain the text of this Resolution, cannot restrict the scope of sanctions incurred by Members of delegations, whose credentials have been ratified, but have had the exercise of certain rights of participation and representation in the activities of the Assembly suspended".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Mr KOX.

Mr Tiny KOX (Netherlands, UEL): No, it is not an improvement of the text.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There's no opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, but I am against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 183.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I see that the whole of the proposals are not going to be adopted. But, anyway, in the draft resolution, after paragraph 2, after the last sentence, insert the following sentence: "The Assembly is sovereign as to the condition of representation of national parliaments within it".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

No one?

No opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, but I am still thinking about what it means. I don't think it adds anything to the resolution so I am against it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 183 is rejected.

184, Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear Colleagues, we are now going to destroy a long term tradition.

In the draft resolution, paragraph 2, after the last sentence, insert the following one: "The procedure for challenging credentials during the session, is not the same statutory basis that the Assembly has devised in special procedures for challenging credentials since 1964".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I understand this amendment, but the report is not on challenging credentials. We're not changing anything to this procedure so I am not sure why this should be added so I would not accept it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

There's no opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 185.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear colleagues,

I'm many times sad that we are on a very slippery road, as well as we are going to make States that are breaching the rules and the principles to be unpunished. And so, I think the following amendments - I don't know, maybe it could be useful - but, anyway, I would like to underscore again and again, we are going to cut our power and it goes against the interests of parliamentarianism. This will be in the interest of those Member States who are used to violating the principles and the pillars of the Assembly.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against amendment No. 185? Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, well, again. There is a procedure, of course, in place in challenging credentials and in proposing sanctions, so I don't see why this should be in this resolution. It limits the resolution in itself, whereas there is another procedure for that, so I don't accept this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 185 is rejected.

Amendment 136.

Mr. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I will call you again and again. The hashtag "safe Council of Europe" is now one of the most popular in my country. I suppose other human rights activists and others who are really concerned about what we are doing here will support it as well. So, any changes should not harm the principles and values, but we are going step-by-step to this goal and it's a sad goal.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, this Amendment is the same - or has the same spirit - as Amendment 215, which I rejected because I felt that it brings a negative message and this is not what we want to do with this resolution. So this is the same reason why I wouldn't accept this one.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 220.

Mr. GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Excuse me. In the draft resolution, paragraph 2, replace the second sentence with the following words: "It could declare it necessary to transform its practices and clear up its regulation, where a reconsideration of its machinery and procedures assured the obligation to assert more effectively the cornerstone principles and values, which are the common heritage of the peoples of Europe to guarantee more resolutely the Council of Europe, substantial values of liberty, rule of law and human rights."

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

No one.

There is no position from the Committee.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As rapporteur, I don't accept this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

We will move on to the second part of the collection of amendments, and I would like to inform you that if we continue at this rate, we will finish our work at 1 a.m. I can only invite you to be as succinct as possible, knowing that it is better to present an amendment, to explain how it is useful, rather than to read it.

I take Amendment No 26, tabled by Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): I promise not to read the whole of this one out. In the draft resolution, we actually said that paragraph 3 should be deleted, because all the way through it's ambiguous.

It hasn't been all sweetness and light. Not everybody has agreed. There have been fundamental decisions, not just from my group, but others.

It started as an *ad hoc* committee under Mr Michele NICOLETTI, and all of this it has actually been a very painful experience. So I can't see why we're celebrating clause 3.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, because this report is part of a bigger exercise that started already some time ago so this paragraph gives this overview and it is essential to understand why we are proposing this resolution, so I would be against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Does the committee have an opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, there is. The Committee was against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I would point out to you that if Amendment 26 is adopted, Amendments 27, 144, 213, 141, 28, 29, 142, 30, 143, 148, 31, 32, 182, 194 and 214 will fall.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment No. 27.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed, Madam President.

In the first sentence, it says "the Assembly welcomes". We would say that the Assembly "takes note of the numerous contributions". I think "taking note" is a better word than "welcome". "Welcome" means that we are happy with it. What we are saying is that if we are not happy with it we take note of it as opposed to welcome it. So, therefore, it is more technical than actually substantive but I believe it strengthens the actual paragraph.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I would stick to the word "welcome", because the exercise done by the *ad hoc* committee gave a lot of useful suggestions. That is a positive thing, so I would not accept the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The Committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC):

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.
The vote is closed.
Amendment 27 is rejected.
Amendment No. 144.
Mr YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you.
Madam President, dear colleagues, I withdraw this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): This amendment is withdrawn. Does anyone else want to take it back?
That is not the case.
It will therefore not be voted on.
Amendment 213.
Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): In the draft resolution, paragraph 3, replace the words "its parliamentary delegations" with the following words: "the delegations of the Member States".
We think it's very important, because we're not only speaking about the parliaments, but about the Member States. And we need to emphasise it in this way. So I want to ask everybody to vote for this very important amendment, N° 213.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr KILJUNEN, against the amendment.

Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN (Finland, SOC): Madam Chair, for me it is the first time to be in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and I admit that this has been an experience.
Based on this experience, I think that in the end the Russian delegation will thoroughly regret if their credentials will be accepted by the end of the day.

By the way, I am against the amendment because it doesn't add anything.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

No opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, but I am against also.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment number 141.

Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Thank you Madam Chairwoman.

We propose deleting the words "set up by the Bureau in December 2017".

We do not understand the purpose of this specification that "the Ad hoc committee on the role and mission of the Parliamentary Assembly, which was established by the Bureau in December 2017".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

No one.

No opinion from the committee?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, but as Rapporteur, I'm against it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 141 is rejected.

Amendment number 28.

In the retranscription of the amendment, I think there is an error in the text when it is written in the draft resolution "delete paragraph 3", since we have already voted on this proposal, it was amendment 26. On the other hand, what remains of Amendment 28 is, in the draft resolution, paragraph 3, line 3, "delete the word 'deep'".

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINER, you have the floor.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINER (United Kingdom, EC): You are quite right Madam President, thank you.

Where it says "the deep commitment of the political groups", so in other words "delegation for the group's deep commitment to the Council of Europe".

"Deep" goes a bit hard I think.

The political groups' commitment to the Council of Europe, I think, is fine.

I'm not quite sure why we need the word "deep".

It doesn't detract but it doesn't actually add anything.

It looks in a way that we're all unanimously agreeing with everything.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER.

Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, it's exactly because of this deep commitment that we welcome all these contributions, so they go together. I would stick to the word "deep".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): What about the committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No position from here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 28 is rejected.

For amendment 29, it is the same remark as in the previous one. The beginning where it says "in the draft resolution, delete paragraph 3" should be deleted, and only the second part of the text should be retained.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER has the floor.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you again, Madam President. I'm sorry about this. I am very grateful for your tolerance. Where it says "their protection", we'd like to drop that out. It doesn't make any bit of difference, in fact, in a way, it is putting us in the front of things that we don't actually do, "their promotion and protection", I thought that was NATO. I'm a bit worried that that could be interpreted the wrong way. I don't think that is our job, we are parliamentarians looking at democracy not at anything else.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment? Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I think that in the Ad Hoc Committee's exercise, all the delegations and political groups have not only shown their commitment to the values but also are contributing to the promotion, to the protection and to the monitoring of the Member States. So to complete, I would stick to the text as it was.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): No opinion from the committee?

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 29 is rejected.

Amendment 142.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Yeah, so - because I hear - I see Mr YEMETS, but it's ok. I will present this amendment. In the draft resolution paragraph, second sentence, after the word "machinery" insert the word "which". So it is technical not special amendment, but I think it can be an aid in this situation. Thanks.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

In fact, it is almost identical to the previous amendment.

Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): For the same reason, I'm against this amendment.

No position of the committee.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment No. 30.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER?

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you Madam President.

What we're suggesting here is –I won't read it out as per your instructions– but drop from where it says "it notes with great satisfaction".

We can't see what this adds.

We have developed over 25 years to ensure Member States respect principles of course.

But we still haven't achieved it.

We certainly haven't achieved the statutory obligations and commitments of people who have joined the Council of Europe.

Therefore this is in a way actually saying something we have not been able to do. Not because of not trying, but just we haven't achieved it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

A different opinion, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This amendment weakens the text of the Resolution so I am not in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 143, which applies only to the English version.

Mr YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Madam President,

Dear Colleagues. In this draft resolution in Paragraph 3, second sentence, we want to change, after the word "machinery", insert the word "which". Because the goal we want to express what machinery we mean in this sentence and in this paragraph. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, this is grammar, and I don't think it makes a difference, so I am against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment number 148.

Mr YEMETS.

Mr Leonid YEMETS (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you, Madam President. Dear Colleagues. We just want to make this sentence more perfect because there is too much "Council of Europe" in one sentence and we just wanted to change in the draft resolution, paragraph 3, second sentence, and replace the end of this sentence where it's written like "up and during the Council of Europe" to make it "up and during the organisation" because we have Council of Europe before so it's too much Council of Europe.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I think you can never have too much Council of Europe. I'm against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 148 is rejected.

Amendment 31.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President.

I will have to read this - this is what we want to add at the end of the paragraph:

"The assembly notes, however, with growing concern the lack of cooperation with the commission on the honouring and the obligations and commitments by Member States to the Council of Europe, i.e. the Monitoring Committee, by certain Member States."

We feel this would actually polarise some of the problems we have faced where people have ignored what we've said, have ignored the Court of Human Rights, have ignored the resolutions and reports of this place.

Therefore, it's not just Russia. It is a lot of other countries, including my own, over personal voting rights.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I don't think it's relevant to add it here in the resolution, so I wouldn't accept it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 31 is rejected.

Amendment number 32.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Yes, Madam President.

Again, it's to add something. Basically, it says that the Assembly expresses concern over the poor implementation rate of judgements of the European Court of Human Rights, especially by the Russian Federation and Turkey, who are roughly responsible for 43% of all violations, which is an enormous amount and I think we do have to recognise this.

We are not all perfect – I quickly add that and I know that my colleague here on the left said so – but though they are nearly 50% of this, and I feel we have to take this into consideration. We are not naming and shaming, we're just making a point.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This is not the place to add such a statement. I would not accept it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 32 is rejected.

Amendment number 182.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): When the Council of Europe was established 70 years ago, it was for the three pillars and the Human rights defence was one of them, the main one. So, I would like to propose to insert the following sentence, "the Assembly reiterates its full commitment and principled response to gross violation of Human rights by any Member States". That's why he are here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Same remark. It's not the place to put such a sentence.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 182 is rejected.

Amendment 194.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Interesting situation but when we have someone who breaches our principles on the board, we do not want to punish it now but we would like to withdraw something to make this person, this innocent. So that is why I would like to underscore that the Assembly reserves to itself the

right to impose the strictest sanctions to the Member States for violating the principles and values of the Council of Europe and the statutory obligations. So that's what we need to do. Otherwise, the spirit of impunity will be in this hemicycle.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Ms DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Same remark. It's an interesting sentence and to the content, I can agree, but this is not the place to put it in the Resolution.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.
The vote is closed.
The amendment is rejected.
Amendment 214.
Mr GONCHARENKO.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I give you the floor, Mr MÖLLER.

Mr Ola MÖLLER (Sweden, SOC): Is it open?

(off mic): Yes, it is.

Democracy demands food because a wise decision is taken on a full stomach, so I suggest five minutes to adjourn because I need to go to the bathroom and I need to eat. I don't care if it's five more minutes at 1 a.m. So please, five minutes' break.

(APPLAUSE)

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): If you agree, I'll give the floor to Mr GONCHARENKO to defend his amendment, and then we'll take a five-minute break.
Mr GONCHARENKO, you can defend your amendment.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): So, yes, we need fuel and one more amendment.

In the draft resolution, paragraph 3, after the second sentence, insert the following sentence: "The Assembly reiterates its full commitment to a principled response to gross violations of human rights by any Member State." We think it is very important because we are welcoming back the Russian Federation, which violates any human rights they can - any. In their territory, overseas, so it should be there.

(OFF MIC: Nonsense!)

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Ms DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, exactly the same amendment as 182 that we just discussed and rejected.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.
The vote is closed.
Amendment 214 is rejected.

I suggest you take a break until 10.15. It's been nine minutes because I think you really need this to go eat and satisfy your needs.

I'll see you later.

[...]

Ladies and gentlemen, we are resuming work. Please take your seats again.

Please! Please!

We have dealt with amendment 214. Of course there is no Amendment number 19, it is a typo.

We come to amendment number 33, tabled by Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

You have the floor.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Madam President. I apologise, we were discussing food. (LAUGHING OFF MIC) Deepest apologies.

The draft resolution – hang on a moment, I need my spectacles – the draft resolution, where it says, “take into consideration”, what we’d like is “to take note of”. “Consideration” means that you are going to do something, in other words, you will do something about it. If you say “take note”, it doesn’t imply that you are going to do anything but you will have taken on board the recommendations or the thoughts, so it is a semantic but we think quite an important one. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Is anyone against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, it's because we want to do something with it that we say “take into consideration”. So I follow the reasoning, but that’s why I am against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 33 is rejected.

Amendment No. 124.

Ms SOTNYK.

Ms Olena SOTNYK (Ukraine, ALDE): Thank you, Madam President.

This amendment is dealing with the right formulation and as always dabbling in the details, but you know, I am looking to this honoured hall and I would dream that someday we would stay until midnight and voting, for example for, to free some prisoners or something like this. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): “Positive reception by” is probably grammatically better than “positive reception of”, so I don’t agree with the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 124 is rejected.

Amendment No. 153.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): That's a matter of what kind of political dialogue we have, political or professional.

So I would like to delete the word "political" as well as too much of political expediency in the events, what we have now. The events, the whole situation of why we are here is just about one state and the demands of one state.

But I think the dialogue should go in a professional manner, so please delete the word "political".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, my view is exactly the opposite. This is very political, so I would leave the word "political".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 153 is rejected.

Amendment 177, Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Before the word 'recognition', there is a word 'its'. Which makes no sense, because it should not be "and its recognition of the urgent need to develop synergies, and provide for coordinated action by the two statutory organs...".

But just: "and recognition of the urgent need to develop synergies..." and so on.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This amendment would change the meaning because "its" is of the Parliamentary Assembly. It's the Parliamentary Assembly that recognises this urgent need, so I wouldn't change the meaning of what we mean.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment No. 34.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President.

If we take this in context, it needs to be read a little bit. It says "the Committee of Ministers of its call for an enhanced political dialogue between the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly and its recognition of the urgent need to develop synergies".

What we're saying is put "full" before "recognition" so it would read - I won't do the whole thing again - "Parliamentary Assembly's full recognition of the urgent need to develop synergies and provide for coordinated action".

We feel this will strengthen immeasurably because it is saying that we are fully committed to doing this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Madame DE SUTTER, against?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This doesn't add anything substantial so I am against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 34 is rejected.

Amendment 201.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): At the first, when we have to discuss the so-called synergy, many times I am discovering in this hemicycle that we don't need a synergy. We need a sharing of the branch. A branch of the executive power and a branch of the parliamentarians. So I don't think that we are going to be on the slippery road of so-called synergy.

We need clear sharing of the responsibility - governmental ones and parliamentary ones.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. If the Assembly takes initiative and the Committee of Ministers follows, this is developing synergies.

I don't see the problem there, so I am not agreeing with the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 193, Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): In the draft resolution, in the second sentence, I propose to delete the word "expect".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, grammatically it should stay there. It is referring to both instances, so I am against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 35, Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President.

What we're suggesting, after the word "mandate" in line 7, is to include the words: "and in full respect of the division of powers". What this does - it basically is saying that we need to develop synergies and provide for coordinated action by the two statutory organs in recognition of their respective mandates.

So we feel this immeasurably strengthens the word "the division of powers" because we are not one organisation, we are still two.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment, Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. Since we say "in recognition of their respective mandates", this implies this division. So I wouldn't accept the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N° 35 is rejected.

Amendment N° 140, Mr. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): In the draft resolution, paragraph four, I would like to insert the following sentence at the end:

"The Assembly therefore welcomes the Committee of Ministers', encouraging support for the proposal it made in Resolution 2277, and Recommendation 2153 — "Role and Mission of the Parliamentary Assembly: main challenges for the future" — to set up, in addition to existing procedures, a joint procedure of reaction, which could be initiated by either the Parliamentary Assembly, the Committee of Ministers or the Secretary General, in order to strengthen the Organisation..."

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment, Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, It doesn't add anything to put this here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment N° 140 is rejected.

Amendment N° 36, Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President.

This word we have already looked at is in the first sentence and in another paragraph. It takes out the word "welcomes" and replaces "takes note of". In other words, we're not - again, as I will reiterate - just welcoming, we are actually taking note of what people say.

It is easy to welcome something, it is much harder to take note of what people really mean and what they say.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. We think it's good that the Committee of Ministers acknowledges the propositions in the report of Mr Kox, so we're happy with that. That's why we use the word "welcome".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 36 is rejected.

Amendment No. 37. I would point out to you that the first sentence in the amendment must be deleted since it appears there by mistake. Do not mark "delete paragraph 4", but in the draft resolution, paragraph 4, line 7, delete the word "encouraging".

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President. What we're suggesting in line 7 is actually deleting the word "encouragement", "encouraging", sorry. We feel that actually it goes without saying, so therefore, we don't need to encourage. We need people to stand by their obligations. In other words, they should do it automatically, not be feeling that there is us saying, "Well, come on, you can do this". It should actually be something that is in all of us as democrats and parliamentarians that we don't need encouragement, it should be natural.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. I want to keep a positive note on this, just as I explained before, so I'm against this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 37 is rejected.

Amendment 146, Mr ARIEV.

LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): It's 125?

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): 146.

I'm very sorry. It's Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Madam President,

It's a small, technical and not so important amendment. It changes some words, but you know, it's nothing considering the report is not so important.

Some four or five years ago, somebody changed the name of Crimea from Ukraine into Russia. It was also not so important to somebody.

This is why I ask support for our amendments because, for us, it is a question of sense.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms Petra De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This is an irrelevant grammatical change that I would not support.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 125, and this time it is Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you.

We don't need to be shy about writing the name of the resolution.

So resolution 2277 - despite the fact that I voted against it - is called the "Role and mission of the Parliamentary Assembly: main challenge for the future". I think this situation is a bit hypocritical.

But I would like to fulfil the name of the resolution in the paragraph.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms DE SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, as far as I can see, it is in the paragraph, in the same sentence after the recommendations. So it's the same report. So no need for this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment No. 159.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Like I say, we are changing several words.

We ask you to support our amendments because, for us, it is very important. We are trying to fight for our country, to fight for our rights and to be European. Thanks.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Synonym. So, irrelevant.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment number 127.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Amendment 127.

In the draft resolution, paragraph 4, delete the words:

"in order to strengthen the Organisation's ability to react more effectively in situations wherein a Member State violates its statutory obligations or does not respect the fundamental principles and values upheld by the Council of Europe".

I think it is correct, right, and can make this report stronger.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, the amendment tries to delete this. There is no need to delete it, if I hear correctly. I will not support the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment No. 38, again there is a mistake. The first sentence should be deleted, where it reads "on the draft resolution, delete paragraph 4". The same thing, moreover, for amendment number 39.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER, Amendment 38.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President.

We are basically saying the last sentence "for its part, the Assembly is firmly committed", we feel that is a presumption. I mean, the proposal should be operational but, actually, it is an open-ended proposal. Therefore, we feel it shouldn't be part or stand part of this paragraph. We are here to look at this in the cold light of day, and I don't feel that this is part of what we are actually about and, therefore, I would ask colleagues to support us in deletion of this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mrs. DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, we feel that it is very important to repeat that this is really what the Assembly wants. So we would not want to delete this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 38 is rejected.

Amendment number 39.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President.

Again, after that, we'd ask at the end, to add "the Assembly is willing to engage with the Committee of Ministers to establish new sanction procedure. It will take its old existing sanction procedure out of the rules of procedure as soon as fully operational and the joint sanction procedure is in place."

In other words, we would like to see a change in this because the way that we are looking at it now, it means that we are going to have problems and back in the presidential committee, we did look at seeing if we could revisit this in January for this very reason.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mrs. DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. This is not consistent with the position that we have taken, that we will not change anything to our existing procedures, so I would not accept this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 39 is rejected.

Amendment number 132.

Mr. GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): In the draft resolution, paragraph 4, at the end, insert the following sentences: "At the same time, the Assembly recalled that every member of the Council of Europe must accept the principles of the rule of law and of the enjoyment by all persons with its jurisdiction of human rights and fundamental freedoms and collaborate sincerely and effectively in the realisation of the aim of the Council, as specified in Chapter 1."

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mrs. DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No need to add this to the resolution.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment number 139.

Mr. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I understand that it's quite an intensive day, but this amendment should be under paragraph 2. But we are now discussing amendments to paragraph 4. So it is placed by mistake to this one, but it's not as well as we passed paragraph 2 by, so I can withdraw this amendment as exceptional.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

No one is taking up this amendment?

There is therefore no need to comment on it.

Amendment number 40.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed, Madam President.

It is at the end of this paragraph, the new paragraph, which is just next to it. We'd like to put in "welcome" - in reply to the Committee members to the Assembly - would "welcome any country's participation in these votes mentioned that has fully fulfilled its financial obligations towards the organisation" - otherwise us, because at the moment, we don't have that. And there is no obligation unless we get the Council of Ministers to be able to take action on this. At the moment, we have one country who, over two years, owes 77 million euros. So, therefore, we feel strongly that this has to be put in so there is a form of sanction in this matter.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mrs. DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): There is no need to put this here in this place.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 40 is rejected.

Amendment number 126.

Mr. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I think we have to clarify paragraph 5, as well as the elections of the Secretary-General. The elections of the judges to the European Court of Human Rights is a bit different. Elections of the judge to the European Court of Human Rights will be in the paragraph.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mrs. DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): First of all, this is perfect English.

And secondly, it's a quote. So we don't change a quote.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 126 is rejected.

Amendment number 160.

Mr. LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: I thank the 40 Members of the Assembly, who like Spartans, are resisting the fall of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe towards shame and defeat. Special thanks to our British colleagues who together with us are fighting for justice in this establishment.

Amendment 160. I think that if a Member country fails to fulfil its financial obligations for two years, the Assembly reserves the right to address the Council of Ministers with a request to stop their membership.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you for respecting the time of the meeting.

Against the amendment?

Mrs. DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, this amendment refers to the joint mechanism that we are preparing together, so it is absolutely irrelevant to put it here in the resolution.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment number 161.

Mr. LIASHKO: You have 30 seconds.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: I ask my dear colleagues and my opponents, please be patient. Don't get nervous. We won't let you in peace if you betray this organisation.

Amendment 161. The Assembly believes that the restoration of the rights of the Russian delegation is possible after public personal statements of each Member of the delegation about the respect for the fundamental values of the Council and the recognition of Crimea as Ukrainian territory.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The recognition of Crimea as Ukrainian territory.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I don't think there is any basis for this amendment in this place. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 161 is rejected.

Amendment 162.

Mr. LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: I very much hope that when researchers will research this particular discussion and the Verbatim record they will see how esteemed Members said there are no grounds to consider Crimea as Ukrainian territory...

Anyway, we insist that the lifting of sanctions is possible only on one condition. After all troops are withdrawn from Ukrainian territory. And I ask Members, in spite of the decisions of your governments which are being sanctified here, I would ask you to support very obvious thing.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): I would ask you to respect the speaking time, otherwise I will have to cut the microphone.

Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. No place in this resolution, in this text to add such an amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 163.

Mr LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: We suggest that the sanctions applied to the Russian Federation cannot be revised or cancelled until the full control of the State border is returned to the Ukrainian authorities. That was the subject of several resolutions of the Parliamentary Assembly which we're forgetting today. Sanctions cannot be lifted until the full restoration of Ukraine over the border, the withdrawal of Russian troops and the stopping of the Russian aggression. I think this is very pertinent.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms DE SUTTER, against?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Same argument. Not a place to put this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The amendment was put to the vote.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 164.

Mr LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: I think I was not mistaken. Are we really in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe? Is it not the stadium of the Russian Federation? Because the very amendments like this are not supported in the State Duma. Some of the Members of the Russian Federation delegation are going to be in this very hall and in the Presidium. They're going to be the representatives of Russia. There was one in the parliament of Georgia, and we know the consequences.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): A contrary opinion from Ms DE SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, always the same argument. This is no place to put such amendments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 165.

Mr LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: We suggest that the lifting of sanctions is possible only after the full restoration to Ukrainian citizens of their right to freedom of movement and access to the territory of Crimea of representatives of international missions. I think this is extremely important. It will enable to protect the rights of Ukrainian citizens, including Crimean Tartars, in occupied territories. There are reprisals against Tartars, and we demand the lifting of aggressions.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Madame DE SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, all these amendments have no place in this resolution, maybe in other texts further in the week, but not here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 166.

Mr LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: I suggest we add to the Resolution that it is impossible to lift or revise sanctions against Russia until full compensation for the damage to those injured citizens who suffered as a result of the Crimean annexation. As a result of Russian aggression billions in damage has already been done. Companies and jobs have been lost for Ukrainian citizens. We think that it is impossible to lift the sanctions against Russia until the compensation issue is settled.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Ms DE SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Same arguments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 167.

Mr LIASHKO.

Mr Oleh LIASHKO (Ukraine, NR)*: Dear colleagues. This is my last amendment. Maybe I won't be able to speak again after. I'm really ashamed of what's going on here. I'm ashamed of myself for being a Member of this establishment. I'm not going to come here any more. I'm not going to work here. I'm ashamed of you. I'm sure that your children will be ashamed of you. My amendment is that sanctions...

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr LIASHKO, you have used your speaking time.

Is there anyone against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, again, or the same reasons. It's not on the content of what Mr Oleh LIASHKO proposed, it's not the place in this resolution. It has nothing to do with what we are voting for.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 167 is rejected.

Amendment 202.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): We also understand that paragraph 5 couldn't be fulfilled, as well as this call for all Member States to take part in the June part-session of the Parliamentary Assembly.

We will not have a Bosnian delegation. So all that story is about the Russian Federation. It's a shame.

I think we have to say that this concerns all Member States whose credentials are ratified. Otherwise, this makes no sense.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Anyone against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well, it does not make sense to add this. It is for all delegations, so, of course, also the Bosnian, next to the Russian.

So I don't think this is a useful amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 202 is rejected.

Amendment 43.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINER (United Kingdom, EC): On this one, we would ask the draft replacement for the following paragraph, paragraph 6. I will quickly read it:

'The Assembly reiterates the terms of Article 25 of the Council of Europe, and considers as an obligation of each Member State's parliament to transmit the credentials of the parliament's representatives at the opening of its ordinary session'.

So we know who is coming, where they are coming from, if there is anybody on the banned list, at least we will know about it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This is simply rephrasing the original text so I don't see any change. I wouldn't change it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 122.

Ms SOTNYK.

Ms Olena SOTNYK (Ukraine, ALDE): Thank you, Madam President.

I realise, by the way, why you are behaving like this. Your country, unlike mine, is not occupied. You do not have to take part in funerals of soldiers and civil people who are killed by Russians.

Anyway, I am doing my job. I am trying to do the best I can for my people, the Ukrainian people.

This is a very technical amendment, I think it makes the text a bit better, but I'm not going to insist on the vote.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, it's just synonyms, so I wouldn't change what is written there.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment number 42.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President.

What we are suggesting in paragraph 6, which is the one we are talking about, line 3, is to replace the word "takes" with the following words, "can only take". So, in other words, we're saying that we want to strengthen this, in that where it "can only take effect". So we believe that this will make a difference to this paragraph and, actually, make it stronger. So I would ask colleagues to look at this carefully with the view of supporting this.

Thank you very much.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Ms DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, it goes against the idea that we are proposing a derogation, so it doesn't make sense.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 42 is rejected.

Amendment 198.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I understand, distinguished colleagues, how tired you are and how you would like to go to your bedrooms in your good hotels to have a glass of champagne. But what do you think about people suffering Russian aggression now? There are children who lost their parents and people who lost their homes. What have they been feeling for the last five years? My amendment is to change conformity for coherence.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, synonym and irrelevant.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.
The vote is closed.
The amendment is rejected.
Amendment number 200.
Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I understand you're angry. You don't want to share responsibility for the people who suffered.

But it will. It will happen. Because we understand that, without the execution of the demands, the Russians should not be here. And, I've seen it all day, that some of you put down your eyes passing by me. That is the reality.

Statute of the Council of Europe instead of the words, in particular in chapters 1 to 3.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Mr ARIEV, this is a request to all the participants in this debate, please justify and explain your amendments, but stop blaming people who do not agree with you. Also others please stop whistling when you do not agree with what you are hearing.

Opposite opinion, Mrs. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, this has no added value, so I would not accept it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.
The vote is closed.
Amendment 200 is rejected.
Amendment number 207.
Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): Yeah, it's not you who will come back and see into the eyes of the parents of killed people. And yes, I understand you but you should also understand us. And for us, what's going on now, here, it's a real tragedy for all of us. My amendment is to replace the words "take effect" with the words "make an influence on".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I think this would worsen the text rather than improve it, so I would not be agreeing with it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.
The vote is closed.

Amendment 207 is rejected.

Then we have amendments number 45, 95 and 119, which have the same content.

We will vote only once on these three amendments.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much, Madam President.

I think if people read this paragraph, they'll discover either that this is already dealt with or it actually means that we are leaving ourselves to slight hostage to fortune. We have got to make sure that where we are doing parliamentary elections, inviting parliaments to the Council of Europe from Member States - which are not represented by the delegation of Europe - present credentials. I think, actually, this paragraph of all the paragraphs is the weakest of all of them. And I say that advisedly to Madam De SUTTER. It is a good report but I would ask to look at rejecting this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER. Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, this is crucial, of course. This is a derogation that we were talking about, so I would be against. And the committee has a position on Amendment 45. It was also against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendments were rejected.

Amendment 47.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed.

What's *quarante-sept* in English, sorry?

(speaking off mic)

Forty-seven. Thank you very much indeed. Thanks, Nigel.

I hadn't got my headphones on, deepest apology to colleagues.

Where we've got "Taking into consideration the Committee of Ministers' held a decision in," place the following words:

"the Assembly decides to amend Rule 11.3 of its Rules of Procedure by adding at the end of the first sentence the following words: 'in the exceptional circumstances, confirmed by the Parliamentary Assembly, appointments can be made at a later date.' The Assembly shall decide whether exceptional circumstances apply or not by using the electronic voting system" Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER. Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Paragraph 7, in total, is drafted in such a way that it is in compliance with the rules and legally sound, so absolutely no changes to this paragraph, please.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Before proceeding to the vote, I would like to inform you that, insofar as this amendment proposes a change that adds a new vote to our Rules of Procedure, which must be carried out with a 2/3 majority, this amendment, in order to be adopted, must itself be adopted at 2/3, because it would entail, in the event of acceptance, the need to vote on the entire resolution with a 2/3 majority.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 48.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you Madam President. Where we delete all the words after "take into consideration" to put "the Assembly decides by way of derogation from Rule 11.3 of its Rules of Procedure". Add a new line, and I quote: "In exceptional circumstances confirmed by the Parliamentary Assembly appointments can be made at a later date. The Assembly should decide by using the electronic voting system, and by a two thirds majority of the votes cast". Again we believe that this strengthens the way that we do our work and we enhance the way that the Parliamentary Assembly works.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER. Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, same argument as just before.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 196.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Many times I've said that the full paragraph 7 is in contradiction to the Statute and, regretfully, it hasn't been deleted as well as it is not in compliance with Article 25 of the Statute. But, OK, I propose just a cosmetic amendment to this paragraph. It would not save it, but I'll keep on proposing.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms DE SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, cosmetic and so, irrelevant.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 46.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Madam President.

Delete the words, and this is paragraph 7 again, "as well as the exceptional context which led to". The reason for this is we just believe that this is accepted. We are in the position we are. I don't think we need to sit around being known to everybody that we're here now. Just by having this in, it makes us look as though we're not quite sure of what we're doing. I would ask the rapporteur if we could possibly remove that statement.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, this wording is crucial in this paragraph. So no, I wouldn't accept the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 197.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I regret that the Assembly refuses to send paragraph 7 for a legal opinion, or to the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights for an opinion. I don't know why.

I would like to underscore that it is in contradiction to the Statute. In the first sentence, I propose to delete the words which led to it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No. It has a place in this sentence, because that was the reason why the Committee of Ministers made that decision.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 49.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINER (United Kingdom, EC): Dear Madam President. In the draft Resolution we would like to replace the words "by way of derogated form" with the following words: "to confirm". We believe this is actually strengthening this part. "Derogated form" has various meanings, and I think this is a stronger way of putting forward what we'd like to do. And I also think it just tidies up that part of the paragraph and it makes better reading.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): It is the opposite of the derogation we are aiming for, so we cannot accept this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 195.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Due to doubts of paragraph 7 being legal or contradicting the Statute, I think the following decision of the Assembly could be undermined. But anyway, the Resolution paragraph 7 first sentence, delete the words "relating to the transmission of credentials of national delegations to the President of the Assembly and their ratification by the Assembly".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): ...for the reference to Rule 6.1 and 6.3, so we should keep it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 195 is rejected.

Amendment 50.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam.

We suggest using the words "June 2019" replacing "June 2020". This gives the Assembly, when they present president credentials, the representatives substitutes. In "June 2019" we would like it to say "20" as part of the part session.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The whole paragraph is irrelevant, of course, and the same with the following amendment. I am against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 171.

Mr LOGVYNSKYI.

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear Madam President.

I think it would be fair to change "June 2019" to "June 2020", because I think it's out of the rules. And in this case, in this paragraph, it shows that we are more political, that we are Human Rights fighters and that we should follow the rules.

We don't need to do anything with Russia's credentials before next year. Thanks.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you. In fact, we have already voted on the same amendment...

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 52.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you Madam President.

We always use the words "opening of the part session" here, or "the part session". It is the standard language we use. So we're suggesting to drop the word "sitting" and actually put in the language of the Council of Europe, which in this case, would be "opening of the part session".

This would basically just continue down the line of what we always do here. We rarely see the word "sitting" in most of our stuff. It's a tidying up exercise.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms. De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): "Part session" would be October, the next "sitting" would be tomorrow morning. So I'm against the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 52 is rejected.

Amendment 51.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): It's exactly the same as the last one basically, Madam President.

Instead of having the word "sitting", having "part session". It's exactly the same argument of tidying up. I do take the other point that Ms Petra De SUTTER makes, but we're trying to use the language that we normally use.

I again think that it would strengthen to use these words, and I again ask Ms Petra De SUTTER to reconsider.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Reconsider my decision.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 53.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much. We suggest, in the draft Resolution, at the end of the paragraph, to insert the words "this exception can only be made for countries who have not yet composed a delegation in full or partial and failed to present their credentials in time". We've all had situations here where that has happened, including my own country, and I therefore think it's a tidying up exercise to make it more relevant in the way that we as parliament, not parliaments, do our business.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): It goes against the exercise we are doing here. So I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 54.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed. Again this is the same sort of principle. We're basically saying at the end to insert the sentence "under no circumstances a national delegation has the right to appoint a Member who is under Council of Europe sanctions". We obviously know what we're all talking about here. I don't make any blames about it. It is a difficult situation because we don't really want Members being arrested if they arrive in a country, for what ever reasons. So therefore, I do think that it is difficult for Member countries to be able to fulfil their obligations to some people.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): ...the following ones, because this is against the procedure that is in place for challenging credentials. So this is not the place in this Resolution. So I'm against. And this was also submitted to the Committee, which was against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 55.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much. Again this is the same principle because we've taken out the Council of Europe, now it is the European Union. The European Union does have sanctions against certain countries. And again, I don't need to say. but it is important to recognise that we have a myriad of MEPs who have made this decision for the reasons they feel are strong and good. And it is very difficult for somebody to be a Member of this place when they're under sanctions from the European Union just across the river. I would again ask Ms Petra De SUTTER to look at this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Against the amendment for the same reason.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 56.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): This is to do with the United Nations. An organisation which all of our countries belong to and we have enormous respect to, as everybody will have. But it is difficult, again, for a national delegation who has the right to appoint a Member who is under United Nations sanctions. Technically it would also mean, to people who are not part of this organisation coming to speak to us, who are under sanctions and under restrictions of movement. And I would again ask Ms Petra De SUTTER to look at this because I think that the United Nations is a very respected body, and I think they would find this very difficult.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 58.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you, Madam President.

This is, again, the same thing. But under the sanctions of the United States of America. The United States of America has an extremely strict policy on sanctions, as we well know. In fact, Iran has had a lot more piled on it today.

Now, therefore, this is a very difficult one, because if you have people that want to go to the United States, they will ban them. Now that can be any of us. If the Americans have a reason for not allowing a parliamentarian in, they ban you. They ban you for 5, 10 years, 15 or life. And therefore I think it is a time that we do need to look at this.

The Americans do have an enormous amount of weight, whether we like it or not.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, same arguments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 57.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed, Madam President.

This is to word the following sentence. "Under no circumstances, a national delegation has the right to appoint a Member who is under sanctions of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe". Now we do know there are people and that some of them are not sitting, some of them do come here. But I think this is a very important one.

It enshrines that if a member here makes a terrible mistake and they are sanctioned, then they have no right to be here. And they should not be here, either with a pass or access through other organisations.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): There's no place for this in this resolution here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 60.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed. Again this is the same principle. Where we're asking that under no circumstances a national delegation has the right to appoint a Member who is convicted of a crime for which the punishment is more than a six month prison sentence. A lot of countries, in our country and other countries, we have this already, where you can be removed as a Member. It is interesting that we don't have it here. And I think it's part of what we should be looking at as to what the procedures and why we have the rules we have if somebody has gone on the wrong side of the law.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, for all the same arguments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 60 is rejected.

Amendment 61.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you Madam President.

Again this takes up the same point. That this is now for twelve months imprisonment. Most of our countries do have this sort of law, these guidelines or instructions in place. Sometimes parliaments can move people. Sometimes it has to be the electorate. But it does mean exactly the same principle.

We are an organisation of law and order. Therefore it is very difficult to understand if you have somebody who is not doing that or is not taking part in what is the norm, how can they actually sit in this place?

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): No, same arguments. Yes, yes, yes.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 97.

Mr ZINGERIS.

Mr Egidijus VAREIKIS (Lithuania, EPP/CD): This is a very special amendment. We are saying what we are derogating from the Rules, but derogation does not mean that we made a wrong decision. And it doesn't mean that this will set a precedent for the future. So this is unique. They have no future and no past.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, of course, I agree with the meaning of what this amendment wants to say. But, because we have stressed the exceptional circumstances, and it is a derogation, it goes without saying. So I don't see the added value of this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 102.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you.

We have a list of amendments.

At the end of paragraph 17, insert the sentence "a member's credentials under consideration, cannot vote at the bureau meeting until his or her credentials have been duly ratified".

This basically means that, if somebody has done something, we have the ability to say that we'd rather they didn't take part in the proceedings.

I will be going through these in the next series of amendments as well.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. And for the whole series, well, it's not in order. It's not correct to state this, and it has absolutely no place in the Resolution. So I'm against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 102 is rejected.

Amendment 103.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you.

Now, I would generally say to the rapporteur, I do understand the concerns. But we need these various issues actually talked about.

I hope she will bare with me, and colleagues as well. Again, where a member or members, whose credentials are under consideration, cannot stand for the office of President.

I would say this would seem fairly obvious, but there are actually no rules to say that if somebody hasn't got their credentials, they can't actually stand for President of the Organisation. Which, I think, is slightly strange in this day and age. I think in most parliaments you wouldn't be Prime Minister or President if that was the case. Again, this is a tidying up exercise.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER. Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 103 is rejected.

Amendment 104.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you.

This again is exactly the same thing. For a member whose credentials are under consideration, he cannot stand for the office of vice-President of this organisation. For exactly the same reasons.

We do need to have various amendments in place to be able to protect ourselves, should this arise. Because if we don't have the rules, we actually don't have a way of doing anything about this.

Now, I'm not saying it's going to happen. It may never happen. And let's hope it doesn't. But it's like the same with the President and the vice-President. There are very important people in this place, so we need protection if something goes wrong.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms. De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, same arguments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 105.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you.

This is slightly different. This is a Member whose credentials are under consideration. They can attend the Presidential Committee, but they cannot vote.

If any party leader, myself or any of my colleagues in the future, actually have their credentials under scrutiny — which in fact the British did, funnily enough—, It would mean you can attend it but you can't actually vote in it.

I know in the Presidential Committee we don't tend to vote. I accept that. But it does mean that we have, again, the protection for all Members in this place.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, for the same arguments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 107.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): This again is a probing amendment.

It's "a Member whose credentials are under consideration can attend the Presidential Committee but cannot speak or vote". If you can't do one, you should look at trying to do another. Because at the end of the day it still doesn't give us the protection.

The Presidential Committee, most people haven't attended but I have, is very very important indeed. I know the Recommendations go to the Bureau, but it still means you still need protection.

And I would urge colleagues to look at amending this one, and I hope Ms Petra De SUTTER hears that.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER.

Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I'm against, sorry.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 108.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you Madam President.

To try and not test the patience too much, but Members with credentials under consideration cannot attend the Presidential Committee. This is the doomsday scenario. If any of us was accused of anything, then you can't attend.

That doesn't mean you have any other way around it, because as part of your group, you can send your vice-Chairman if possible or whatever. But again, it's the same principle, we do need protection for ourselves, and I believe this is one of the ways we can do this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Same reasons.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 109.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Now this is actually down to the Bureau. The Bureau is very much the steering organisation that we have here, to make sure that everything is ratified and goes through. Then it comes to the plenary session.

What we'd like to say is that a Member whose credentials are under consideration cannot speak or vote at the Bureau meeting until his or her credentials have been duly ratified. This is exactly the same reason.

If a country isn't having its credentials ratified for whatever reason, that there is a way for not allowing them to skew the Bureau.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Against.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 110.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed.

This is where a Member whose credentials are under consideration cannot attend the Bureau meetings until his or her credentials have been duly ratified. Please don't confuse the two with the one before.

This is where you cannot attend. We're saying there is a fallback where Members who haven't been ratified actually can't attend the Bureau. The Bureau is incredibly important, and I don't think we should water it down when we have a problem like with credentials.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER. Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Almost got it confused with the previous one, but this one I cannot accept. No.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 111.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you.

In the draft resolution at the end of paragraph 7, we'd like to add: "A Member whose credentials are under consideration can be a member of a political group but cannot enjoy any other rights derived from membership of a political group". And again that is because it's a safeguarding of us. It doesn't matter which group it is, and it doesn't matter how big the country is. It just means that there is a mechanism within the groups where people cannot come along and demand on their behalf or their countries behalf things they cannot possibly do if their credentials haven't been approved.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER. Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Same arguments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 106.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you.

This one again is the same principle. A member whose credentials are under consideration cannot be a member of a political group. I know a lot of colleagues will think that's a bit odd. But at the end of the day we do have a lot of unaligned members here. So actually not being part of a group is not that surprising. What we're saying is that if there is a credential challenge, because the groups are so important, and we are very proud of our groups. It is difficult to see how they won't be diluted if you have people whose credentials are not actually being ratified. Therefore I ask colleagues to consider it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I'm against this amendment. Same arguments.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 106 is rejected.

Amendment 59.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): At the end of the sentence: "Under no circumstances has a national delegation the right to appoint a member who is in sanction of Canada". Canada is one of the observers here. They are an incredibly good friend of the Council of Europe. They're an incredibly good country. It's difficult to understand how a Member who is under sanctions, we could actually appoint them and say they could go. Because the Canadians would have every right to say no, even though technically they would have to say yes. So I would urge people to let that list to be put in. I think it's important.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): The same argument as with the US and the other organisations. I cannot accept this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 59 is rejected.

We can move on to the third part of the collection of amendments, paragraph 8.

Amendment 115.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed Madam President.

What we're basically saying in this is that before paragraph 8 insert the following paragraph. In the draft Resolution, at the end of paragraph 8, insert the following sentence. Sorry, there's a typo here. "In the light of the synergy between the Parliamentary Assembly and the Committee of Ministers, the Assembly hopes that the Committee of Ministers can, jointly with the Assembly, closely observe member states who are not fulfilling their obligations". I do apologise for getting it wrong, but I do believe this is a very crucial part of this paragraph.

Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

You may notice that the first sentence of the amendment is out of place here. Because it is not about inserting a paragraph. So it is the second part of the amendment that is correct.

Speaking against, Ms Petra De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I don't think this has added value in that paragraph. I wouldn't add it there.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

Amendment 115 is rejected.

Amendment 68.

Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed.

On the first sentence we'd ask to consider deleting the words "the Assembly notes", and replacing them with the following words: "the Committee of Ministers notes". So it would tighten this up. I think it just makes this better. Probably Ms Petra De SUTTER won't agree with me, but I do believe it makes the wording better and tighter. It is important to establish between us and the Committee of Ministers. We are two very different organisations.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

A position against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): With the Committee of Ministers we note the same thing. So I think the original text should remain.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 189.

Mr. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): We have to oblige all member states to participate in the organs, but we have now rejected all the amendments which oblige them to fulfil these obligations. That's quite strange for me. My proposal here is to replace, in this paragraph, the word "organs" in each instance by the word "bodies".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): As a medical doctor I object to saying that "organs" and "bodies" are synonyms so I don't accept the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 188.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I understand that the situation is quite funny and we're going to laugh about that. But we are unlikely to participate in the sittings together with forgiven perpetrators.

My amendment to the draft Resolution is, after the words "On the Statute of the Council of Europe" insert the following words: "with the exception of cases specified in Article 8 and 9 of the Statute". These articles are about responsibility.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, those are something quite different, so they don't have a place here. I don't agree with the amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 219.

Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): In the draft resolution, paragraph 8, replace the third sentence with the following sentence:

'It is clear from the statements, that all the parliamentary delegations enjoy the same rights under its Rules of Procedure, and are subject to the same obligations according to procedures that have been applied equally to all members'.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Is there anyone against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): It's just rephrasing the same sentence. So it has no added value.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 190.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): My proposal shortened the draft Resolution paragraph 8. Delete the words "in this respect".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms De SUTTER.

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Right english. I don't see any added value in taking it out.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 70.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed. Sorry. Yes, this is to actually take out the three words after the word "rights". We'd like to insert the words "and obligations". Everybody has rights, but you also have obligations. Now that goes for all of us in any parliament. I think this just strengthens this whole thing by saying that we understand one part but we also expect another part. Now I would ask Ms Petra De SUTTER to consider this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Well we have already considered it because it is in the same sentence, but just a few words further. So no need to amend this.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 89.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you. Ms Petra De SUTTER quite rightly pointed out that the word is in there. But after that word of "obligations" we'd like to insert the following: "including financial ones". Now everything around here at the moment seems to do with money. So therefore, it seems fairly obvious that we should add that somewhere in all of this. And therefore, it's very straight forward, adding three words: "the financial obligations", to which we all have to live by and we all expect to live by. Therefore I believe strongly that it is quite important to add that part.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Ms De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. It is not the delegations that have financial obligations. It is the Member States. So this is not in place here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 187.

Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I would like, in the draft Resolution paragraph 8, after the words "apply equally to all", to insert the following words: "except when the powers of a Member state are suspended in the manner described by the Statute of the Council of Europe and by the Rules of Procedure for the Assembly" it's good clarification.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): It has no added value to put it here because equal application to all in the rights and obligations are described in this paragraph. We don't have to add this here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 75.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much.

Here at the end of paragraph 8 we'd like to insert the following sentence: "These equal rights can, however, be only enjoyed by members who are not on the EU sanction list". And I think that is important because we have EU sanctions. We can't ignore them because most of our countries are involved. And, therefore, why should members enjoy whatever they want and equal rights when they're on a list? I would hope that it's straightforward, but I would ask Madam De SUTTER to consider that, please.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This paragraph is on Member States and on delegations. It is not on individual members.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment N° 77, Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much.

Notwithstanding, it includes the word "organs". I hope Ms Petra De SUTTER is not going to take a view on that. I won't read the whole thing out. It reminds the Council of Ministers that there is no joint sanction procedure, and it needs to be established. Somebody has always preserved its right to maintain its existing sanction mechanism, and we'll use it with the same care and caution as it has done over the last 70 years. So we have that ability, but I would ask this to be included to strengthen the whole thing.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Mrs. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. It is saying something that is already in place and that does not need to be stressed in this paragraph in the Resolution, so I wouldn't accept it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment N° 90, Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much.

In the Draft Resolution, at the end of 8, we'd like to insert the following words: "In order to enjoy these equal rights, equal obligations must be fulfilled first". Again, I know that sounds fairly obvious, but it hasn't always been the case. If people want to be part of this organisation, there is an obligation. And there also is no right to be a part of this. It is the ability of us, as parliamentarians, to control that. And I think this is an important end of the sentence.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, because I'm not sure that I agree on that. I think rights and obligations come together and are indivisible. You can't say which comes first and which comes after that, so I wouldn't agree on this amendment.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment N° 91, Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much. In order to... We'd like to revise the end of paragraph 8: "In order to enjoy these equal rights, equal obligations, especially financial ones, must be fulfilled first". One of the reasons we're here tonight, and doing this, is that actually it is our financial obligation. And therefore we can't just ignore any country who does this. So, therefore, surely it should be right, that you pay up before you get absolute rights and accesses to this place. And that, unfortunately, has not been always the case. And therefore, through Ms Petra De SUTTER's report there is an opportunity to change that for the better. I'd, therefore, ask for consideration for this, and ask colleagues to look at it carefully.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment, Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, the same reasoning as before.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment N° 116, Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): Thank you very much indeed.

In the draft Resolution, at the end of it, we'd like to put "the Assembly reiterates the terms of Article 25 of the Statute of the Council of Europe hopes the Committee of Ministers will consider action against any Member state not complying", not complying, I repeat it, "with the conditions outlined in Article 25 of the Statute". I think this is incredibly important. It's safeguarding both sides of this. And it makes sure, absolutely, that Article 25 is sacrosanct. It's what we all abide by. It's why we're here. It's what we do. So I'd ask the rapporteur again to look at this and try to include it in a final deliberation.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Mr De SUTTER, against the amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Article 25 is already mentioned in this paragraph, in the first sentence, so there is no need to repeat it in the same paragraph.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment N° 172, Mr LOGVYNSKYI .

Mr Georgii LOGVYNSKYI (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Now it is a quarter to twelve, and I'm happy that all of you are fighting for some ideas and reasons.

Maybe we have different reasons, but I know all of you want to go home. Like me! As a Crimean Tartar, I also want to go home to Crimea. As well as other Members of parliament... (he gets interrupted)

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): You have used up all your speaking time.

Ms De SUTTER, against this amendment?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I don't think it adds value to this paragraph. Of course, it is interesting what is written there, clearly, but here is not the place to put it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 71, Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): What we'd like to do is, where the words "upon its adoption", we'd like to replace those words with "as soon as a new joint sanction mechanism with the Committee of Ministers has been established".

We need to be able to do that. We need to be harder than "upon its adoption". So, therefore, I would ask Members to look at this and vote in favour.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

Against the amendment, Ms De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, I'm against. This is on paragraph 12, of course, in another place. But no, I would not agree with this amendment because then the Resolution will not get into action, as we of course immediately want. I agree that the joint mechanism is important, but I would not add this to paragraph 12.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 120.

Mr KROSS.

Mr Eerik-Niiles KROSS (Estonia, ALDE): We are actually not trying to replace the paragraph with anything. But we would like to add "monitoring" as a failure to honour obligations in monitoring processes. One ground to take collective measures against a Member State. Right now we have Rules of procedure and a Statute and violations of those. But monitoring has been mentioned as a very important process in this body. We would like to specify and outline that. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): I understand the amendment, but it is not in place, because this is on Rule 10.1.c which really talks on the sanctions in challenging credentials. Nothing else. So I don't think it's in place here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.
The vote is closed.
The amendment is rejected.
Amendment 186.
Mr ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I would like to propose a technical amendment in paragraph 9, in the first sentence, to replace the word "however" with the word "therefore".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes, it has a slightly different meaning which is not in place here, so I wouldn't change the text.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.
The vote is closed.
The amendment is rejected.
Amendment 78, Mr. LIDDELL-GRAINGER.

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER (United Kingdom, EC): This is in the very first sentence where there is the word "recalls". What we'd like to do is replace it with the word "maintains": "However, the Assembly maintains that it may decide" and then it goes on. We feel that this is a very different word to "recalls". Because "maintain" has a very different meaning, and therefore, we feel that it would be better for this entire paragraph to have that word in the first three words.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): "Maintain" has a connotation of no change, and we want to change. So I don't think "maintain" is a good word here.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 152.

Mr. ARIEV.

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): Dear Colleagues. I withdraw this amendment. But, I would seriously like to ask you to support amendment number 2. The next amendment. It is quite an important one.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Amendment 152 is withdrawn. No one else wants to take it up, so we'll move on to Amendment No. 2.

I give the floor to... Who's going to defend it? Ms LIBINA?

Ms OZOLA.

Ms Linda OZOLA (Latvia, NR): This is amendment number 2. We have tabled this amendment in order to set a very clear context of, and the link to the events that triggered the suspension of certain rights of the Russian Federation at the Council of Europe. Namely, the occupation of Crimea in 2014, and we think it's essential in the given circumstances. Thank you.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

What is the committee's opinion?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. Paragraph 9 is a factual description of a rule which we will amend. So this is not the place to add the statement which is in this amendment. I understand why it's there, but this is absolutely not the place to put it.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.

The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

That amendment is rejected.

Amendment 191. Mr ARIEV?

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV (Ukraine, EPP/CD): I would like to ask you to support this amendment. In the first sentence of paragraph 9 replace "decide" by the word "conclude".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?

Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): Yes. This is an irrelevant amendment in my view.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The ballot is open.

The vote is closed.

The amendment is rejected.

Amendment 203.

Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC): In the draft Resolution, paragraph 9 delete the words "on procedural or substantive grounds".

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Against the amendment?
Mr. De SUTTER?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC): This is how it is in the rules. So why would we take out "procedural or substantive grounds"? I don't see the added value.

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open...
The Amendment No. 203 was not adopted.
Amendment No 211, Mr GONCHARENKO.

Mr Oleksii GONCHARENKO (Ukraine, EC)
Transcription in progress

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you, contrary opinion of the rapporteur?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC)
Transcription in progress

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): The vote is open.
The vote is closed.
Amendment No. 211 is rejected.
Amendment No. 117, Mr van de VEN.

Mr Mart van de VEN (Netherlands, ALDE)
Transcription in progress

Ms Liliane MAURY PASQUIER (Switzerland, SOC, President of the Assembly): Thank you.
Contrary opinion of the rapporteur?

Ms Petra De SUTTER (Belgium, SOC)
Transcription in progress