

Arrests for exploitation of female victims for prostitution

9 October 2019 [[NL](#)]



✘The Dutch, Romanian and Belgian authorities, with the assistance of Eurojust, arrested two Romanian nationals, who are suspected of trafficking in human beings, people smuggling, money laundering and other crimes. The suspects exploited and partially forced into prostitution a group of approximately 10 women from Romania and the Republic of Moldova in the Netherlands, taking away most of their income. The women involved, who now are no longer victims of the suspects, were sometimes lured into work as prostitutes under false pretences; in one case, the suspicion of abduction was raised. The criminal offences are supposed to have been committed since January 2015.

A total of 6 house searches were carried out over the last two days in Romania and Belgium; one suspect was arrested in the Netherlands and one in Belgium. The Dutch Public Prosecutor's Office (PPO) Oost-Nederland in Arnhem did not rule out possible further arrests. During the searches, cash, various goods, documents, and different devices were seized.

The favourable outcome of the operation was also due to the setting up of a joint investigation team (JIT) between the Dutch and Romanian authorities. Eurojust supported the case by awarding funding to the JIT, organising a coordination meeting and providing legal assistance. The operation was successfully concluded by the Dutch PPO and National Police Oost-Nederland, Arnhem/Zwolle the Iasi territorial office of the Directorate for Investigation of Organized Crime and Terrorism, Romania, and the Romanian Police. During the joint action day, the PPO and Police of Limburg (Hasselt) in Belgium assisted the operations by making 1 house search and 1 arrest.

Photo © Shutterstock

Speech by President Donald Tusk at the Athens Democracy Forum 2019

There are three reasons why I am grateful for the invitation to Athens. I will begin with the most banal one, which is very obvious and personal at the same time. The history of Greece has always been my passion. Before I was ten I read Homer's *Iliad* in Polish. No sooner had I finished, than I started

reading it again, and so it went for several months. Almost learnt it by heart. 'Sing, o goddess, the anger of Achilles, son of Peleus, that brought countless ills upon the Achaeans'. Homer had given my life a meaning, because children also look for a meaning and a purpose in life. I decided to become an archaeologist, to discover the ruins of Troy, and read everything there was to read in Polish about ancient Greece: mythology, Plutarch, essays on Athenian architecture and the *Peloponnesian War*, philosophers and Herodotus. Imagine my despair when I read the biography of the famous archaeologist Heinrich Schliemann. It turned out that Troy had been discovered long ago, and so I lost my sense of purpose for quite some time.

So the only thing I could do was to pursue a more modest dream: to become a historian and, sometime in the future, to see the Acropolis with my own eyes. The first dream came true after ten years, the second – after forty years. When, as a fully grown man, I first arrived in Athens, having climbed the Acropolis and put my arms around one of the columns of the *Erechtheion*, I was moved to tears just like when I first read about the deadly arrow of Paris hitting the heel of Achilles.

Immersed in Greek history, and a bit later also in Greek tragedy and philosophy, I had to, sooner or later, come across that cursed word: politics. Cursed today, since for the ancient Greeks, *politikon* had many positive meanings: public, civic, daily, ordinary, sociable, even polite! The spelling of the word *polite* is not a coincidence.

In secondary school, our history teacher told us to read Sophocles' *Antigone*, and then act out the trial of Creon. No-one wanted to be his advocate. Then the teacher looked at me with a telling smile and said, 'Donald, you always have something to say, even when not asked, and ancient Greece is your passion, so you will defend Creon'. Oh my god, I – a 17-year-old idealist – am forced to take the side of a merciless tyrant, the side of authority, against rebellion? I didn't know Max Weber at the time, I had no idea about the ethics of responsibility, but I managed somehow, and when the class gave their verdict, it was a draw. Perhaps it was then that, unknowingly, I became a politician. One thing is for sure, a quarter of a century later I became the head of government in Poland.

There is also a second reason for my gratitude for the invitation to Athens. It gave me the opportunity to have an extended discussion, just hours ago, with my friends, Prime Minister Kyriakos Mitsotakis and his predecessor Alexis Tsipras. Of course these were separate meetings, as you may guess, but in essence they were quite similar. Even if the battle dust has only just settled after the last election campaign, both my interlocutors focused not on that which today divides the people of Greece and Europe (and there would be much to talk about), but on that which can and should unite us, how to bring back a positive meaning to the term *Politeia*, which Cicero translated into Latin as *Res Publica*, a public affair. This may perhaps be the greatest challenge of our times – how to make out of politics what it once was: acting and thinking for the common good. Because, after all, we all feel how social entities and political communities are breaking into incompatible pieces. Increasingly often we are witnesses and victims of growing polarisation. Earlier partners, still yesterday competitors, today – sworn enemies. I can

see this process happening in so many places, including my home country. Politics, from being the art of coexistence of different ideas and communities, is turning into the ability to deal brutally with opponents, competitors, misfits or strangers. Violence, lies, hate speech, myths and resentment – these are the tools of today's politics. It is politics understood as war: even if shots are not fired everywhere, almost everywhere, some part, some fragment of the whole, wants to destroy, invalidate or totally subordinate the others. Emotions have replaced reason, while in political mathematics, dividing and subtracting have displaced multiplying and adding.

It is no accident that in the latest issue of the prestigious Polish periodical *Political Review (Przegląd Polityczny)* devoted to Brexit, there are essays on Thucydides and his reflection on the theme of *stasis*, an ancient Greek term literally meaning: a part, a fraction, denoted a state of public disorder, chaos resulting from political passions and a constant escalation of internal conflicts. As an example Thucydides gave the situation in Korkyra, where agreement was not possible also because, in the heat of the battle, the sides freely changed the meanings of words, while values were being reversed. Madness and reckless audacity came to be seen as courage; common sense as cowardice, moderation as conformism. Every pause for thought or attempt at reflection was treated as capitulation or laziness. Those who sowed anger, resentment and destruction became figures of political and even moral authority, and whoever resisted them, in the name of order and prudence, was under suspicion.

Thucydides noticed that in the state of upheaval, human nature comes before justice. Emotions and passions, inherent in our nature, are stronger than our attachment to the laws and rules we ourselves have established, and will always be pushing us towards violation and domination. The most important political inventions of humanity – democracy, human rights and freedoms, international order, checks and balances, the rule of law – they all stem from this awareness of our nature as well as from past, negative experiences. But do they stem only from the past? Aren't we today facing our own *stasis*, amplified by the technological revolution and the mass character of social phenomena? Are Europe and the world not turning, before our eyes, into ancient Korkyra?

I am curious how today Thucydides would diagnose the situation in the United States under the administration of President Trump, in the United Kingdom in the time of Brexit and permanent parliamentary crisis, in some countries in East Central Europe, where the foundations of liberal democracy and the rule of law are being undermined, or on the border of Russia and Ukraine. For sure he would have something to write about.

There is also a third reason why I'm grateful for the invitation to your Forum. To me personally, it is especially important and moving. This is because the hosts have decided to award the prize posthumously to Paweł Adamowicz, my friend and close collaborator, the Mayor of my city, Gdańsk, who was murdered in January this year. He was stabbed to death the moment after saying the following words, addressed to thousands of people gathered in Gdańsk, at the culmination of a great charity event, and I quote: "Gdańsk

is generous, Gdańsk shares its good, Gdańsk wants to be a city of solidarity. This is a wonderful time of sharing what is good." He fell victim to hatred, which he opposed all his life. He was not an ancient hero, like Demetrius Poliorcetes, he did not conquer or destroy other cities. He built his city with the belief that not everything is lost, that love is stronger than hate, that solidarity is stronger than egoism. I also believe that not everything is lost, and I want to wish you all the same faith.

Arrests for exploitation of female victims for prostitution

9 October 2019 [[NL](#)]



✘ The Dutch, Romanian and Belgian authorities, with the assistance of Eurojust, arrested two Romanian nationals, who are suspected of trafficking in human beings, people smuggling, money laundering and other crimes. The suspects exploited and partially forced into prostitution a group of approximately 10 women from Romania and the Republic of Moldova in the Netherlands, taking away most of their income. The women involved, who now are no longer victims of the suspects, were sometimes lured into work as prostitutes under false pretences; in one case, the suspicion of abduction was raised. The criminal offences are supposed to have been committed since January 2015.

A total of 6 house searches were carried out over the last two days in Romania and Belgium; one suspect was arrested in the Netherlands and one in Belgium. The Dutch Public Prosecutor's Office (PPO) Oost-Nederland in Arnhem did not rule out possible further arrests. During the searches, cash, various goods, documents, and different devices were seized.

The favourable outcome of the operation was also due to the setting up of a joint investigation team (JIT) between the Dutch and Romanian authorities. Eurojust supported the case by awarding funding to the JIT, organising a coordination meeting and providing legal assistance. The operation was successfully concluded by the Dutch PPO and National Police Oost-Nederland, Arnhem/Zwolle the Iasi territorial office of the Directorate for Investigation of Organized Crime and Terrorism, Romania, and the Romanian Police. During the joint action day, the PPO and Police of Limburg (Hasselt) in Belgium assisted the operations by making 1 house search and 1 arrest.

Photo © Shutterstock

Press release – Opening of October I plenary session



President Sassoli expressed his condolences to the family of Jacques Chirac, calling him a great European who always worked for peace, tolerance and democracy.

Recalling those who lost their lives in a shipwreck close to Lampedusa, President Sassoli said tangible measures were needed to bring an end to the deaths in the Mediterranean sea.

The President expressed his condolences to the people of Halle, adding that his thoughts are with the families of the victims.

Changes to the agenda

Wednesday

The debate on the MFF is moved to Thursday morning, as the first item and replaced by the debate on “Greening the European Investment Bank” as the first item, moved from Thursday.

Additional debates:

- Council and Commission statements on “Preventing conflicts of interests in the EU institutions”
- A debate on “US tariffs on European goods following WTO’s decision on the Airbus dispute”
- A statement by the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the “Situation in Northern Syria”
- A Commission statement on “Authorisation of GMOs”
- A Commission statement on the “Fight against cancer” will come as the last item, before the One-minute speeches. The debate is to be wound up with a resolution, to be put to the vote at a future part session.

As a consequence, the sitting is extended until 23:00.

Thursday

The Council and Commission statements on the “Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027 and own resources: time to meet citizens’ expectations” are moved to Thursday morning, as the first item;

The report on “Economic policies of the euro area 2019”, which was rejected in committee, is removed from the agenda.

Furthermore, 5 objections pursuant to Rule 112 were adopted by the ENVI committee and will be added directly to the votes:

- Active substances, including flumioxazine
- Active substances, including chlorotoluron
- Genetically modified maize MZHG0JG (SYN-000JG-2)
- Genetically modified soybean A2704-12 (ACS-GM005-3)
- Genetically modified maize MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 × DAS-40278-9 and genetically modified maize combining two, three or four of the single events MON 89034, 1507, MON 88017, 59122 and DAS-40278-9

Requests by committees to start negotiations with Council and Commission

Decisions by several committees to enter into inter-institutional negotiations (Rule 69c) are published [on the plenary website](#).

If no request for a vote in Parliament on the decision to enter into negotiations is made by midnight on Wednesday, the committees may start negotiations.

Statement by Michel Barnier at the European Parliament Plenary session

Merci, Monsieur le Président,

Madame la Ministre,

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés,

Quelques mots en complément de ce que vient de dire le Président Juncker.

Les négociateurs britanniques nous ont fait part de leurs propositions et, avec leur propre équipe, qui est une équipe compétente et professionnelle, ils s'efforcent de nous les expliquer et de les clarifier au cours de plusieurs réunions techniques ces derniers jours.

o Pour dire les choses simplement et franchement, avec objectivité, au moment où je vous parle, nous ne sommes pas au point de trouver un accord.

o Pourtant, le temps presse. Nous sommes désormais à une semaine du Conseil européen et à quelques jours de cette date du 31 octobre qui a été agréée avec le précédent gouvernement pour la sortie du Royaume-Uni de l'Union européenne dans une forme ordonnée qui vaut beaucoup mieux qu'une sortie désordonnée

Les propositions britanniques soulèvent **trois problèmes majeurs**.

Le premier point concerne la question de la frontière, et le contrôles sur les biens sur l'Ile d'Irlande.

Le gouvernement de M. Johnson a rejeté dès son arrivée le *backstop*, qui est une sorte d'assurance ou de filet de sécurité sur lequel nous nous étions entendus avec le gouvernement de Theresa May C'est un fait.

Dans le même temps, le Premier ministre reconnaît qu'un alignement réglementaire pour les biens est indispensable entre l'Irlande du Nord et l'Union européenne, et nous sommes d'accord sur ce point.

En revanche, pour résoudre le problème de contrôles douaniers, le Royaume-Uni propose tout simplement que nous prenions ensemble un engagement juridique pour éviter « en toutes circonstances des contrôles douaniers et réglementaires ou toute infrastructure physique à la frontière entre l'Irlande et l'Irlande du Nord ».

Nous partageons évidemment cet objectif, qui est l'un des objectifs du *backstop*, mais ce qui nous est demandé en réalité, c'est d'accepter un système qui n'est pas développé, qui n'est pas testé, de contrôles dispersés sur l'Ile d'Irlande, système qui reposerait largement sur :

o des exemptions et des dérogations au code douanier européen,

- o des technologies qui restent à développer
- o des changements au droit international prévu par le *Common Transit Convention*
- o un système de « compliance » nouveau, mais sans les garanties prévues par le Protocole.

Nous avons besoin, à chacune des limites du marché unique et de notre Union douanière, de contrôles douaniers et réglementaires sérieux et rigoureux.

En Irlande, comme partout ailleurs, nous avons besoin de contrôles opérationnels, réels, crédibles.

C'est la crédibilité du marché unique qui est en cause, et donc la crédibilité vis-à-vis des consommateurs, des entreprises et des pays tiers avec lesquels nous avons des accords.

*

Le deuxième point concerne l'exigence de trouver des solutions juridiquement opérationnelles.

Avec le Protocole, nous avons établi un filet de sécurité qui clarifie le régime applicable sur l'île d'Irlande. Ce filet de sécurité est juridiquement opérationnel, puisqu'il s'appliquerait jusqu'à ce que nous trouvions une solution alternative.

En proposant de supprimer ce filet de sécurité et de chercher des solutions alternatives pendant la période de transition – c'est-à-dire plus tard, la proposition britannique ne nous donne pas la sécurité du Protocole.

- Un exemple : il n'y a pas dans cette proposition britannique de solution réelle pour les petites et moyennes entreprises sauf de proposer une dérogation générale.
- Deuxième exemple : que se passerait-il si le *Joint Committee*, auquel les Britanniques veulent renvoyer toutes les questions sans réponse pour l'instant, ne trouvait pas d'accord pendant la transition ?

Selon les propositions britanniques, la solution dépendrait alors de l'adoption de mesures unilatérales à prendre par le Royaume-Uni ou par l'Union européenne.

Il y aurait alors un risque significatif pour l'intégrité du marché unique, puisque les propositions britanniques nous engageraient en même temps à ne jamais prévoir de contrôles à la frontière entre l'Irlande et l'Irlande du Nord, qui deviendront deux juridictions différentes.

*

Le troisième point de désaccord concerne la proposition britannique sur le « *consent* ».

Nous avons toujours regretté l'absence de Stormont depuis deux ans et demi pour donner une voix solide et forte nord-irlandaise dans nos négociations.

Dans le Protocole existant, nous avons prévu avec les Britanniques des mécanismes qui permettent la représentation de l'Irlande du Nord.

Nous sommes prêts à examiner des idées nouvelles pour un rôle plus important pour les institutions nord-irlandaises dans la mise en œuvre du Protocole, dans le respect du Good Friday/ Belfast Agreement.

Mais, aujourd'hui, la proposition britannique consiste à conditionner la mise en œuvre du Protocole à une décision unilatérale des institutions d'Irlande du Nord qui pourraient décider :

- o Dès le départ, au lendemain de la ratification de l'accord de retrait, de ne pas activer la solution proposée pour l'Irlande du Nord
- o Et, si elle était quand même activée, tous les quatre ans, de la remettre en cause cette solution.

La proposition du gouvernement britannique, telle qu'elle est, et que nous ne pouvons pas accepter, remplacerait une solution opérationnelle, pratique, légale, par une solution hypothétique et provisoire.

*

Enfin il y a un quatrième point qui ne concerne pas l'accord de retrait mais la déclaration politique, qui décrit la future relation que nous devons reconstruire dans tous les domaines, qu'il y ait un accord ou pas d'accord.

Aujourd'hui, M. Johnson nous demande de nous concentrer pour l'avenir de notre relation économique seulement sur un accord de libre-échange basique et pas sur d'autres options que nous avons laissées ouvertes dans la déclaration politique et il nous demande aussi de supprimer les références que nous avons agréés avec Theresa May sur un point très important qui est le *level playing field*, c'est-à-dire une règle du jeu de base, un socle de règles en matière fiscale, d'aide d'Etat, de droits sociaux, de droits environnementaux, de droits des consommateurs.

Et donc nous sommes face à cette demande qui laisse entrevoir le risque pour nous, avec un accord de libre-échange basique, de faire face à une compétition réglementaire, voire à un risque de dumping fiscal, social ou environnemental que nous n'accepterons pas.

Voilà pourquoi je dis que l'ambition et le niveau de notre futur accord de libre échange avec le Royaume-Uni sera proportionnel aux niveau des engagements pris pas les autorités britanniques durablement pour une règle du jeu commune.

Monsieur le Président,

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés,

Personne à Londres ou ailleurs ne doit s'étonner que l'Union s'attache dans cet accord de retrait à obtenir des solutions opérationnelles, juridiquement solides et durables.

Car le Brexit crée des problèmes concrets, précis, graves, notamment en Irlande.

Face à ces problèmes immédiats, nous avons besoin aujourd'hui, et pas demain, de solutions précises, opérationnelles, légalement contraignantes pour les deux parties.

Dans ce moment grave et important, nous resterons de notre côté, comme toujours, calmes, vigilants et constructifs en même temps que nous resterons respectueux du Royaume-Uni et de ceux qui le dirigent.

Nous restons, avec mon équipe et en permanente coopération avec le Parlement européen et l'ensemble des Etats membres, disponibles 24 heures sur 24, dans les jours qui viennent.

C'est dans cet esprit que je rencontrerai à nouveau demain le ministre britannique Steve Barclay et, dans le respect scrupuleux du mandat qui nous a été confié par le Conseil européen et des résolutions du Parlement européen, nous allons continuer à travailler.

Même s'il est très difficile, s'il y a de la bonne volonté des deux côtés, un accord reste possible avec les Britanniques.