

Answer to EESC members statement

Dear Mr Jose Antonio Moreno Diaz,

Dear Mr Jukka Ahtela,

Having carefully read your statement, recently published at the EESC website, I must regretfully notice it contains baseless attacks on Polish authorities being accused of “explicit threat” accompanied by “disregard for the normal procedure for selecting Polish CSO representatives to the EESC”. According to your private opinion “this situation has prevented them [CSOs] from choosing their own candidates as they wish”.

First of all, I have to kindly remind you that each Member State is solely responsible for the procedure of selecting candidates to EESC. Therefore, I am astonished that colleagues from Spain and Finland chose to intervene in these issues.

Secondly, I would like to correct the inaccuracies contained in the statement. You state that: “This situation has prevented them [CSOs representatives] from choosing their own candidates as they wish, in a specific procedure that differs from the one applied to the country's social partners (who can freely nominate their candidates for the EESC's other two groups – the Workers' Group and the Employers' Group).” The procedure for selecting candidates to EESC has been consulted and approved by the Council for Public Benefit, where CSOs representatives have the majority of membership. In the procedure identical for all three types of candidates, either Social Dialogue Council (for Workers’ and Employers’ Group) or Council for Public Benefit, had the opportunity to choose their candidates. According to the procedure, in cases where the above mentioned bodies do not agree on the EESC candidates, the appropriate ministry has the responsibility of selecting them from the full list of those who applied. Such was the case for the CSOs representatives applying for membership of the Group III of EESC.

Last but not least, I would like to briefly comment of the FRRL country report published after a visit to Poland in 2018. I have already, at the beginning of this year, clearly and openly informed Council for Public Benefit about this report and the whole range of untrue statements it contains. The country report contains explicit untrue statements and opinions which have not been confronted with Polish authorities. To give one example: The National Freedom Institute was accused of certain irregularities: “A watchdog reported several cases where CSOs selected during the awarding process did not receive any funds, and vice versa.” Nobody from FRRL delegation or further on while composing the report, has made any attempt to verify this information. Open discussion about such publications should never be considered as a threat or retaliation to any CSO legally acting in Poland. Moreover, the Polish authorities have never interfered in Committee’s work nor exerted pressure on Ms Dreszer-Smalec.

You have concluded your statement: “there must be room for transparent and constructive dialogue”. Therefore, kindly accept my cordial invitation to Poland and to The National Freedom Institute, and, on behalf of the both Co-Chairman, to the Council for Public Benefit. I hope during this visit you will be able easily to experience openness, transparent procedures and the spirit for dialogue with any CSO in my country.

In this search for room for transparent and constructive dialogue, I kindly ask you to publish this letter to accompany your statement.

With kind regards,

WOJCIECH KACZMARCZYK
Sekretarz/Secretary
Komitet do spraw Pożytku Publicznego/
The Committee for Public Benefit
KANCELARIA PREZESA RADY MINISTRÓW
THE CHANCELLERY FOR THE PRIME MINISTER

