EP Rules of procedure, rule 136.1: temporary committees of inquiry

1995/2247(REG) - 23/10/1995

Presenting the report by Mr Ben FAYOT (PSE, L), Mrs Marlies MOSIEK-URBAHN (EPP, D) pointed out that during the vote on this report on 19 September part of the new text of Rule 136(1) of Parliament's Rules of Procedure had been rejected, thus preventing parliamentary committees of inquiry from investigating abuse or infringements by public administrative bodies of the Member States. However, the Interinstitutional Agreement of 19 April and the Treaty establishing the European Community authorised parliamentary committees of inquiry to carry out such investigations. The FAYOT report sought to amend Parliament's Rules of Procedure to bring them into line with the superior legislation of the Treaty establishing the European Community and the Interinstitutional Agreement by tabling an amendment that included in Rule 136(1)of the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure the text that had mistakenly been rejected. - On behalf of the PSE Group, Mr Robert EVANS (UK) stated that the European Parliament should be authorised to investigate abuse by Member State administrations. He wondered why any Members of the European Parliament would be opposed to this. What were the motives of the political groups that rejected this proposal? - On behalf of his group, Mr Florus WIJSENBEEK (ELDR, NL) noted that since the public administrations acted as agents of the European Union in numerous areas (for example when collecting taxes at external borders), it should be possible to investigate their actions. - Mrs Ana PALACIO VALLELERSUNDI (EPP, E) expressed her group's full support for the points made by the previous speakers. - On behalf of his group, Mr Vassilis EPHREMIDIS (GUE/NGL, GR) stated that extension of the right of inquiry to areas that were the responsibility of the Member States would encroach upon their competences. - On behalf of the EDN Group, Mr Hervé FABRE-AUBRESPY (F) believed that when Mr FAYOT had written to President HÄNSCH he had told him about an incident. It was not up to the President to refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure. This report would change a vote that was not the result of a practical error. It therefore infringed Rule 125(2) of the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure. In addition to bringing Parliament into disrepute, a new vote would show disregard for the Members who had voted in all honesty. Mr FABRE-AUBRESPY considered that the substance of this new provision contradicted the Treaty on European Union. The Member States alone were responsible for judging the functioning of their administrations. Finally, he did not believe that an interinstitutional agreement could amend the Treaty.