

**Professor Danuta Hübner, Chair of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs**

***"Negotiations with Council and Commission on European Parliament's right of inquiry: legislative proposal - Oral questions"***

European Parliament - plenary session

17 April 2019, European Parliament, Strasbourg, France

The right of inquiry is a fundamental weapon for any modern Parliament to make the executive accountable for their action.

If we think about the “mad cows disease”, “tax fraud on cigarettes”, “diesel gate” or “Panama papers” we understand that it is fundamental that EP has a solid and sharp power of inquiry.

The Council systematically refused to sit at the table and have a real discussion on the content of European Parliament’s proposal.

The argument was that the proposal of the Parliament did not take into consideration their fundamental concerns.

But this means actually ignoring the nature of the special legislative procedure established by article 226 TFEU, according to which the Parliament has the legislative initiative and adopts the final text after receiving the consent of the Council and of the Commission.

This procedure implies that the institutions exchange views and search for a compromise acceptable for all them. It is thus unacceptable that the Council would demand that the initial proposal of the EP should already contain the text acceptable for the Council.

This is not the way the consent procedure functions!

How would the Council or the Commission react if the EP refused even to discuss possible ways to reach an agreement on, let’s say the MFF using the pretext that it does not like the proposal of the Commission?

Moreover, this attitude is not compatible with the principle of loyal cooperation between the institutions that we all should respect and cherish.

At stake here is a fundamental question of respect for the prerogatives of the EP and for the institutional balance. It is fundamental that the Council and the Commission understand it

At the end of the day, we do not have an obligation to agree with each other. But we have the duty to try. Sadly, the Council has not lived up to that duty.