



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Employment and Social Affairs

2014/2252(INI)

20.4.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 55

Draft opinion
Helga Stevens
(PE1049996v01-00)

on Annual reports 2012-2013 on subsidiarity and proportionality
(2014/2252(INI))

AM\1058171EN.doc

PE554.884v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Takes the view that employment and social policies are mostly in the area of Member States competence and where the EU has a remit to take measures to ensure the coordination of the Member States' employment policies, by defining guidelines and in particular by normative documents for labour market; encourages therefore the European Commission and Member States to intensify discussions on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the field of this policy;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. ***Welcomes*** the closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process, ***which*** has resulted in ***a positive*** increase in awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context;

1. ***Expresses concern at the fact that the*** closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process has resulted in ***an*** increase in awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context; ***takes the view that it is vital to define appropriate criteria to assess compliance with both principles, so as to ensure that their application does not go beyond the provisions of the Treaties and jeopardise the building of a united***

Amendment 3

Evelyn Regner, Brando Benifei, Mercedes Bresso

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the *closer participation* of national parliaments in the European legislative process, which has resulted in *a positive increase in* awareness of the principles *of* subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the *increased interest and the stronger involvement* of national parliaments in the European legislative process *in the recent years*, which has resulted in *an increased* awareness of the *basic principles upon which the EU is founded, such as* subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional *context as well as European politics and policy making in the national* context;

Or. en

Amendment 4

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process, which has resulted in *a positive increase in* awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process, which has resulted in *increasing* awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context;

Or. en

Amendment 5

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Marian Harkin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process, which has resulted in a positive increase in awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process, which has resulted in a positive increase in awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context; ***notes however, that further work still needs to be done in this context; Suggests therefore that the Commission engages in a yearly debate with each of the national parliaments in the national parliament in order to strengthen the dialogue between the Commission and the national parliaments;***

Or. en

Amendment 6

Rina Ronja Kari

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process, which has resulted in a positive increase in awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the closer participation of national parliaments in the European legislative process, which has resulted in a positive increase in awareness of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the interinstitutional context; ***Believes, however, that the efforts to increase the participation of national parliaments in the legislative process should be strengthened;***

Or. en

Amendment 7

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Marian Harkin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Reminds that according to Article 5 in the Maastricht Treaty the European Union shall only act if and in so far as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 8

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Marian Harkin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Stresses that the principle of subsidiarity is an important tool to balance the exercise of power and to ensure genuine European added value and thereby promoting growth and job-creation; stresses that in respecting the principle of subsidiarity it is key to consider the role of the social partners and to ensure their autonomy according to Member States' customs and traditions, believes in this regard that breaches of the principle of subsidiarity can lead to unintended consequences such as undermined faith in the European Union for European citizens and that breaches of the principle of subsidiarity should therefore be avoided;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Brando Benifei

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Highlights that the principle of subsidiarity is a characteristic feature of federal states, as those political entities deriving legitimacy from popular sovereignty in which no one level of government is subordinate to another but each is coordinate;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Regrets that the ‘early warning’ thresholds are difficult to meet, especially when the time frame is shortened, given the lack of vigilance on the part of some national governments;

Or. fr

Amendment 11
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Suggests making national parliaments better aware of their prerogatives;

Or. fr

Amendment 12
Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes the *importance* of regional parliaments, especially those with legislative powers, ***and of their territorial impact and closeness to its citizens, and calls, where appropriate, for their greater involvement*** in the early warning system;

Amendment

2. Points out that the involvement of regional parliaments – especially those with legislative powers – in the early warning system, where possible, can increase the risk that legislative proposals geared towards attaining the EU’s objectives will be challenged on the basis of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality;

Or. es

Amendment 13
Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes the importance of ***regional parliaments, especially those with legislative powers***, and of their territorial impact and closeness to its citizens, and calls, where appropriate, for their greater involvement in the early warning system;

Amendment

2. Notes the importance of parliaments and of their territorial impact and closeness to its citizens, and calls, where appropriate, for their greater involvement in the early warning system;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes the importance of regional parliaments, especially those with legislative powers, and of their territorial impact and closeness to *its* citizens, and calls, where appropriate, for their greater involvement in the early warning system;

Amendment

2. Notes the importance of regional parliaments, especially those with legislative powers, and of their territorial impact and closeness to citizens, and calls, where appropriate, for their greater involvement in the early warning system;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Encourages national parliaments to issue reasoned opinions not only to the European Commission's legislative documents but also to those non-legislative, which precede the drafting of EU legislation, in order to increase effectiveness of influencing future EU initiatives and legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Recalls that, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, the EU will take action outside its areas of exclusive competence only and insofar as the objectives of a planned measure can better be achieved at Union level rather than at national, regional or local level; subsidiarity may, therefore, lead both to an extension of the activities of the Union within the framework of its powers when circumstances so require and, conversely, to the action concerned being restricted or curtailed where it is no longer justified; emphasises that subsidiarity, in this context, not only applies to the relationship between the EU and its Member States but encompasses as well the regional and local levels;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Helga Stevens

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Underlines that the principle of subsidiarity must always be the starting point for all policy formulation;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Tatjana Ždanoka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. **Highlights** the fact that 2012 saw national parliaments show their first ‘yellow card’ in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, in response to the proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services;

Amendment

3. **Welcomes** the fact that 2012 saw national parliaments show their first ‘yellow card’ in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, in response to the proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. **Highlights the fact** that 2012 saw national parliaments show their first ‘yellow card’ in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, in response to the proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services;

Amendment

3. **Points out** that 2012 saw national parliaments show their first ‘yellow card’ in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, in response to the proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services, **and that it is possible that the proposal may be withdrawn by the Commission; expresses concern about the adverse effect that the withdrawal of that proposal, as well as many others, could have as regards building a sound European Union in the long term;**

Or. es

Amendment 20
Brando Benifei, Evelyn Regner, Mercedes Bresso

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Highlights the fact that 2012 saw national parliaments show their first ‘yellow card’ in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, in response to the proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services;

Amendment

3. Highlights the fact that 2012 saw national parliaments show their first ‘yellow card’ in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, in response to the proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services; ***points out however that according to the Commission the principle of subsidiarity had not been breached;***

Or. en

Amendment 21
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Regrets that in spite of the fact that 13 reasoned opinions were submitted and that the Member States managed to reach the yellow card threshold on the matter of creating a European Public Prosecutor’s Office, the Commission has decided to continue the project. The discrepancy between the reasons put forward by the different parliaments left the Commission unconvinced, which highlights the absence of interparliamentary coordination and the inadequacy of the procedure;

Or. fr

Amendment 22
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Recalls that the national parliaments represent EU citizens and asks for reasoned opinions and yellow cards to carry more weight in future and for the Commission to take the Member States' opinions more seriously;

Or. fr

Amendment 23
Tatjana Ždanoka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States; ***deleted***

Or. en

Amendment 24
Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of ***deleted***

this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States;

Or. es

Amendment 25
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 26
Brando Benifei, Mercedes Bresso

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission *demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States;*

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission, ***due to general political opposition and not because of any breach of the principle of subsidiarity, demonstrates the necessity of improving Union policies and efforts on the transnational aspects of industrial relations, in compliance with the art. 9 TFEU and the Title X TFEU on Social***

Policy;

Or. en

Amendment 27

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States;

Amendment

(Does not affect the English version.)

Or. pl

Amendment 28

Jérôme Lavrilleux

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States;

Amendment

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States; *encourages the various parties involved to engage in a new interinstitutional debate better geared to bringing about consensus;*

Or. fr

Amendment 29
Helga Stevens

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States;

Amendment

4. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission demonstrates the difficulty of finding common ground at EU level as to how best to deal with industrial conflict in situations involving businesses and workers in different Member States; ***Calls in this respect on the need for greater consideration for the principle of subsidiarity;***

Or. en

Amendment 30
Evelyn Regner, Ole Christensen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Stresses that the yellow card and the strong resistance of trade unions and other stakeholders which in the end led to the withdrawal of Monti II by the Commission, were largely based on the realisation that the proposal would not result in adequate safeguards for fundamental and social rights; criticises in this context, that the Commission has still not come forward with any new proposals to ensure fair competition, equal treatment and worker's rights;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Tatjana Ždanoka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. regrets that the Commission proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action fell short of what is needed to create legal certainty for all actors; reminds the Commission of the importance of full stakeholder consultation on such sensitive matters;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Believes that the eventual withdrawal of this proposal by the Commission highlights the importance of a procedure through which the national parliaments can monitor the EU legislation process;

Or. fr

Amendment 33
Rina Ronja Kari

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Calls on the Commission to provide prior information on its choice of

legal base for legislative acts as this will facilitate the cooperation with national parliaments;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Takes note of the fact that in 2013 national parliaments, for the second time ever, exercised the right to 'yellow card' procedure in the context of the subsidiary control mechanism which shows increasing interest, role and added value of national parliaments in development of the EU law;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Highlights that yellow card procedure, which is an instrument of influencing the EU decision-making, could effectively be strengthened by an earlier exchange of information on positions of national parliaments, therefore encourages national parliaments to exchange views on the scope and evaluation methods used to assess the conformity with subsidiarity and proportionality principles;

Amendment 36
Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. Takes the view that the meaning of the subsidiarity and proportionality principles is not clear and therefore national parliaments interpret it in various ways which causes difficulties in reaching agreements and achieving compliance of their decisions; welcomes the fact that the European Commission has established common criteria to assess compliance with the principle of subsidiarity and proportionality; encourages national parliaments and other institutions to use those criteria in order to increase compatibility assessment and coordination and effectiveness of the subsidiarity control mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Helga Stevens

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Believes that the opinions of national, and were applicable regional parliaments should be reviewed, in particular by introducing a red card procedure allowing proposals to be rejected on grounds of lack of conformity with subsidiarity;

Amendment 38
Rina Ronja Kari

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Notes that the national parliaments came close to raising a "yellow card" in the context of the proposal for a European Public Prosecutors Office; Believes that in cases where the yellow card procedure is supported by a number of national parliaments, the follow-up Commission Communication should address all objections of these parliaments;

Amendment 39
Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Firmly believes that the 'Think Small First' principle is a key element in the policy process and can play an important role in job creation and growth by reducing the costs of regulation for businesses;

deleted

Amendment 40
Jutta Steinruck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Firmly believes that the ‘Think Small First’ principle is a key element in the policy process and can play an important role in job creation and growth by reducing the costs of regulation for businesses;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 41
Evelyn Regner, Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Firmly believes that the ‘Think Small First’ principle is a key element in the policy process and can play an important role in job creation and growth by reducing the costs of regulation for businesses;

Amendment

5. Calls on the Commission to consider that, as stated in the opinion by the European Economic and Social Committee, the ‘Think Small First’ principle is not intended to exempt microenterprises and SMEs from the application of the legislation and must not be used for this purpose but rather to keep the fact that it will also apply to small enterprises should be kept in mind when drafting legislation; stresses that this approach should neither compromise the intended objective of the legislation nor any health, safety and employment high standards;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Tatjana Ždanoka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. ***Firmly believes*** that the ‘Think Small First’ principle *is* a key element in the policy process and can play an important role in job creation and growth by ***reducing the costs of regulation for businesses;***

Amendment

5. ***considers*** that the ‘Think Small First’ principle ***could be*** a key element in the policy process and can play an important role in job creation and growth by ***focussing on smart regulation which can be implemented in a way that ensures a level playing field for SMEs and micro-enterprises who have less administrative capacities than big enterprises; rejects any attempts to automatically exempt micro-enterprises or SMEs from European legislation; reminds all actors that UEAPME, the European Association of craft, small- and medium-sized companies considers the exemption of SMEs or micro enterprises of European legislation as a general rule as going against SME interests;***

Or. en

Amendment 43
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Firmly believes that the ‘Think Small First’ principle is a key element in the policy process and can play an important role in job creation and growth by reducing the costs of regulation for businesses;

Amendment

5. Firmly believes that the ‘Think Small First’ principle is a key element in the policy process and can play an important role in job creation and growth by reducing the costs ***and red tape*** of regulation for businesses;

Or. it

Amendment 44
Jutta Steinruck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Points out that legislation can have a different impact on large enterprises and SME's, which should be kept in mind during the drafting process; stresses that all employees have a right to the highest level of protection regarding health and safety in the workplace regardless the size of the employer, the underlying contract or the Member State of employment;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Is surprised that deregulation is proposed as the main strategy for helping SMEs. The current economic crisis has exacerbated the difficulties that SMEs encounter at national level as a result of fiscal policies and sometimes restrictive administrative requirements;

Or. fr

Amendment 46
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Recalls that reforms of this kind fall within the competence of the Member States, who are aware of the changes required;

Or. fr

Amendment 47
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that cases of subsidiarity and proportionality must be thoroughly argued and should not be used as pre-text to prevent legislation at Union level or to undermine EU Social Dialogue;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Jutta Steinruck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Welcomes the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and to

6. Notes the crucial importance of impact assessments as tools for aiding decision-making in the legislative process, and stresses the need, in this context, for proper consideration to be given to issues

review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible in the legislative process.

relating to subsidiarity and proportionality;

Or. de

Amendment 49
Tatjana Ždanoka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Welcomes* the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, *and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review* Commission impact assessments *and to review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible* in the legislative process.

Amendment

6. *Notes* the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles *and on impact assessments; nevertheless , believes that* Commission *and Parliament's* impact assessments *should be considered as a simply tool to allow a well-informed political decision and should never replace political decisions or cause delays* in the legislative process.

Or. en

Amendment 50
Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Welcomes* the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and to review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible in the legislative process.

Amendment

6. *Considers appropriate* the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and to review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, *with reference at all times to appropriate criteria as regards assessing compliance with both principles.*

Amendment 51
Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and to review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible in the legislative process.

Amendment

6. Welcomes the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and to review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible in the legislative process; ***reminds in this regard that every Commission proposal should have a European added value and a positive impact on European citizen's lives, European competitiveness and European job-creation; calls therefore for better and more ambitious impact assessments to be done throughout the political cycles and for the impact assessments to prove that a proposal have a genuine European added value and a positive impact on European citizens' live, European competitiveness and European job-creation; suggests that if this positive impact cannot be proven through impact assessments the proposal in question should be withdrawn.***

Or. en

Amendment 52
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and to review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible in the legislative process.

Amendment

6. Welcomes the increasing emphasis placed by the Commission on the policy cycles, and calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and to review Parliament's ex-ante impact assessment analysis as early as possible in the legislative process; ***points out that proper impact assessments also need to cover social and environmental consequences as well as the consequences of non-legislation; underlines that impact assessments cannot substitute for political assessments and decisions.***

Or. en

Amendment 53
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Draws attention to the fact that national parliaments are given few opportunities to take part in the various stages of European policy development and that the EU institutions do not include any representatives of publicly elected bodies.

Or. fr

Amendment 54
Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Takes the view that there needs to be a debate on the EU's competences, and that changing the competences would enable the EU to take action in areas in which it does not yet have exclusive competence and would prevent disputes with regard to subsidiarity and proportionality; points out that the consolidation of a European project that is successful in the long term will depend on those principles being applied in the areas in which they are needed.

Or. es

Amendment 55

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Welcomes the European Commission's ongoing revision of the existing legislation, which is concentrated on areas with a significant European added value in accordance with principle of subsidiarity, since overregulation might cause more harm to business and employment; express the view that the European institutions should take more frequently into account the principle of subsidiarity.

Or. en