



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Legal Affairs

2015/2040(INI)

21.4.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 25

Draft opinion
Jean-Marie Cavada
(PE551.952v01-00)

Procedures and practices regarding Commissioner Hearings, lessons to be taken from the 2014 process
(2015/2040(INI))

AM\1058439EN.doc

PE554.914v01-00

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Enrico Gasbarra

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Reiterates the importance of guaranteeing the independence of Commissioners-designate; takes the view that scrutinising declarations of interest, which is the responsibility of the Committee on Legal Affairs, is a key stage in assessing their independence, but that the limited scope of the declarations of interest means that this is not taken into account;

Amendment

1. Reiterates the importance of guaranteeing the independence of Commissioners-designate; takes the view that scrutinising declarations of interest, which is the responsibility of the Committee on Legal Affairs, is a key stage in assessing their independence, but that the limited scope of the declarations of interest means that this is not taken into account; ***considers, therefore, that in the coming months the Committee on Legal Affairs ought to produce guidelines, in the form of a recommendation or an own-initiative report, to facilitate the reform of the procedures concerning Commissioners' declarations of interest;***

Or. it

Amendment 2
Tadeusz Zwiefka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Reiterates the importance of guaranteeing the independence of Commissioners-designate; ***takes the view that scrutinising declarations of interest, which is the responsibility of the Committee on Legal Affairs, is a key stage in assessing their independence, but that the limited scope of the declarations of interest means that this is not taken into account;***

Amendment

1. Reiterates the importance of guaranteeing the independence of Commissioners-designate; ***considers that scrutiny of Commissioner's declaration of interests should remain the exclusive competence of the Committee on Legal Affairs; considers however, that the current scope of Commissioners' declarations of interest is too limited, and invites the Commission to revise its rules on this as soon as possible;***

Amendment 3
Tadeusz Zwiefka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Takes the view that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves ***not only*** checking whether a declaration has been duly completed, ***but also*** establishing whether its ***contents*** reveal a conflict of interest; ***considers that the Committee on Legal Affairs should have genuine investigative powers, including, in particular, the option of demanding the disclosure of any further information needed in order to carry out an in-depth assessment of the declarations;***

Amendment

2. Takes the view that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves checking whether a declaration has been duly completed ***and*** establishing whether its ***content*** reveal a conflict of interest;

Amendment 4
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Takes the view that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves not only checking whether a declaration has been duly completed, but also establishing whether its contents reveal a conflict of interest; considers that the Committee on Legal Affairs should have genuine investigative powers, including, in particular, the option of demanding the

Amendment

2. Takes the view, ***on the basis of a reading of the existing rules***, that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves not only checking whether a declaration has been duly completed, but also establishing whether its contents reveal a conflict of interest; considers, ***further***, that the Committee on Legal Affairs should have genuine investigative

disclosure of any further information needed in order to carry out an in-depth assessment of the declarations;

powers, including, in particular, the option of demanding the disclosure of any further information needed in order to carry out an in-depth assessment of the declarations;

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Takes the view that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves not only checking whether a declaration has been duly completed, but also establishing whether its contents reveal a conflict of interest; considers that the Committee on Legal Affairs should have genuine investigative powers, including, ***in particular***, the option of demanding the disclosure of any further information needed in order to carry out an in-depth assessment of the declarations;

Amendment

2. Takes the view that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves not only checking whether a declaration has been duly completed, but also establishing whether its contents reveal a conflict of interest; considers that the Committee on Legal Affairs should have genuine investigative powers, including the option of demanding the disclosure of any further information needed in order to carry out an in-depth assessment of the declarations;

Or. bg

Amendment 6
Mary Honeyball, Clare Moody

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Takes the view that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves not only checking whether a declaration has been duly completed, but also establishing

Amendment

2. Takes the view that scrutinising the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate involves not only checking whether a declaration has been duly completed, but also establishing

whether its contents reveal a conflict of interest; considers *that* the Committee on Legal Affairs should have *genuine investigative* powers, including, in particular, the option of demanding the disclosure of any further information needed in order to carry out an in-depth assessment of the declarations;

whether its contents reveal a conflict of interest; considers, *in that case, that* the Committee on Legal Affairs should have *enhanced powers of scrutiny*, including, in particular, the option of demanding the disclosure of any further information needed in order to carry out an in-depth assessment of the declarations, *and the power to require the presence of the Commissioner-designate to answer further questions on the basis of the financial declarations without encroaching upon the privilege of the lead committee to conduct the hearing*;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Jean-Marie Cavada

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Points out that it is for the Commission to identify any conflict of interest which might prevent one of its Members from performing his or her duties, and takes the view, therefore, that the Commission should be in a position to check and guarantee the accuracy and completeness of the declarations of financial interests submitted by Commissioners-designate prior to their hearings before Parliament;

Or. fr

Amendment 8
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

PE554.914v01-00

6/15

AM\1058439EN.doc

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Takes the view that it would be easier to guarantee the independence of Commissioners-designate if the Commission were not composed of one national of each Member State, in accordance with the spirit of Article 17(5) of the Treaty on European Union; takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked; therefore calls on the European Council to review its decision on the number of Commissioners and to reduce it before the next Commission is appointed;

deleted

Or. bg

**Amendment 9
Tadeusz Zwiefka**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Takes the view that it would be easier to guarantee the independence of Commissioners-designate if the Commission were not composed of one national of each Member State, in accordance with the spirit of Article 17(5) of the Treaty on European Union; takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked; therefore calls on the European Council to *review* its decision on the number of Commissioners and *to reduce it* before the next Commission is appointed;

3. Takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be ***closely*** linked; therefore calls on the European Council to ***re - examine*** its decision on the number of Commissioners and ***consider its reduction*** before the next Commission is appointed;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Mary Honeyball, Clare Moody

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that it would be easier to guarantee the independence of Commissioners-designate if the Commission were not composed of one national of each Member State, in accordance with the spirit of Article 17(5) of the Treaty on European Union; takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked; therefore calls on the European Council to review its decision on the number of Commissioners and to reduce it before the next Commission is appointed;

Amendment

3. Considers it desirable that there be a greater alignment between the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees, without the privilege of each institution to determine its own internal structure and composition being infringed by the other;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that it would be easier to guarantee the independence of Commissioners-designate if the Commission were not composed of one national of each Member State, in accordance with the spirit of Article 17(5) of the Treaty on European Union; takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked; therefore calls on the European Council to review its decision on the

Amendment

3. Takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios should be carefully divided so that they do not overlap and so that each Commissioner's remit is clearly defined, and that this should be done in cooperation with Parliament, which has supervisory and control powers over the Commission;

number of Commissioners and to reduce it before the next Commission is appointed;

Or. cs

Amendment 12
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that it would be easier to guarantee the independence of Commissioners-designate if the Commission were not composed of one national of each Member State, in accordance with the spirit of Article 17(5) of the Treaty on European Union; takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked; therefore calls on the European Council to review its decision on the number of Commissioners and to reduce it before the next Commission is appointed;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked;

Or. hr

Amendment 13
Evelyn Regner, Mary Honeyball

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that it would be easier to guarantee the independence of Commissioners-designate if the Commission were not composed of one national of each Member State, in

Amendment

3. Takes the view that it would be easier to guarantee the independence of Commissioners-designate if the Commission were not composed of one national of each Member State, in

accordance with the spirit of Article 17(5) of the Treaty on European Union; takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked; therefore calls on the European Council to review its decision on the number of Commissioners and to reduce it before the next Commission is appointed;

accordance with the spirit of Article 17(5) of the Treaty on European Union; takes the view that the Commissioners' portfolios and the respective remits of the parliamentary committees should be linked; therefore calls on the European Council to review its decision on the number of Commissioners and to reduce it before the next Commission is appointed *and with the understanding that the lead committee will make the final recommendation to the Conference of Presidents;*

Or. en

Amendment 14
Mary Honeyball, Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Proposes that an own-initiative report should be undertaken specifically into the issue of conflicts of interest in the financial declarations made by Commissioners-designate;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Jean-Marie Cavada

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Takes the view that the hearings conducted by the committees responsible are important as a means not only of assessing nominees' personalities and

political priorities, but also of verifying their aptitude and ability to perform their intended duties; emphasises that nominees for posts as Commission Vice-Presidents should be treated in the same way as all other nominees;

Or. fr

Amendment 16
Jean-Marie Cavada

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Emphasises the need to achieve gender parity among the members of the College of Commissioners;

Or. fr

Amendment 17
Mary Honeyball, Evelyn Regner, Julie Ward, Clare Moody, Jytte Guteland

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. Further considers that, in this context, the gender balance of the proposed College should occupy a significant place in the process.

Or. en

Amendment 18
Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph -4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-4a. Stresses that the purpose of the hearings is to give the Commissioners-designate an equal and fair opportunity to present themselves and their opinions in accordance with Annex XVI of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament, with particular emphasis on the impartiality and political neutrality of the procedure;

Or. cs

Amendment 19
Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Takes the view that there should be more flexibility, especially as regards the time allowed for supplementary questions.

4. Takes the view that there should be more flexibility, especially as regards the time allowed for supplementary questions ***and the candidates' replies.***

Or. cs

Amendment 20
Mary Honeyball, Clare Moody

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Takes the view that ***there should be more*** flexibility, especially as regards the ***time allowed for*** supplementary questions.

4. Takes the view that, ***in order to encourage more in-depth discussion, the structure of the hearing should allow for more*** flexibility, especially as regards the ***right of Members to ask*** supplementary

questions;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Jean-Marie Cavada

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Takes the view that *there should be more flexibility, especially as regards the time allowed* for supplementary questions.

Amendment

4. Takes the view that *hearings should be organised in a more flexible way, in particular by doing away with the restrictions on their duration, which would allow time, for example, for spontaneous* supplementary questions;

Or. fr

Amendment 22
Mary Honeyball, Clare Moody, Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Considers that the Parliament in plenary should have the right to vote on individual commissioners-designate;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Takes the view that the number of questions to be put could be reduced in order to enable the authors of questions to put follow-up questions immediately (for example, 30 seconds could be allowed for the follow-up question and one minute for the answer);

Or. fr

Amendment 24
Jean-Marie Cavada

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. Takes the view that rules, in particular concerning deadlines, should be laid down to govern hearings of replacement nominees, so that the latter are not placed at a disadvantage vis-à-vis the Commissioners-designate originally heard; calls, therefore, for rules governing hearings of Commissioners-designate to be set out in an interinstitutional agreement;

Or. fr

Amendment 25
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4d. Takes the view that in cases where the coordinators have not reached a

*consensus on the assessment of a
Commissioner-designate, the final
decision should be put to a roll-call vote
in the committee;*

Or. fr