

**Question for written answer P-002729/2016  
to the Commission**  
Rule 130  
**Kristina Winberg (EFDD)**

Subject: Answering of written questions

In its reply to Kristina Winberg's Written Question E-015091/2015, a question about whether the impact of the terrorist attacks in Paris on 13 November 2015 could have been prevented, or at least rendered less serious, if Member States had applied the Dublin system, the Commission answered: 'The Commission does not speculate on matters which are subject to criminal investigations by the competent authorities of Member States'.

In the proposal for a directive amending Council Directive 91/447/EEC on control of the acquisition and possession of weapons (COM(2015)0750), however, the Commission opts to speculate about details of the Paris attacks in order to justify restrictions on Swedish citizens' right to own weapons. For example, in footnote 1 of the Explanatory Memorandum on the proposal, it is asserted that the terrorist attacks in Paris underlined the link between organised crime and terrorism.

Is the answer that was given to the above question correct? If so, why does the Commission not adhere to this rule but allow itself to speculate about and draw far-reaching conclusions from the same ongoing criminal investigation, at a far earlier stage of the investigation moreover, when it is a matter of increasing its own power and restricting rights, but not when a politician elected by the people asks it to reply to a clearly formulated question?

If not, can the Commission without delay correct the erroneous answer given to Question E-015091/2015?