

**Question for written answer P-9989/2010
to the Commission**

Rule 117

Konrad Szymański (ECR)

Subject: The right of MEPs to put parliamentary questions for written answer

I received several different responses to my question of 30 September 2010 on the rights of religious institutions with regard to EU anti-discrimination legislation. Unfortunately, however, none of them actually answered the question I asked.

First, all MEPs are entitled to put one priority question per month, with an urgent answer being provided within three weeks. On 12 October 2010, it turned out that my question was too complicated for me to receive an urgent answer within that time.

Next, on 26 October 2010, the Commission asked for one of the specific questions to be cancelled as its subject was 'outside the EU's sphere of responsibility'. I objected to this absurd request, despite its being part of the Commission's official answer. It is basically one of the Commission's preferred phrases when it has to answer difficult questions.

Finally, on 3 November 2010, I was invited to refer to the answer to a question put by another MEP, Michael Cashman. I have read that answer, and it clearly addresses an entirely different question.

If, for over a month, my question was deemed too complicated to receive an answer under the priority procedure, why, on 3 November 2010, was referral to another Commission answer deemed to be a way of responding?

Why was my question registered on 5 November, when the answer had already been given on 3 November?

Why can't the Commission answer this one simple question: 'what exactly does the right of the Church and other public or private organisations, the ethos of which is based on religion, to "require individuals working for them to act in good faith and with loyalty to the organisation's ethos"¹ entail under EU law'?

¹ Council Directive 2000/78/EC