

Monitoring Report on the National Assembly's Performance

XIII Convocation

2022 - 2023



Monitoring Report on the National Assembly's Performance

XIII Convocation

2022 - 2023

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OPEN PARLIAMENT ON THE WORK OF THE XIII CONVOCATION OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY IN 2022 AND 2023

CONTENT

Summary and review of the XIII Convocation	4
Overview of the work of the XIII Convocation of the National Assembly	6
Urgent scheduling of sessions without an annual work plan	6
Biased chairpersonship of the Assembly	6
Consolidation of discussions and hyperproduction of laws	7
The atmosphere in the plenum is on the verge of incidents	7
Avoiding the days for parliamentary questions and no “unpleasant” public hearings	8
Obstruction of the work of the committees chaired by the opposition	9
The marginalisation of independent institutions continues	9
Neglected people’s initiative, non-compliance with procedures	10
The election of prominent jurists revealed the weaknesses of the new constitutional solutions	10
The May tragedies and demands of the “Serbia against violence” protest in the Parliament	11
Resignation, dismissal and lack of confidence in ministers	12
The sabotaged work of the Inquiry Committee on mass murders	12
Prevented assessment of constitutionality before the Constitutional Court	13
Conclusion	13

Summary and review of the XIII Convocation

The work of the XIII convocation of the National Assembly (August 2022 – October 2023) was marked by intense **manipulations of procedures and abuses of parliamentary rules**. The parliamentary leadership used its position to give the ruling majority an institutional advantage over the opposition by denying equal access to parliamentary mechanisms. While the primary intention behind this behaviour was primarily to achieve a political advantage over the opposition parties, **the wider effect achieved is the restriction of the right to exercise the parliamentary mandate and the additional undermining of the already significantly eroded integrity and role of the National Assembly in the political system of Serbia**.

The work of the entire convocation was marked by the marginalisation of the representative role and parliamentary mandate. The Speaker of the Assembly did not prepare an annual work plan, following the practice of his predecessors, so he often used it to **schedule the sessions from one day to the next**, which made it significantly more difficult for the members of the Parliament to prepare for the debate and influence the agenda.

The Speaker of the Assembly often denied the right of reply to opposition MPs, demonstrated unequal criteria for **reporting violations of the Rules of Procedure**, imposed **fines** only for opposition MPs, and regularly abused his position to **participate in the debate** from the position of chairperson, which is explicitly prohibited by the Rules of Procedure.

Instead of discussing the items on the agenda, the time was mostly used for verbal confrontations with political opponents, which is a practice that is present during convocations and mainly contributes to the collapse of trust in the Parliament.

Out of the total number of **laws adopted during the convocation (197)**, amendments were proposed to 109 of them. Over 4,000 amendments were proposed during the convocation. Out of that number, **less than 1%** was adopted.

In the XIII convocation, the Assembly **broke the record for the number of laws passed per day** – in only 71 working days of the convocation, an average of 2.77 laws were adopted per day, while in the previous two convocations, that number was 1.96 laws per day for the XII convocation (2020-2022) and 1.66 laws per day for the XI convocation (2016-2020). This practice only further undermines the integrity of the Parliament and strengthens the public's belief that this institution is a mere rubber stamp for regulations made by the executive authority, without its own initiatives and without exercising its control role.

The practice of **avoiding the day of MPs' questions to the Government continued, by scheduling sessions to avoid the last Thursday of the month**. The MPs' questions day was held three times out of a possible fifteen. Those three were held in the forced climate of the EU officials' visits to the Parliament, as well as immediately after the May tragedies.

The treatment of **the marginalisation of independent institutions** continued – in February 2023, at the joint hearing, 13 reports of independent institutions were considered at once, along with another 13 items on the agenda. Candidates for leadership positions in the Anti-Corruption Agency and the Protector of Citizens were (re)elected without serious discussion, i.e. without

considering the essential arguments, which further strengthened the public's doubt about the integrity of these persons.

Committees and the Secretariat regularly turned a deaf ear to or **actively obstructed the initiatives of opposition MPs**, particularly significant initiatives such as the work of the inquiry committee regarding the May tragedies, the interpellation procedure of Siniša Mali, the evaluation of the constitutionality of the Law on amendments and supplements to the Law on planning and construction, as well as the people's initiative to ban mining of lithium and boron in Serbia or failure of the committee to act upon a report on violation of the Code of Ethics. Non of the initiatives received an epilogue until the end of the work of the convocation.

During the first **election of new members of the High Judicial Council (HJC) and the High Prosecutorial Council (HPC)** after the constitutional changes, a controversial mechanism was immediately resorted to in rare cases of overcoming blockages during elections. Instead of MPs, a committee made up of the President of the National Assembly, the President of the Constitutional Court, the President of the Supreme Court, the Supreme Public Prosecutor and the Protector of Citizens decided on the candidates, regardless of the proposal of the competent committee, thus announcing that the procedure for exceptional situations will become the rule.

Statistical data for the period of **work of the Parliament** from August 2022 to October 2023 are as follows:

- Out of the 17 sessions, almost all were scheduled exactly **24 hours in advance**;
- **71 days** were spent in **plenary sessions**;
- **197 adopted legal acts**, of which **105** laws and **92** ratified international treaties, 196 legal acts were proposed by the Government of Serbia;
- The convocation broke the record for the number of adopted laws per working day – **2.77 laws per day**;
- **All** but one of the **adopted laws** were proposed by the Government, **13% of the laws** were adopted according to the emergency procedure;
- **More than 4,000 amendments were proposed**, **less than 1%** were adopted at the plenary sessions;
- During the 15 months of work of this convocation, **7 public hearings** were held, the day for parliamentary questions was held only **3 times**, **310** committee meetings were held, of which **29% of committee meetings** lasted less than **20 minutes**.

Overview of the work of the XIII Convocation of the National Assembly

Urgent scheduling of sessions without an annual work plan

During the work of the XIII convocation of the Parliament, **a total of 17 sessions were held**, of which eight sessions were held during regular and five during extraordinary sessions. Three special sessions and one constitutive session were also held.

All regular sessions **were scheduled 24 hours in advance, which made it significantly more difficult for the members of the opposition to prepare for the sessions**. Since the deadline for submitting amendments to the agenda is no later than 24 hours before the start of the session¹, **it was practically impossible for the MPS to propose amendments to the agenda**.

Following the practice of his predecessors, the Speaker of the Assembly **did not adopt an annual work programme** from which it would be known when the sessions are held, which is his obligation according to the Rules of Procedure².

The practice of convening sessions in the shortest possible time, without a work programme, **enables the ruling majority to impose priorities and topics without hindrance, as well as to significantly marginalise opposition MPs**, keeping them in constant uncertainty, without any influence on the agenda or the planning of the sessions themselves. **The role of the Collegium**, as a body that should enable the planning and coordination of parliamentary work between the Speaker of the Assembly and parliamentary groups, **is also meaningless** because the meetings of the Collegium during this period were held according to protocol, without joint agreements on the work at the sessions.

Biased chairpersonship of the Assembly

Although his primary task is to ensure the implementation of the Rules of Procedure³, **the Speaker of the Assembly continued to abuse his position and manipulate the provisions of the Rules of Procedure in favour of the ruling majority**.

In deciding on the right to a rebuttal⁴, visibly different criteria were applied, so that right was often denied to opposition MPs in situations when MPs from the ruling majority spoke descriptively about them or their parliamentary group. In cases where there was an exchange of rebuttals, the round of rebuttals would most often end with the representative from the authority.

Biased decisions were also made in cases of reported violations of the Rules of Procedure by the MPs. The chairperson regularly interrupted the members of the opposition during the reporting of violations of the Rules of Procedure, while often avoiding to explain the rejection of the report,

¹ art. 92, para. 4 Rules of Procedure of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, "Official Gazette of the RS", no. 20/2012 - revised text

² art. 28 Ibid.

³ art. 27 Ibid.

⁴ art. 104, para. 3 Ibid.

which he is obliged to do according to the Rules of Procedure⁵. Finally, all opposition MPs' applications for violation of the Rules of Procedure, for which a statement was requested, were rejected because there was no majority for it.

The President of the National Assembly continued to take part in the debate with the MPs in the trial from the position of the Speaker of the Assembly without moving to the MPs' benches, which according to the Rules of Procedure he is obliged to do in such cases.⁶

Three **vice-speakers of the Assembly from the opposition parliamentary groups** have not been given the opportunity to preside over the plenary session since the beginning of the convocation.

Consolidation of discussions and hyperproduction of laws

Regular sessions of the Assembly were generally burdened with **a large number of items on the agenda**, which prevents quality discussion and potentially leads to bad legislative solutions. A negative impact on the quality of the discussion was also left by **unifying the discussion on all items of the agenda** in many sessions, i.e. simultaneously discussing unrelated items as if they were one.

The last session of this convocation, held at the end of October 2023, had **a record 60 items on the agenda**, and all of them were discussed in a unified debate. The opposition was also denied the right to supplement the agenda this time. The chairperson read the agenda for the entire 7 minutes and 12 seconds, and the MPs had a total of five hours at their disposal for the general debate on these 60 points. The quality of the debate is vividly illustrated by the fact that, on average, only 18.75 seconds were available to each parliamentary group for each item on the agenda. Important laws and acts were on the agenda, such as the Budget Law, controversial media laws (which quickly entered the procedure), laws on education, international agreements, and the like. All items were discussed together, which means that as many as 60 items were discussed at the same time, which made it very difficult to follow and participate in the parliamentary debate.

In the XIII convocation, the Assembly **broke the record in the number of laws passed per day** – for only 71 working days of the convocation, an average of 2.77 laws were adopted per day, while in the previous two convocations, that number was 1.96 laws per day for the XII convocation (2020-2022) and 1.66 laws per day for the XI convocation (2016-2020).

The Government of Serbia submitted for adoption to the Assembly 196 out of a total of 197 laws that were adopted **during the session (197)**. Over 4,000 amendments were proposed to 109 of them. Out of this, significantly less than 1% was adopted in the plenary sessions, with almost all accepted amendments being voted on four laws in the session held in September 2023.

The atmosphere in the plenum is on the verge of incidents

The time at the plenary sessions of the National Assembly was primarily **used for verbal confrontations with political opponents instead of discussions on agenda items**. The speeches of a certain number of MPs, both from the ruling majority and from the opposition, were characterised by incendiary rhetoric. There were also several situations on the verge of physical

⁵ art. 103 Ibid.

⁶ art. 100 Ibid.

conflict. In one case, instead of imposing measures or declaring a break for consultations and reducing tensions, the chairperson called the security of the assembly to stand in a “living wall” between him and the opposition MPs. [1]

Discrimination and sexism were normalised in the XIII convocation. In addition to the indecent gesture of **Dalibor Ščekić**, a representative of the ruling majority, which was addressed to opposition MP Tatjana Manojlović, the strongest public reaction was caused by the statement of Minister Aleksandar Martinović at the plenary session, where the dismissal of the Minister of the Interior Bratislav Gašić was discussed, when he said that those MPs who do not have children “so instead feed puppies, kittens and fish” have no right to “give lectures about children” to anyone. Following this statement, **there was no adequate reaction of the leadership of the Assembly to the disrespect of the dignity of the National Assembly.**

Based on the measures to maintain order during the entire convocation, **finances were again imposed only on MPs from opposition parliamentary groups.**

In June 2023, an incident occurred that significantly affected the transparency of Parliament's work. The leadership of the National Assembly decided **to censor the official transcript of the parliamentary sessions** in order to remove from them the parts that indicate the verbal violence of the ruling majority. The comment that MP Nebojša Bakarec sent to MP Zoran Zečević in which he said that MP Zečević was “killing the retired people in Aranđelovac” disappeared from the official transcripts. This incident was noticed by the fact that it took longer than usual for the official transcript to be released, and after it was released, a difference was noticed compared to the transcript that was given to journalists a few days earlier, in which that comment was recorded.

Avoiding the days for parliamentary questions and no “unpleasant” public hearings

During the 15 months of the **13th convocation of the Parliament, the day for parliamentary questions to the Government was held only three times**, all three in the period April – June 2023. The rules of procedure provide that on the last Thursday of every month, the session be interrupted in order to ask parliamentary questions live to members of the Government. For years, there has been a practice of avoiding scheduling the day for the session on the last Thursday of the month in order to avoid the obligation of members of the Government to answer the questions of MPs. Even these three times can be interpreted **in the context of forced moves** caused by the visits of European officials at the time, as well as the impact of the tragic events from the beginning of May 2023. The last session of the second extraordinary session in 2023 ended with voting on the last Thursday of October, just before the time set for parliamentary questions.

One of the mechanisms that committees can use for the purpose of exercising control over the executive authority is **public hearings**⁷, which is intended to obtain information, that is, expert opinions on proposed acts that are in parliamentary procedure. **This mechanism was used seven times during the work of the XIII Convocation.** Public hearings were organised in the Committee for Justice, State and Local Self-Government, the Committee for Finance, the Republic Budget and Control of Spending of Public Funds, the Committee for Human and Minority Rights and Gender Equality, the Committee for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management and the Committee for

⁷ art. 83 and 84 Ibid.

Spatial Planning, Traffic, infrastructure and telecommunications. Nevertheless, none of the hearings was organised on the initiative of the opposition MPs, so it can be assumed that **the public hearings are mainly organised for the purpose of promoting already defined legal solutions** with the mandatory presence of Government representatives. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the initiative of opposition MP Biljana Đorđević to hold a public hearing on the topic of femicide prevention did not receive any epilogue.

Obstruction of the work of the committees chaired by the opposition

One quarter of the committees (5/20) was chaired by the opposition MPs. However, as most of the members in the committees were members of the ruling majority, the achievement of pluralistic dialogue in these bodies was often prevented by circumventing the rules governing the work of the committees. As in the plenum, the work in the committees was subject to obstruction.

The work of the Committee for Environmental Protection was obstructed by the impossibility of holding a **Committee session outside** the National Assembly **building** – during the session in Loznica, on the topic of lithium and boron mining, when the ruling majority in the Committee organised a parallel session in Belgrade, or scheduled sessions in the municipalities of Babušnica and Žagubica, when the Committee was denied a quorum due to the absence of Committee members from the ruling majority.^[2] After the ecological disaster of the ammonia spill in Pirot, the majority in the Committee voted to remove the item “Miscellaneous” from the agenda so that it would not be used for discussion on this topic.

Obstructions to the work of the Committee for Culture and Information were recorded, as well. The ruling majority in this Committee voted against discussing the case of publishing a disturbing interview with a serial rapist in the Informer tabloid, despite strong public reactions. After the tragic events that took place at the beginning of May, the **REM Report** was also presented at the Committee meeting. This session of the Committee was marked by tension, lively discussion, and the relativisation of violence and the role of reality shows in it. The session ended with the adoption of the REM’s report by overriding of the ruling majority by 10 to 6 votes. The Committee President Siniša Kovačević submitted his irrevocable resignation as President and member of the Committee shortly after the session. ^[3]

The marginalisation of independent institutions continues

The reports of independent state bodies for the year 2021 reached the plenum only at the end of February 2023, when as many as **13 reports were considered and adopted at the plenary session in a unified debate, together with 13 other items on the agenda.** One of the points was **the election of the director of the Anti-Corruption Agency directly by the Assembly, who was elected without discussing his professional achievements.** ^[4] The reports of the independent bodies for the year 2022 regularly arrived in the Assembly by the end of March 2023, but by the end of the convocation, not one of them had reached the plenum, and only a few were discussed at the competent committee.

The procedure for **the election of the Protector of Citizens** was marked by several months of delay and a lack of transparency. **The current Protector of Citizens, Zoran Pašalić,** was elected the new Protector of Citizens, and this will be his second mandate. Civil society organisations, which follow the election process with dedication, were not granted the request to allow them to attend the

session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legislative Issues where the Committee decided on the candidate to be voted on in the plenary session, and the public was ensured by broadcasting the session on the tNational Assembly website.^[5] At the plenary session, Zoran Pašalić **was elected as the new Protector of Citizens at a joint hearing, as one of the five items** on the agenda, where, among other things, the election of other members of state institutions of great importance (such as members of the High Judicial Council and the High Prosecutorial Council) was discussed.

Neglected people's initiative, non-compliance with procedures

The work of the XIII convocation was marked **by postponing and illegal blocking of proceedings initiated through the parliamentary control mechanisms**, primarily through the misuse of provisions in the Rules of Procedure related to prescribed deadlines. The mechanisms launched during the period of work of the Parliament from August 2022 to February 2023 did not have a final outcome, nor was any progress made.

In June 2022, more than 38,000 citizens submitted a people's initiative⁸ for the adoption of the Law on banning boron and lithium mining in Serbia. All traces of this initiative were subsequently lost in the National Assembly. The opposition repeatedly asked for information and explanations regarding the people's initiative, but the Committee on Constitutional and Legislative Issues, as well as the Ministry of State Administration and Local Self-Government officially responded that the collected signatures never reached them for administrative verification. The representatives of the "Go-change" organisation, which submitted the people's initiative, also asked for an explanation. At the end of October 2023, they met with the Vice President of the National Assembly, Zoran Lutovac, who stated that by asking a parliamentary question, he would try to get an answer as to why this people's initiative was not acted upon⁹. The question remained unanswered until the end of the convocation.

The interpellation that was initiated in December 2022 against the Minister of Finance Siniša Mali due to serious accusations addressed to the members of the opposition did not have its outcome. By the end of this convocation, **11 months later**, the Committee on Constitutional and Legislative Issues **had not given its opinion** on the compatibility of the text of the interpellation with the Rules of Procedure of the National Assembly, without which the procedure cannot continue¹⁰.

The Administrative Committee has never decided on the application for violation of the Code of Ethics submitted by the Open Parliament due to the violation of the Rules of Procedure by the member of the ruling majority, Dalibor Šćekić. The Committee had a deadline of 30 days from the day of receipt, which expired on December 22, 2022.

The election of prominent jurists revealed the weaknesses of the new constitutional solutions

The process of constitutional changes and adoption of a set of accompanying judicial laws was finally completed in April 2023 **with the election of new members of the High Judicial Council**

⁸ According to the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, one of the three ways of exercising sovereignty by citizens.

⁹http://www.parlament.gov.rs/Potpredsednik_dr_Zoran_Lutovac_razgovarao_sa_predstavnicima_organizacije_Kreni-Promeni_o_va%C5%BEnosti_z%C5%A1tite_javnog_interesa.48278.941.html

¹⁰ Art. 222, Rules of Procedure of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, "Official Gazette of the RS", no. 20/2012 - revised text

and the High Prosecutorial Council. Before the final selection, the competent committee had the task of interviewing candidates among “prominent jurists” for the composition of these key judicial bodies.

Since **the criteria of “prominence” and “impartiality”** of candidates are not defined in the laws, the members of the Committee could not agree on the precise definition of those terms. Thus, among the selected candidates, lawyers, professors, and in one case, employees of the Security Information Agency, there were mostly persons who are not known to the general public, or without exceptional judicial experience. While in several cases there were also candidates whose political neutrality can be seriously doubted regardless of the width of the definition of impartiality.

The facts that the procedure of discussion and selection of candidates was prolonged until the deadline, that all but one session dedicated to this issue were scheduled for the weekend, as well as that civil society organisations were prevented from attending those sessions, leave the impression that there was **an intention that this process be seen as weakly as possible in public.**

The most controversial solutions from the new laws were laid bare **during the election of candidates in the plenum** – the required two-thirds majority for the election of council members was not achieved, so **it was necessary to resort to a controversial mechanism**, provided for rare cases of overcoming blockages during the election, which implies that the final decision is made by a five-member Commission made up of the Speaker of the National Assembly, the President of the Constitutional Court, the President of the Supreme Court, the Supreme Public Prosecutor and the Protector of Citizens (positions generally elected by a simple majority of the MPs of the National Assembly), from a wider list of candidates, regardless of the recommendations of the competent committee.

Nonetheless, immediately before the entry into force of the new laws, **the Assembly used the right from the previous legal solution to directly elect 35 judges who are serving their first mandate.** Considering the manner, moment and intensity of the use of this opportunity, there remains a strong suspicion that it was an abuse.^[6]

The May tragedies and demands of the “Serbia against violence” protest in the Parliament

After the two mass murders that took place in May 2023, and after the clumsy request of the MPs from the opposition who asked for an extraordinary session (instead of a regular one), the Speaker of the Parliament, due to public pressure, convened a third regular session **with an agenda that matches the demands of citizens at the “Serbia against violence” protest.** ^[7]

A tense atmosphere, inflammatory rhetoric and mutual accusations between the ruling majority and the opposition marked the discussion at that session. The atmosphere was fuelled by the biased application of the rules of the Rulebook by the Speaker of the Parliament – with reactions mainly in favour of the ruling majority, and sometimes even **with active participation in accusations against the opposition** (*for example, not reacting to the statement of SNS (Serbian Progressive Party) MP Nebojša Bakarec, that the opposition is “armed to the teeth” and that they “refuse to hand over his weapons”*).

Due to the unproductive discussion and the end of the regular session, the Speaker of the Parliament scheduled an extraordinary session immediately after May 29th with the other three items

on the agenda that were not discussed. Nevertheless, **the further course of the debate, even within the extraordinary session, continued in the rhythm of inflammatory rhetoric and accusations against the opposition that they are allegedly leading civil protests with the intention of destabilizing the state, and even planning a “colour revolution” in Serbia.** [8]

Resignation, dismissal and lack of confidence in ministers

The period of work of the Parliament in May and June was marked by the questioning of several ministerial positions. The first in line was **Branko Ružić, who resigned from the position of Minister of Education under public pressure. His resignation was noted at the end of the regular session on May 29th.** In his place, at the end of July, Slavica Đukić Dejanović was elected, also a member of the SPS (Socialist Party of Serbia), as was Branko Ružić.

The last item on the agenda within the 3rd extraordinary session was **a proposal for a vote of no confidence in the member of the Government, Minister of Internal Affairs Bratislav Gašić.** The presentation of this point fell to the opposition MP, Miroslav Aleksić, for the second time in a row. The discussion started with the lack of a quorum, and then MP Aleksić opened up the issue of **political accountability**, which caused the MPs of the ruling majority to react violently. The continuation of the discussion was marked by **harsh rhetoric and deviating from the topic, discriminatory vocabulary of members of the government, as well as the expression of Prime Minister Ana Brnabić’s strong position that she will not propose the dismissal of Minister Bratislav Gašić.**

On this occasion, Bratislav Gašić caused an additional uproar by stating that it is known who killed Oliver Ivanović and that this person is protected by Germany, which is why the German embassy had to react by rejecting the accusations. The MPs voted against the dismissal of Bratislav Gašić with a large majority of 148 votes to 37 for and 7 did not vote.

During the session, Prime Minister Ana Brnabić proposed a new agenda item – the dismissal of the Minister of Economy Rade Basta. The reason for the change is the expressed support for the “Serbia against violence” protests and advocacy for the introduction of sanctions against Russia. Minister Rade Basta was dismissed by a large majority of MPs from the ruling parties. [9]

The sabotaged work of the Inquiry Committee on mass murders

In May 2023, MPs from the opposition submitted a proposal for the formation of an Inquiry Committee to determine the facts and circumstances that led to the mass murders in the “Vladislav Ribnikar” elementary school and in the territory of Smederevo and Mladenovac. Opposition MP Radomir Lazović, as a representative of the proposers, had unlimited time at his disposal, which he used in full capacity **to highlight the behaviour of members of the government as the cause of the eruption of violence in society.**

The formation of the Inquiry Committee is the only point on which MPs from the opposition and from the ruling majority agreed during the vote. Yet despite this unity, the Inquiry Committee met only twice before its work was thwarted. At the first session, MP Marinika Tepić was elected as the Chair of the Inquiry Committee, and at the second, only the agenda was adopted. The discussion at the session then deviated from the topic and was reduced to **attacks on Marinika Tepić and questioning the work of the Inquiry Committee.** A key argument against Inquiry

Committee was information that the parents of the murdered children were opposed to its work for fear that it might challenge the official investigation.

The very next day, the National Assembly published an unsigned statement stating that the Inquiry Committee will suspend its work until the criminal proceedings before the prosecutor's office and the court are finished, according to the wishes of the parents from "Ribnikar".¹¹ Immediately after the announcement, members of the Inquiry Committee who belong to the ruling majority announced that they would no longer participate in its work. This act represents a dangerous precedent and an attack on the institution of Parliament and the parliamentary mandate. [10]

Prevented assessment of constitutionality before the Constitutional Court

In July 2023, MPs from the opposition **were prevented from asking the Constitutional Court for an assessment of the constitutionality of the Law on Amendments to the Law on Planning and Construction.**

Although the MPs submitted a request for constitutionality assessment immediately after the law was passed, the Assembly's secretariat thwarted the procedure. In order to properly submit a request to the Constitutional Court, it is necessary to attach a certified original of the law to it. The Secretariat of the Assembly did not certify this document before the law was proclaimed the following day by the President of the Republic.

By using a loophole in the procedure, which does not prescribe a deadline in which the General Secretary of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia must certify the original of the law, **the law was forwarded to the president and promulgated the next day, without the MPs being able to use their constitutional right to initiate the normative control procedure before the promulgation of the law. [11]**

Conclusion

Bearing in mind everything stated, it can be concluded that in this convocation the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia was again not what it should be, the highest representative body of this country – a place where laws are passed in the interest of the community and debates of importance for citizens and their lives, the place from which citizens exercise control and influence over the executive branch of government through their elected representatives. In this convocation, the National Assembly had only two roles. One, to quickly and without significant obstacles adopt everything that the Government sends for adoption, and the second, to help as much as it can in the fight against all those who are not in power or with the government, and this time with, so far, the most extensive abuses, violations and abuse of own rules and procedures. As long as the Assembly is reduced to these two roles, it will not enjoy trust and respect, and finally, it will not be a representative body of the citizens of Serbia.

¹¹ In accordance with Art. 68 of the Rules of Procedure of the National Assembly, the Inquiry Committee does not deal with investigative and judicial actions, so even if it had continued its work, it could not have influenced the ongoing criminal proceedings.