

CONV 752/03

CONTRIB 330

SAATE

Lähetäjä: Sihteeristö

Vastaanottaja: Valmistelukunta

Asia: Valmistelukunnan jäsenen Olivier Duhamelin esitys:
- "Necessity to present a text without options"

Valmistelukunnan jäsen Olivier Duhamel on toimittanut valmistelukunnan pääsihteerille liitteenä olevan esityksen.

Contribution by Olivier Duhamel, full member of Convention**Necessity to present a text without options**

The way towards the European constitution is as long as dangerous. Until the ultimate ratification by one of the 25 Member States, somewhere in 2005, all can be called into question. Meanwhile, the leaders of the aforesaid States can damage what will be proposed to them. Previously, Convention must agree on a project of constitution which gives to the Union the institutions which it needs without depriving the States of what they would not stand to lose.

We must and can build the necessary consensus by stopping to struggle on basis of false certainties. This necessity of the reason seems to progress. If it did not go until its term, a great danger threatens : to finish our work with options reproducing the initial divisions.

I call on Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and the Presidium to challenge this way which has the appearance of the facility but the reality of debility. The President hardly wants the creation of a Congress of the people, associating national and European members of parliaments. He could thus stay on his position and present it in option. Let us hope he can renounce to this idea, and stick to the only creation which is important, that one of the constitution.

I call on the British government and the representatives of less populated States, still claiming for such or such revendications. Their demands were, are and will be taken into account, as our requests for effective institutions must be. It would not be usefull for to them to fix their intransigence in an imposed option. This false solution would only grant one transitory satisfaction. Let's hope they understand that the intergovernmental conference (CIG) will not give them what Convention would not have conceded.

To present options instead of a single project of constitution would sign the failure of Convention. It was created because the negociations between the representatives of the States were blocked and that the last ICG were conclude with provisional patching ups. But that joined together in public with national and European members of Parliament, with the Commission, connected to the civil company, on an ambitious project, they could succeed.

The failure of Convention would sign that one of the Constitution. And this failure would subject the European Union a durable paralysis. Everyone knows that the institutions we have will not be any more efficient. Everyone knows that the ICG will perhaps demolish a little what Convention will have done, but that it will not realize to any case what Convention will not have achieved.

I call on all the Conventional to agree on these obviousnesses and measure the consequences. Many of us are opened to various compromises on the unsolved questions. But let us proclaim high and strong that we refuse the options. Let us extirpate this venom before it is spread. Let us say with one voice what the reason imposes. A Constitution, yes. Options, no.