

CONV 599/03

CONTRIB 268

BEGELEIDENDE NOTA

van: het secretariaat

aan: de Conventie

Betreft: Bijdrage van verscheidene leden van de Conventie

"De te Nice en te Laken vastgestelde data van de IGC handhaven"

De secretaris-generaal van de Conventie heeft de aangehechte bijdrage ontvangen van:

De heer Sören LEKBERG, de heer Göran LENNMARKER, de heer Peter SKAARUP, de heer Kimmo KILJUNEN, de heer Matti VANHANEN, mevrouw Gisela STUART, de heer David HEATHCOAT-AMORY, de heer Edmund WITTBRODT, de heer Tunne KELAM, de heer Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS, de heer Algirdas GRICIUS, de heer Jelko KACIN, de heer Jozef OLEKSY, de heer Rihards PIKS, mevrouw Liene LIEPINA, de heer Josef ZIELENIEC, leden van de Conventie, en

de heer Kenneth KVIST, de heer Ingvar SVENSSON, de heer Per DALGAARD, de heer Esko HELLE, Lord TOMLINSON, de heer Pat CAREY, mevrouw Genowefa GRABOWSKA, de heer Ülo TÄRNO, de heer Mihael BREJC, de heer István SZENT-IVÁNYI, de heer Guntars KRASTIS, de heer Arturs Krisjanis KARINS, de heer Farnč HORVAT, plaatsvervangende leden van de Conventie.

Contribution to the European Convention

Keep the IGC timetable from Nice and Laeken

Signatories

Members of the Convention, Representatives of National Parliaments

Mr Sören LEKBERG
Mr Göran LENNMARKER
Mr Peter SKAARUP
Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN
Mr Matti VANHANEN
Ms Gisela STUART
Mr David HEATHCOAT-AMORY
Mr Edmund WITTBRODT
Mr Tunne KELAM
Mr Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS
Mr Algirdas GRICIUS
Mr Jelko KACIN
Mr Jozef OLEKSY
Mr Rihards PIKS
Ms Liene LIEPINA
Mr Josef ZIELENIEC

Alternate Members of the Convention, Representatives of National Parliaments

Mr Kenneth KVIST
Mr Ingvar SVENSSON
Mr Per DALGAARD
Mr Esko HELLE
Lord TOMLINSON
Mr Pat CAREY
Ms Genowefa GRABOWSKA
Mr Ülo TÄRNO
Mr Mihael BREJC
Mr István SZENT-IVÁNYI
Mr Guntars KRASTIS
Mr Arturs Krisjanis KARINS
Mr Farnč HORVAT

Keep the IGC timetable from Nice and Laeken

The New Member States have a right to fully participate in the debate on the Future of the Union, since they will be full members in the future Union. As Members of the European Convention representing National Parliaments, we share a particular responsibility for making sure that the Constitutional Treaty, and the process for adoption, respond to the wishes from the citizens to have a greater say in European Union affairs. The Laeken mandate makes it abundantly clear that one of the major concerns in Europe today is the need to reconnect the European project with its citizens. With this in mind, we have come to the following conclusions as regards the method and timetable for the finalisation of the Convention, and for the start of the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC).

1. Since Nice and Laeken, an extra element has been added, namely the date of 1 May, 2004, for the accession of the large group of New Member States. There will be referenda on the whether to join the EU in these states. Before their respective referendum, the New Members will not have reached their full negotiating potential in Brussels. The citizens in the New Member States need time after the referenda to debate the Convention outcome.
2. The timetable established at Nice, which foresees the IGC for 2004, makes sense. The outcome of the Convention will most likely be comprehensive, covering the whole range of EU co-operation. This outcome deserves to be debated all over Europe. Such a broad, public debate will only be possible if there is a gap of at least six months between the end of the Convention and the commencement of the IGC.
3. It is of utmost importance that our Parliaments are given real opportunities to pronounce themselves on the Convention outcome, thereby shaping the mandate for the ensuing IGC. The Convention having been initiated with much political fanfare, there must be ample time to discuss the outcome before the Heads of State and Government negotiate and lock themselves in different bargaining positions.
4. The Nice Declaration, as mentioned above, clearly states that the IGC will be convened in 2004. This was a unanimous decision by the Heads of State and Government. It is for those who now propose a different timetable to establish why a change is necessary.
