

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

Session document

23 November 2000

B5-0888/2000

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

further to the Council report and Commission statement

pursuant to Rule 37(2) of the Rules of Procedure

by Yves Butel, Jens-Peter Bonde, Ole Krarup and Jean Saint-Josse

on behalf of the EDD Group

on the Nice European Council, including the common commercial policy (with a view to the draft Treaty by the French Presidency)

European Parliament resolution on the Nice European Council, including the common commercial policy (with a view to the draft Treaty by the French Presidency)

The European Parliament,

A. having regard to the progress made by the Intergovernmental Conference,

1. Deplores the fact that the negotiations are revolving around proposals rejected at Amsterdam, setting the effectiveness of the European decision-making process against respect for national democracy;
2. Calls for constraints on the concentration of powers in the hands of a college of non-elected commissioners, which has no legitimacy as regards embodying the diversity of European peoples and nations;
3. Is surprised that it should be necessary to point out that the Council Presidency may accompany the Commission in the context of international negotiations and wonders about the consequences of a possible ban on a Member State requesting the creation of a special group in the WTO;
4. Calls on the IGC to reflect on the added value of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, and even more on the risks of legal confusion between the Court in Strasbourg, the constitutional courts of the Member States and the Court of Justice in Luxembourg, which makes interpretations going beyond the letter of the law;
5. Is concerned at the implications for the representativeness of Members of the European Parliament if the number of seats per Member State is significantly reduced, as well as respect for the original balance if parities were to be changed;
6. Takes the view that the debate on the weighting of votes and the extension of qualified majority voting raises the question of the democratic consent of each Member State, expressed through the vote of its representatives in the Council, and rejects any quest for a European majority which disregards the democratic mechanisms of the Member States;
7. Is concerned at the headlong rush towards enlargement, and at the impact of enlargement, which has been underestimated by all those concerned; calls, therefore, on the Member States to draw up a framework for cooperation which respects subsidiarity, identities and differences;
8. Wonders as to the contradiction in Article 151 (Culture), which, while establishing as its objective respect for national and regional diversity, at the same time proposes moving to qualified majority voting, which would prevent this right to diversity from being asserted;
9. Welcomes the method proposed in Article 137 in the field of social protection and hopes that this approach based on cooperation and the exchange of good practices amongst the Member States, 'excluding any harmonisation', will serve as a model for the entire

European project, but fears that this article might be misused and might undermine collective bargaining as practised in the Member States;

10. Calls for it to be made clear in Article 16, independently of the concept of minimum universal service, that the definition and supervision of the public services necessary for social and regional cohesion remain within the competence of the Member States, and for structures designed to serve the collective interest and having no economic purposes to be excluded from the scope of competition rules;
11. Opposes the extension of Article 93 to indirect taxation and the amendment of Article 175, as proposed, and points out that, as regards fiscal matters, the power to raise taxes must remain the exclusive competence of the Member States;
12. Deplores that, at the Agriculture Council, it proved impossible to obtain a ban on meat and bone meal in animal feed, doing nothing to remove the doubts of consumers and penalising the beef and veal sector and its hundreds of thousands of jobs; is concerned at the alternative solutions, such as the use of protein feed, which would bring with it the risk of GMO-based feed;
13. Argues for a high but realistic level of health protection in the area of foodstuffs while guaranteeing safety throughout the human and animal food chain, which should be based on criteria which respect product quality and traditional forms of production;
14. Insists that an obligation of prior consultation with all local actors, professionals and users concerned should be imposed in these areas, in accordance with the proximity principle;
15. Insists that the European Food Authority should, on the one hand, be a cooperation and evaluation body, not endowed with regulatory and legislative powers, and on the other hand be a body for gathering and exchanging information amongst the national bodies responsible for food safety policies, those bodies alone remaining responsible for risk management;
16. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the governments and parliaments of the Member States and the governments and parliaments of the applicant countries.