

EU Constitution Project Newsletter

Volume 1 • Issue 5 • September 2003 • constitution@fedtrust.co.uk

In line with the Federal Trust's aim to enlighten the debate on good governance, this Newsletter reviews the current reform process of the EU from the standpoint of the work of the Federal Trust's project on Constitutionalism, Federalism and the Reform of the European Union (the 'EU Constitution Project'). The Newsletter will look at current developments in and outside the Convention and will also cover the UK debate. It will provide information about relevant events and publications.

Contents

1. The small (?) print of sweeping up after Giscard - by Professor Clive Church	1
2. Developments in the EU's constitutional debate	2
3. Still an awkward partner? - by Paul Magnette	4
4. News from the Constitution Project	5
5. Constitutional online essays	6
6. Un-Convention-al - comment by the EU Constitution Project	6
7. Forthcoming events	7
8. Become a Friend of the Federal Trust	8

1. The small (?) print of sweeping up after Giscard by Professor Clive Church

My father used to have an expression 'after the Lord Mayor's show, the dustcart'. Well the Lord Giscard show is over. Despite fears that the Convention would not reach an agreement a mixture of judicious concessions and self restraint helped to produce a single text (albeit only after an uncomfortable number of editions) which was both widely supported in the Convention and given a relatively positive reception outside. Though not perfect many have seen it as better structured and presented than the existing treaties and containing improved institutional arrangements And it has now been formally presented to the Italian government ahead of the IGC.

So, if the show is over, what has to be swept up by the dustcart and who is driving it? The answer to the first question, certainly in the United Kingdom, seems to be not a lot. The drawn out resolution of the Convention's deliberations meant that little was said about it in June and July. Since then, it has all been driven off the front pages by the Hutton enquiry even in the Daily Mail the originator of a kind of referendum in May and June. Although the Times has printed a number of letters on the subject these have been concerned as much 1975 as with the actual details of the new constitutional treaty. Many of those who comment do not know what is presently in the treaties and are unaware that the many amendments made in the Convention are no longer in play.

EU Constitution Project

Brendan Donnelly, Director
Lars Hoffmann, EU Constitution
Dr. Anna Verges, EU Constitution
The Federal Trust for education and research
7 Graphite Square
Vauxhall Walk
London, SE11 5EE
Tel: +44 (0)20 7735 4000
Fax:+44 (0)20 7735 8000

Professor Jo Shaw, Professor of European Law and
Jean Monnet Chair
School of Law, University of Manchester
Oxford Road,
Manchester M13 9PL
Tel: +44 (0)161 275 3658
Fax: +44 (0)161 275 3579

This is in line with British distance from both things European and general constitutional issues. The recent Eurobarometer poll on the Convention showed the British to be still the worst informed of all the states polled, with only 25 per cent having actually heard of the Convention compared to an average of 45 per cent. More significantly 51 per cent of Brits declared that they had no intention of reading the treaty. On this they ranked joint second with the Dutch to the Finns. Only an average of 3 per cent of the sample had actually read the texts despite the lengths to which the Convention has gone in making them available on a continuing basis. So it is not surprising either that none of the Eurosceptic papers chose to follow *Le Monde* and publish Part I or that the Tories have apparently preferred to go with David Heathcoat-Amory's broad rejection of the new treaty than with Timothy Kirkhope's much more detailed and sophisticated counter-project. Equally, publishers have shown themselves to be very resistant to printing a brief, cheap and cheerful, commented version of the text.

In other words, we have had little sweeping up after Giscard so far whether by the government, the media or the opposition. Silence has ruled and even IDS' new Little Entente against the treaty seems to have had no echoes here. No doubt much British opinion would say, so what? Yet it does matter, particularly if we are to have a referendum. Not looking at either the existing treaties or the new draft means that, come the day, people will have little ability to know what is being proposed and how it differs from the Giscardian draft, let alone the status quo. People will have to read what is still a long text and this needs time. So starting now is important.

Yes there is a democratic right to consultation but this imposes obligations on the democrats. Ignoring politics in favour of a snap judgement, based on gut feelings and occurring every five years, as happens in electoral politics, is not a wise response to such a complicated issue. But this is what is happening. Public opinion is happy to

let the dustcart go on being driven by the usual suspects: governments, institutions and lobbies, even if they may not like the outcome. Perhaps if we had a written constitution of our own people might be more willing and able to face up to their responsibilities.

Obviously the problem is not that of the people alone. The text, even now, is not easy. It may be better than the present treaties, but it leaves a lot to be desired. It bears all the marks of something done in stages and never subjected, as the US constitution was (twice) to the work of Committee on Style. Providing a good text is also vital and whatever the argument for the IGC leaving the Convention's handiwork well alone, an improved text is vital. Experiments with it in schools suggest that the language alone could encourage a rejection.

The text also needs to be explained. Unfortunately neither the Maastricht precedent nor the Iraq crisis engenders total confidence in government's ability to do this effectively and convincingly. The FCO is said to be thinking about how to publicise the new treaty and the IGC but has yet to report. But, despite all the ritual denunciations of 'spin', successfully sweeping up after Giscard requires a real effort of presentation and exposition. If not the dustcart could well overturn in Irish fashion as it heads back to the national tip. And this will not help the cause of constitutionalism.

Clive H. Church
Emeritus Professor of European Studies,
University of Kent

2. Developments in the EU's constitutional debate by the EU Constitution Project

Reactions to the draft constitutional treaty

On 18 July, after the Convention's final two sessions at the beginning of the month, ValÉry Giscard d'Estaing handed the final document to the Italian Presidency. The draft has provoked a range of different reactions throughout the Union.

In Germany, Professor Siegfried Bross, a judge in the German Constitutional Court criticised the draft constitutional treaty and a perceived hurry to achieve an agreement. He specifically criticised the lack of a 'Competence Court' to resolve disputes between member states and the European Union over competencies. Currently, the European Court of Justice cannot rule on such disputes because it cannot rule on the constitutional law of the member states, and National Constitutional courts cannot fill the void since they cannot rule on interpretations of European law. It is unusual for a judge of the Constitutional Court to speak out on such a current issue, and his doing so has provided ammunition to the opposition Christian Social Union and the Liberal FDP who are calling for a referendum on the treaty.

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)
[Die Welt](#)
[EU Observer](#)

In mid-August, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, and Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi agreed to try to limit the number of amendments to the draft treaty that will be tabled by heads of government at the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) scheduled to start on 4 October 2003. The meeting and the consensus on limiting changes to the draft text were widely perceived to have healed the rift between the German Chancellor and the Italian Prime Minister, which had been opened by Mr. Berlusconi's controversial comments to a German MEP during his speech to the European Parliament on 2 July 2003. Joschka Fischer, during a trip to Prague, has also warned that if the consensus on the draft treaty is opened, it might become very difficult to close again.

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)
[Der Standard](#)
[Le Monde](#)
[Das Handelsblatt](#)
[euractiv.com](#)
[EU Observer](#)

In Finland, whilst declaring that his government has no plans to hold a referendum on the constitution, the Prime Minister, Matti Vanhanen, said that Finland was likely to put forward some changes to the draft text agreed by the convention. Finland is uneasy about the idea of an elected President for the EU, and feels that more needs to be done to protect the equal status of members and maintain a balance between EU institutions.

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)
[EU Observer](#)

Many smaller member states and accession countries are worried by the perceived rush to the IGC. Finland led claims that the short time period meant that there would not be enough time for parliament to properly scrutinise the draft text. Smaller countries fear that many of the changes contained in the draft, particularly the abolition of the rotating Presidency, will shift the balance of power in the Union further towards the big countries. Austrian foreign minister Benita Ferrero-Waldner said that on many issues there was 'much room for debate.' Small country and accession country representatives will meet in Prague on Monday 1st September to discuss the draft treaty.

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)
[EU Observer](#)
[Das Handelsblatt](#)

In London, the British government has described the draft treaty as 'a good basis for negotiation.' The government will issue a White Paper in early September setting out its negotiating position for the IGC in October. Speculation as to what it will contain has centred on preserving the national veto on taxation, and eliminating clauses that might set up a European Defence Community outside of NATO.

Related Articles:

[Daily Telegraph](#)

A committee of MEPs has called for Heads of States to be cautious in any

attempts to alter the draft constitution. On 25 August, the Committee of Constitutional Affairs in a draft report agreed to support the work of the convention. MEP Dimitros Tsatsos said: 'Let's accept the sound compromise achieved and avoid re-opening the IGC debate from the start.' The report was not uncritical, warning of potential adverse effects of two-tier commissioners, and saying that more needed to be done to consolidate economic and social cohesion policy.

Related Documents:

[European Parliament](#)

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)

In Poland, the Minister for Europe, Danuta Huebner promised MPs of the Sejm's Parliamentary Committee for European Integration that the Polish government would continue to lobby for a reference to Christianity, and the maintenance of the Nice qualified majority voting rules in the constitution. Four out of seven parliamentary groups have their doubts about the draft document, amendments to Poland's constitution require a two thirds majority in parliament, so this could complicate matters if signing up to the final version of the constitution would require Poland to change its constitution.

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)

Green Non-Government Organisations have been critical of the draft treaty. A group of eight green NGOs known as the 'Green Eight' have put forward a series of amendments in a document entitled 'Towards a green EU constitution.' They claim that concentration on institutional issues meant that reformulation of EU policy chapters did not get the attention it required. They propose, among other things, the abolition or revision of the Euratom treaty of 1957, and the addition of a protocol on sustainable development.

Related Documents:

[Greenpeace](#)

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)

[euraactiv.com](#)

Those calling for a mention of Christianity in the constitution have now shifted their attention to the IGC. The draft text only refers to Europe's 'Religious Heritage'. The Pope has repeated his call for a mention of Europe's Christian heritage to be included. The Pope said: 'The explicit recognition in the treatise of the roots of Christianity in Europe would become the principal guarantee of the future of the continent.' It is likely that Spain, Ireland, Poland, and Italy would support such a move at the IGC, however Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi has said that it is unlikely that all twenty five current and future members of the Union would agree to such a revision of the draft text.

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](#)

[EU Observer](#)

[The Independent](#)

[EU Observer](#)

[Der Standard](#)

Referendums

It was reported in our last newsletter that support for EU membership in Estonia had fallen to 48 per cent, although this was still a plurality of those intending to vote. In Latvia polls show a substantial fall in the number intending to vote for EU membership and a rise in those who say they will vote against. Latvia will hold its referendum one week after Estonia, and will be the last accession country hold a vote on the issue. A poll by the independent Latvijas Fakti found that support for membership of the EU has fallen to 49.6 per cent with 34.5 per cent against membership and 15.9 per cent undecided. In the Czech Republic, the opposition Civic Democrats are calling for a referendum on the constitution, the foreign minister Cyril Svoboda has said that a referendum will not be necessary, but the ruling coalition has not completely ruled out a referendum. The Czech Republic endorsed EU membership in a recent referendum on a 77.3 per cent majority from a high turnout of 90 per cent. In Poland, the EU-sceptical League of Polish Families is trying to get the required support of five hundred thousand voters in order to force a

nation-wide referendum on the constitution.

Related Articles:

euractiv.com
[Ceske Noviny](http://ceske.noviny.eu)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)

More member states have been clarifying their position on whether they will hold a referendum on the new European Constitution. 'The Committee of Constitutional Affairs of the European Parliament has supported the idea of referendums on the constitution in a draft report, and said that they should all be held simultaneously with the elections to the European Parliament next June. In Britain, the opposition have been calling for such a referendum and thirty-three of the government's own MPs have called for one, while the government has said that it doesn't believe one to be necessary. However, the Europe Minister Denis MacShane has hinted that a referendum has not been completely ruled out, only saying that it is now 'too early' to call for one. The Prime Minister of Finland said that his government does not expect to hold a referendum on the constitution. Two German opposition parties have also called for a referendum in Germany on the issue and a judge from the Constitutional Court expressed his doubts over the document. The Danish Prime Minister has said that his government will submit the results of the IGC to a referendum, there is discussion as to whether the referendum should cover Denmark's opt-outs from the Maastricht treaty on Justice and Home affairs, Common Defence and Security, and participation in the Euro. Torben Lund, the leader of the Danish Social Democrats in the European Parliament has already said that he would like to see the constitution turned down because it 'goes too far in giving away influence from the national parliaments to Brussels.' In Portugal, a poll revealed the 84 per cent of the public want a referendum on the new constitution for the EU, and the Prime Minister has hinted that he is willing to hold one. The same poll reveals that only 67 per cent had heard of the constitution, and a majority could not say what it contained.

Related Documents:

[European Parliament](http://www.europarl.europa.eu)

Related Articles:

[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
epolitix.com
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
euractiv.com
[The Copenhagen Post](http://www.thecopenhagenpost.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)

The IGC

The opening date for the sixth IGC has been set as 4 October 2003. The aim is to have the treaty finalised, translated into all twenty official languages, and signed by early May 2004 so that voters know the context in which elect a European Parliament in June of that year. Although the president of the constitutional convention, Valery Giscard D'Estaing has warned that the document represents a delicate set of compromises and cannot easily be taken apart and put back together, many member states have expressed the intention of changing aspect of the constitution or another during the IGC.

Many smaller states are questioning this timetable, they believe that it does not allow sufficient time for parliamentary debate on the issues raised by the draft constitution. At a meeting of foreign ministers on Monday 21 July, Finland's foreign minister Erkki Tuomioja said that it was too early to start discussions, Benita Ferrero-Waldner of Austria said that there were still some open questions. Lithuania's foreign minister said that the discussions are so important they should take as long as is needed. Sweden's foreign minister, Anna Lindh has suggested that Ireland, who take over the EU's rotating Presidency from Italy on 1 January 2004, might have a better basis for uniting member states round a single text.

The German government, broadly satisfied with the draft treaty as it stands, would like to see it passed quickly and relatively unchanged, Gerhard Schröder and Joschka Fischer have

been warning of the dangers of reopening debate on issues at the IGC. Italy too would like to see an agreement quickly, so that Europe's first constitution will be enshrined in a second Treaty of Rome, the European Community having been founded by the first Treaty of Rome.

However, there will be pressure to change some areas of the document, the new method of qualified majority voting has proven to be controversial in Poland and Spain, because it reduces their power relative to the weightings that were agreed at Nice. The United Kingdom has serious reservations about areas of Foreign and Security policy and is likely to seek to water down mutual defence guarantees which might undermine NATO. It also has reservations about the double-hatted foreign minister, being worried that this might be a way for the Commission to gain powers over foreign policy. Almost all of the smaller states are uneasy about ending the rotation of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers and electing a President of the Council for a longer term, since they see this as something which transfers more powers to the more populous countries at their expense. Both the United Kingdom and Ireland want to retain their vetoes over taxation issues, seeing taxation as something that must be linked to voters through their parliaments.

Related articles:

euractiv.com
[BBC](http://www.bbc.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[Der Standard](http://www.derstandard.at)
[Le Monde](http://www.lemonde.fr)
[BBC](http://www.bbc.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[EU Observer](http://euobserver.com)
[Daily Telergaph](http://www.dailytelgraph.com)

3. Still an awkward partner? Comment by Paul Magnette

On 13 June 2003, the members of the European Convention adopted by consensus the 'draft treaty establishing a constitution for Europe.'

They had been negotiating over the last sixteen months. Some days later, the members of this Convention, back in their respective countries, explained before their respective Parliaments, and in the press, why they had accepted this new text. In Britain, Peter Hain, Gisela Stuart and others argued, echoed by Jack Straw, that this draft treaty is 'a great prize for Britain'. According to their interpretation, this new treaty is a major British victory: 99 per cent of its dispositions correspond to the government's agenda - much more, the argument goes, than could be expected.

Those who have followed the previous treaty changes should not be surprised by this discourse: after the Single European Act, after Maastricht, Amsterdam and Nice, the British negotiators had made the same argument. '99 per cent of our agenda, much more than we expected'.

My point is not to assess whether this is true or not. Since the 'agenda' had not been made public before the start of the negotiation, this cannot be demonstrated. The British members of the Convention who represented (directly or indirectly) the government might be right - although Peter Hain's hesitations, in a recent debate on some articles of this treaty in the House of Commons, tend to indicate that he does not measure precisely all the legal implications of the government's concessions.

But even if the British government is legally right - even if this draft treaty simply rephrases the *acquis* - the political meaning of this event is much more important than they claim. Most of the 'formal' changes they have accepted amount to abandoning 'guarantees' that former British governments had required: the pillars structure is forgotten and the treaties are merged; qualified majority voting and codecision have become the rule; the Charter will be incorporated in the treaty; the European Parliament will be strongly empowered; the primacy of EU law is codified; the treaty itself

'establishes a constitution'. True, on most of these points, the British government required and obtained 'exceptions' or 'clarifications' - but like former exceptions, they will be under pressure. Within the Convention, and in parallel negotiations, the British negotiators have not blocked the aspiration of those who wanted to 'constitutionalise' the EU.

Whether they acknowledge it or not - and one can understand why, with public opinion still largely hostile, they don't acknowledge it - the members of this government have deeply changed the British attitude vis-à-vis the EU. They have accepted negotiation in a mixed Convention - with commissioners and MEPs, not just among representatives of the governments; they have adopted open-minded and relaxed attitudes on most issues; they have argued and listened; and although they won't state it publicly, they have changed their mind on many points, and accepted many important concessions. The contrast with former treaty changes is obvious. The representatives of the British government sometimes turned back to more aggressive attitudes - but much less often, and much less rudely than, say, their Spanish or Polish colleagues. This Convention might be remembered, in the next decades, as the moment when Britain became a European country like any other.

Paul Magnette
Université Libre de Bruxelles
pmagnet@ulb.ac.be

4. News from the Constitution Project

Federal Trust Workshop II: From the Convention to the IGC (10/11 July 2003, London)

supported by UACES

The second workshop of this Study Group was held at the British Institute of International and Comparative Law in London. The workshop focused on the draft constitution established by the Convention and its prospects having

regard to the forthcoming intergovernmental conference. The workshop consisted of four full panels, plus three individual lectures/presentations.

After a welcome by the Federal Trust's Director, Brendan Donnelly, Jo Shaw (University of Manchester) gave a lecture talking about issues which have arisen over the course of the longer term debate about European constitutionalism focussing on the Convention as an addition to an already complex constitution-building process.

The first panel was chaired and discussed by Prof Jo Shaw. Jesse Scott (EUI, Florence) focused in her paper on the public debate generated by Convention throughout the EU in general and in the UK in specific. Dr Derek Beach (University of Aarhus) presented a comprehensive analysis of Convention as a new method of constitutional bargaining by comparing it to previous rounds of treaty reforms.

The second panel was chaired and discussed by Prof Richard Bellamy (University of Essex). Christine Reh (College of Europe, Bruges) gave a paper (co-written with Dr Thomas Christiansen from the University of Aberystwyth) on the theories of treaty reform by analysing the Convention method as a new form of treaty reform. Prof Maureen Covell (Simon Fraser University, Canada) presented a paper dealing with constitution-making from a comparative perspective by conceptualising the way in which the Convention can be embedded in the long-term process of constitutionalisation. Mette Jolly (University of Nottingham) claimed in her paper that there is a lack of progress in the academic debate about the 'democracy deficit' in the European Union.

In a lively and provocative presentation, Dr Hannes Farnleitner (Representative of the Austrian Chancellor at the Convention) gave an overview of his experience at the Convention and explained that the Convention has led to an increased influence of small states in the treaty reform process.

The third panel was chaired and discussed by Prof Charlie Jeffery (University of Birmingham). Dr Kirsty Hughes (CEPS, Brussels) analysed in her paper the power-balance between the EU's institutions and William Sleath (Commission) gave an account of the Commission's role in the Convention and its view regarding its results. Prof Jeffery, who also gave a brief presentation, analysed the role of the regions' in the Convention.

The last panel, chaired and discussed by Prof Iain Begg (LSE) dealt with economic and social issues. Cécile Barbier (European Social Observatory, Brussels) examined in detail the Convention's results in the field of economic and social policy. Prof Stefan Collignon (LSE) gave a presentation arguing in favour of a further deepening of European economic and political integration leading to the establishment of a European Republic and Tony Brown (IEA, Dublin), who acted as an adviser to Irish Convention member Proinsias de Rossa, gave an account of his Convention experience by analysing his view on the Convention's results in the area of economic and social issues.

Finally, David Frost (FCO) gave a lecture explaining the view of the UK government on the work of the Convention and its position vis-à-vis the forthcoming IGC. This session was chaired by Brendan Donnelly (Federal Trust).

Each panel/lecture/presentation was followed by an extensive Q&A session allowing the participants and the paper-givers to exchange views and to elaborate arguments.

Most of the papers and a more detailed report is available on the Federal Trust website at:

[Constitution Publications](#)

and

[Constitution Workshop 2](#)

or contact Anna Vergès Bausili or Lars Hoffmann at:

constitution@fedtrust.co.uk

5. Constitutional online essays

The Constitution Project has put online several new essays over the summer months. Apart from the Workshop papers mentioned above, there have been several other contributions all available on our website.

- Michael Dougan: The Convention's Draft Constitutional Treaty: A 'Tidying-Up Exercise' That Needs Some Tidying-Up Of Its Own
- Paul Craig: What Constitution does Europe Need? The House that Giscard Built: Constitutional Rooms with a View
- Kirsty Hughes: A Dynamic and Democratic EU or Muddling Through Again? Assessing the EU's Draft Constitution
- Brendan Donnelly: A European Foreign Policy: Dream or Reality?
- Andrew Duff: A Liberal Reaction to the European Convention and the Intergovernmental Conference

6. Un-Conventional

Comment by the EU Constitution Project

The draft constitution, which has been presented by Convention President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing to the Italian Presidency on 18 July 2003, has been much commented on not only by the member states', EU institution, European press but also by academics and think tanks.

Whereas the member states' governments were mostly content with the result many of them remained keen to reopen negotiations on at least a limited number of issues during the next IGC. Yet the European Parliament and the Commission both endorsed the Convention's work urging the member states' to accept it in full during the IGC.

The reaction from academia and civil society has been much more critical; mostly because the draft lacks clear legal drafting or because it does not go far enough to make the European Union more efficient, effective and democratically legitimate with regards to the forthcoming enlargement.

The main area of criticism is the Convention's proposal for the future institutional structure of the EU. The

imprecise job description of the new permanent president of the European Council, the election/nomination procedure for the Commission President, the number of Commissioners, and the lack of clear differentiation between the General Affairs and the Legislative Council are the most criticised points.

The shortcomings in this area come as no great surprise. Certain aspects of the institutional structure (e.g. the number of Commissioners) have been on the agenda of several IGCs without member states producing an acceptable solution. The Convention was relatively successful in most other controversial areas, such as incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, simplification of legislative procedures and redefining the proceedings for qualified-majority voting in the Council. Yet it failed to produce an institutional framework, which meets the criteria of improving efficiency, transparency, simplification and bringing the Union closer to the citizens.

Examining the Convention's working methods more closely, one discovers that it dealt with most important issues in specially formed working groups, which discussed the issues in depth and presented the plenary with consensus-based suggestions and recommendations. "However, there was no working group on the institutions (the only other significant area where no working was formed was on the role of the regions). In addition the Convention spent only a fraction of its 16 months lifetime debating this crucial issue and the debate was mainly founded on contributions made by member states' representatives and the Convention's Praesidium. Giscard practically transformed the Convention into an intergovernmental mode with multilateral meetings behind closed doors to find an acceptable compromise between the smaller and larger member states; and making sure that Commission and European Parliament would stay on board as well.

To conduct the debate on the institutional structure in such an 'un-Conventional' manner (which even included an actual vote in the

Convention Praesidium contradicting the Convention's golden rule consensus politics) can undoubtedly be attributed to the political sensitivity of this issue. Member states' government had put forward in some form or another their – often strong – opinion on the matter whilst indicating that their room for debate was rather limited. It seems as if Giscard was afraid that if the Convention came up by itself with an institutional framework, which would then prove to be unacceptable to the IGC, that that would mean the end not only to Convention's compromise on the institutional structure but would give member states the 'right' to reopen the entire draft. So it seems that by working closely with the member states' on the institutional question, Giscard tried to produce a compromise, which would be strong enough to keep the coherence of the entire draft treaty during the IGC-stage.

The problem is that the institutional structure described in the Convention might well hold before the IGC but it is very much an intergovernmental compromise rather than a Conventional step towards efficiency and democracy. For example it seems odd that there should be a permanent president of the European Council 'to improve consistency and efficiency'. The Council is indeed in need of more consistency but rather in its legislative than its executive function. Especially in Britain, in order to calm the eurosceptic commentators, it is often argued that it is not the 'faceless bureaucrats in the Commission' but the national ministers in the Council that pass directives and regulations. So why did the Convention not insist on giving the Council – in its legislative function – a permanent president who would be able to ensure that its legislative tasks were subject to more coherence and political consistency? That would have improved the Council's function and allowed member states to exercise more effectively their role as European legislators – of course in co-operation with the European Parliament.

Similarly, the number of European Commissioners has been modified to

allow every member state its own Commissioner although some of them will not hold the right to cast a vote in the College of Commissioners. This is a compromise that is entirely based on the negotiations between the Praesidium and the member states' governments. Had there been a vote on the issue it would not have been supported by a majority in the Convention plenary. The Commission will potentially be weakened by this restructuring because its executive functions will be diluted among too many portfolios. Small member states insisted on 'their' Commissioner and French MEP Alain Lamassour pointed out during a conference at the European Parliament Office in London that no decision coming from a Commission without a French Commissioner would be politically acceptable in France. But why? Just because no Commissioner was involved in the vote (or session) of the Commission College on a legislative proposal does not mean that this proposal was drafted without any French input as many of the actual drafting and research staff will originate from a variety of member states. Also no matter whether a country had (in any case only temporarily) no Commissioner, the country would still be able to defend its national interests during the ensuing legislative procedure, which, by definition, includes MEPs and Council members from every country.

Moving to a leaner and more effective Commission with a reduced number of Commissioners, based on an equal rotation among member states, would have been a reform that certainly would have found the support of most of the Conventionals. But the intergovernmental mode which Giscard adopted for the discussions on the EU's institutional structure produced a compromise which might represent a lowest-denominator solution among the member states but it does not make the European Union's legislative procedure more effective and efficient.

Note: For additional comments, analyses and different view points please refer to these in-depth papers:

Michael Dougan: The Convention's Draft Constitutional Treaty: A 'Tidying-Up Exercise' That Needs Some Tidying-Up Of Its Own

Kirsty Hughes: A Dynamic and Democratic EU or Muddling Through Again? Assessing the EU's Draft Constitution

The EPC: The Draft Constitutional Treaty - An Assessment ([link](#))

7. Forthcoming events

From Convention to Constitution: Northern Ireland and the Future of Europe

Queen's University Belfast

18 September 2003

Info and registration:

c.madden@qub.ac.uk

Regional Government in Yorkshire and the Humber: Encouraging Stakeholder Participation

West Yorkshire Playhouse

19 September 2003

Info and registration:

Ulrike.rub@fedtrust.co.uk

The Impact of Regionalisation on Rural Areas

15 September 2003

Lake District National Park Offices

Information:

Ulrike.rub@fedtrust.co.uk

The Europeanisation of British Politics and Policy

Sheffield University

19 September 2003

Info and registration:

i.bache@sheffield.ac.uk

The Evolving European Migration Law and Policy

Manchester

Date to be confirmed

Information:

Dora.k@man.ac.uk

Comprehending the EU's Role in Global Politics

London

Date to be confirmed

Information:

Whitman@wmin.ac.uk

Europa auf dem Weg zum wettbewerbsfähigsten und dynamischsten Wirtschaftsraum der Welt? Eine Zwischenbilanz der Lissabon-Strategie.

Hamburg

11/12 September 2003

Information:

aei@ari-ecsa.de

The Changing Character of the European Union: Consequences for the EEA and EFTA Countries

Reykjavik

18-19 September 2003

[Information](#)

8. Become a Friend of the Federal Trust

If you would like to become a Friend of the Federal Trust or would like to make a donation to support the work of the Constitution Project, please contact

Friends@fedtrust.co.uk