

Proposals for the Intergovernmental conference which began July 23, 2007

Democracy

Double majority is defined as 75 % of the member states in the Council and a simple majority in the European Parliament

Justification:

Today decisions by qualified majority require 74 % of the weighted votes in the Council. Amendments from the European Parliament are also based on weighted representation from the different member states. In the US all states are represented equally in the Senate. In the German Bundesrat states have votes between 3 and 6. There may eventually be a protocol giving a member state a right to block a decision if a national parliament instructs its prime minister to raise the topic at the next EU summit.

Composition of the Commission

Each member state elects its own commissioner.

Justification:

60 % of the members in the Convention signed a written proposal to keep one commissioner for each member state. The Commission has a monopoly of initiative and decides most laws and implementing rules themselves. We cannot have laws governing our countries decided only by foreigners – and with a legal status above our own constitutions.

Minimum rules instead of total harmonisation

When harmonising laws the EU must allow member states to have a higher protection of health and environment, security and working environment, consumer protection, animal welfare and cultural diversity.

Justification:

The EU aim at delivering a high level of protection for health, environment and consumer protection. When harmonising laws no country shall be bound to lower its protection. The highest levels of protection must always be safeguarded through the establishment of minimum rules instead of identical rules - “total harmonisation”

Seat of the European Parliament

The European Parliament is asked to decide its permanent seat by a simple majority vote.

Justification:

The European Parliament is discredited by the public for the waste of tax payers' money for meetings in different locations. The heads of states have to change the existing protocol on the seat of different institutions. The locations missing the European Parliament may be compensated with other European institutions of similar economic benefit.

A fairer budget

The budget is financed by progressive contributions based on GNP. Rebates can be established for countries with GNP below average.

Justification:

Free trade is normally of benefit to the richest countries more than the poor countries. Therefore we often link financial protocols to free trade agreements. Our own EU budget is not financed progressively and deserves a reform with contributions defined after a progressive scale based on GNP.

A transparent budget

No money can be spent from the budget without publication for the purpose and the recipient.

Justification:

No one is bound to receive subsidies from the EU. To avoid fraud and misuse of tax payer's money we must establish full transparency in all spending.

More votes for Romania and Malta

Romania will have 19 votes in the Council instead of 14 and Malta 4 instead of 3 under the agreement from the Nice Treaty.

Justification:

Romania has 57 % of the Polish population but only 52 % of their votes. Netherlands have 43 % of the Polish population but 48 % of their votes. 19 votes are more just for Romania. Malta and Luxembourg have 0.08 and 0.09 % of the total population. It does not justify the difference between 3 and 4 votes under the system established in Nice.

Transparency and openness

All documents and meetings are transparent and public unless derogations are decided by qualified majority.

Justification:

This proposal was signed by 200 of 220 members and substitutes in the Convention. The proposal was supported by all members from the national parliaments, all from the European Parliament except one and 23 of 28 governments. No other proposal had such a big support in the Convention. It deserves to be installed.