

European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1983 - 1984

8 November 1983

DOCUMENT 1-984/83

Report

drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee

on the communication from the Commission of the
European Communities to the Council and the
European Parliament on the conciliation procedure
(COM(81) 816 final)

Rapporteur: Mr P. DE PASQUALE

PE 83.972/fin.

English Edition

At its sitting of 17 April 1980 the European Parliament referred the motion for a resolution tabled by Sir James Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the report by the Committee of Three (Doc. 1-33/80) pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure to the Political Affairs Committee as the committee responsible.

At its meeting of 22 January 1981, the Political Affairs Committee decided to draw up a report. At its meeting of 21-23 April 1981 the committee appointed Mr DE PASQUALE rapporteur. At its meeting of 23-25 June 1982 the Political Affairs Committee decided to forward the draft report on the Three Wise Men report (PE 79.417) to the Subcommittee on the Application of the Institutional Provisions of the Treaty, because of its implications for relations between the Community institutions.

At its meeting of 20 April 1983 the Subcommittee on the Application of the Institutional Provisions of the Treaties concluded that the draft report on the Three Wise Men report had been superacted by events, particularly in the light of the resolutions drawn up by the Political Affairs Committee and the new proposals on institutional affairs submitted by the Commission of the European Communities. The subcommittee therefore decided to concentrate its attention on one specific and important aspect, which had been taken into consideration in the Three Wise Men report and later developed further by the Commission - the conciliation procedure. Mr DE PASQUALE drew up a draft report (PE 83.982) on the Communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council and the European Parliament on the conciliation procedure (COM(81) 816 final).

By letter of 21 April 1983 the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Application of the Institutional Provisions of the Treaty, Mr d'ORMESSON, requested the chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, Mr RUMOR, to submit the matter to the committee and to take the necessary steps to regularize the procedure.

At its meeting of 20-22 April 1983, the Political Affairs Committee accepted the subcommittee's request and instructed Mr RUMOR to ask the President of the European Parliament, Mr DANKERT, for authorization to draw up a report on the Communication from the Commission of the European Communities on the conciliation procedure. By letter of 26 April 1983 Mr RUMOR requested the President of the European Parliament to grant this authorization.

At the sitting of 6 June 1983 the President of the European Parliament announced that the Political Affairs Committee had been authorized to draw up a report on the matter and requested the Legal Affairs Committee to deliver an opinion.

The committee considered the draft report at its meetings of 20-22 April 1983, 24-25 May 1983, 13-14 June 1983, 28-30 September 1983 and 2-3 November 1983.

At the last meeting the committee adopted the motion for a resolution unanimously.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Rumor, chairman; Mr Haagerup, first vice-chairman; Mr Charzat, second vice-chairman; Mr De Pasquale, rapporteur; Mr Barbi, Mr Bocklet (deputizing for Mrs Lenz), Mr Bournias, Mr Deschamps, Lady Elles, Mr Fellermaier (deputizing for Mr Schieler), Mr B. Friedrich, Mr Habsburg, Mr Hansch, Mr von Hassel, Mrs van den Heuvel, Mr Klepsch, Mr Kyrkos (deputizing for Mr Segre), Mrs Macciocchi (deputizing for Mr Cariglia), Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Salzer (deputizing for Mr Antoniozzi), Mr Schall, Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Mrs Theobald-Paoli (deputizing for Mr Jaquet), Mr Vankerkhoven (deputizing for Mr Penders), Mr Walter and Mr Zagari

The opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee is attached.

This report was tabled on 4 November 1983.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Amendments	5
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	9
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	11
Annex: Motion for a resolution tabled by Sir James Scott-Hopkins and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the Report on European Institutions by the Committee of Three ('Three Wise Men') (Doc. 1-33/80)	14
Opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee	16

The Political Affairs Committee hereby submits to the European Parliament the following amendments and motion for a resolution, together with explanatory statement:

Draft Second Joint Declaration of the
European Parliament, the Council and the Commission
on the conciliation procedure
(COM(81) 816 final)

Amendments tabled by the
Political Affairs Committee

Text proposed by the Commission
of the European Communities

Preamble and recitals unchanged

Amendment No. 1

Begin the text of the declaration
with the following
Paragraph 1:

'The conciliation procedure between
the Council and Parliament,
instituted by the joint declaration
of Parliament, the Council and the
Commission on 4 March 1975
(OJ C 89 of 22.4.75), is hereby
established.'

Paragraph 1

The conciliation procedure shall
be used for Community legislative
acts which are of general application
and of considerable importance for the
Community and whose adoption is not
required by acts already existing.

New paragraph 2

(= am. by Legal Affairs Committee)

'The conciliation procedure shall be used
for Community legislative acts which are of
general application and which, in the opinion
either of the Parliament or of the Council, are
of considerable importance for the Community
and whose adoption is not required by acts
already existing.'

Amendment No. 2

Paragraph 3: new text:

'The purpose of the procedure shall be to seek agreement between the European Parliament and the Council.'

(Italian amendment not applicable to English text)

Amendment No. 3

Replace Paragraph 2 of the Commission text with the following Paragraph 4:
'The procedure shall be opened on the initiative of Parliament or the Council.'

Paragraph 2

The procedure shall be initiated at the request of the European Parliament, the Council or the Commission.

Amendment No. 4

Replace paragraph 3 of the Commission text with the following Paragraph 5:
'Should the Commission consider that difficulties may arise in adopting a legislative proposal, it may recommend that Parliament and the Council initiate the conciliation procedure.'

Paragraph 3

The purpose of the procedure shall be to seek agreement between the European Parliament and the Council.

Amendment No. 5

After the new Paragraph 5, insert a new Paragraph 6 as follows:

'As soon as Parliament or the Council take the initiative of opening the conciliation procedure, the Presidents of both institutions, with the active participation of the President of the Commission, shall determine the arrangements for the application of the procedure';

Amendment No. 6

Replace Paragraph 4 of the Commission text with the following Paragraph 7:

'Conciliation shall be effected within a Conciliation Committee composed of the Council and representatives of the Parliament. The Commission shall participate in the work of the Conciliation Committee. The presidency of the Conciliation Committee shall be held alternately by the Council and Parliament.'

Amendment No. 7

Replace Paragraph 5(a, b, c, d, e) of the Commission text by the following

Paragraph 8:

'Subject to the decisions of the Presidents of the Council and Parliament provided for under paragraph 6 of the present declaration, the conciliation procedure shall be as follows, normally for a maximum duration of three months from the date of the first meeting of the Conciliation Committee;

- (a) the Conciliation Committee shall meet immediately after the initiative of opening the conciliation procedure has been taken;
- (b) any agreement reached within the Conciliation Committee shall be submitted to Parliament for its approval. Following this, the Council shall take definitive action;
- (c) failing agreement, the Conciliation Committee shall hold further meetings to examine and resolve the points of disagreement;

Paragraph 4

Conciliation shall be effected within a Conciliation Committee composed of representatives of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission.

Paragraph 5

Unless the Presidents of the three Institutions concerned decide otherwise, laying down schedules and special arrangements for the conciliation procedure in particular cases, the conciliation procedure shall be as follows:

- (a) A first meeting of the Conciliation Committee may be held as soon as, after receiving an opinion from the European Parliament, the Council has determined what the main problems posed by a Commission proposal are and how they might be settled;
- (b) On the basis of the work of the Conciliation Committee, the Council may either take definitive action on or may establish a joint approach, possibly including various options, to the proposal under discussion;
- (c) This joint approach shall be submitted to the Conciliation Committee;

(d) after these meetings, the results shall be submitted to Parliament which shall deliver a new opinion within a time-limit fixed by the Conciliation Committee; the Council shall then take definitive action within a time-limit fixed by the Conciliation Committee;

(e) should Parliament, acting by a majority of its Members, vote against the text of the proposal submitted to it following conciliation, the motion for a resolution shall not be put to the vote. In such cases, a new agreement between the institutions concerned must be reached before the measures concerned may be adopted.'

(d) The European Parliament shall, within a maximum period of three months following the second meeting of the Conciliation Committee, deliver a new opinion on the Commission proposal;

(e) On expiry of this period or as soon as it has received a new opinion from Parliament, the Council shall be entitled to act definitively.

Amendment No. 8

Paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Commission text:

Delete.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the draft Second Joint Declaration of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on the conciliation procedure

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Joint Declaration of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission of 4 March 1975 on the conciliation procedure¹,
 - having regard to the report of October 1979 of the Three Wise Men to the European Council on European Institutions,
 - having regard to the resolution on relations between the European Parliament and the Council of 9 July 1981²,
 - having regard to the Joint Declaration of 30 June 1982 by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on various measures to improve the budgetary procedure,
 - having regard to the Communication from the Commission (COM(81) 816 final),
 - having regard to the report of the Political Affairs Committee and the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-984/83),
 - having regard to the result of the vote on the draft Second Joint Declaration of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on the conciliation procedure,
- A. whereas, if it is to advance, the process of European integration must be based on the widest possible consensus, as represented in particular by democratically elected bodies such as the European Parliament, which must therefore take a more direct part in defining Community policy,

¹ OJ C 89, 22.4.1975

² OJ C 234, 14.9.1981

- B. whereas, following its election by direct universal suffrage, the problem of widening the powers of the European Parliament, and particularly its participation in the Community decision-making process, has become increasingly pressing and unavoidable,
- C. recalling that at the beginning of the 1970s the debate on these issues, particularly as regards joint responsibility for legislative decisions, led to the signing of the Joint Declaration of 4 March 1975 by Parliament, the Commission and the Council,
- D. stressing that the purpose of the conciliation procedure is to bring together the positions of the various bodies, so as to enable the Council to act on the basis of an agreement with Parliament,
- E. whereas the 1975 Act, which was the result of a compromise within the Council, leaves the European Parliament on the fringes of the decision-making process,
- F. stressing that any partial improvements to the procedure, or arbitrary restrictions on its timing, without a reform of the conciliation procedure as a whole, would be likely to make the European Parliament's participation in that procedure even less meaningful than at present,
1. Proposes that the conciliation procedure established by the Joint Declaration of 1975 be renegotiated on the basis of the proposals contained in the Commission document on this subject, supplemented and amended by the amendments proposed by the European Parliament;
 2. Stresses the particular importance of the following three proposals:
 - extending the field of application of the procedure;
 - the possibility for the procedure to be initiated at the request of the Council or Parliament;
 - the immediate holding of the first conciliation meeting between Parliament and the Council, with the active collaboration of the Commission, before they have adopted their respective positions on the proposal under discussion;

3. Points out, however, that the Commission document omits any reference to the problem of the arrangements for closing the procedure in the event of a disagreement between the institutions and to the specific time limits and mechanisms required to speed up the decision-making process;
4. Hopes that on the basis of the proposals contained in Parliament's amendments an agreement can be reached as quickly as possible between the three institutions, confirmed by a new Joint Declaration on the conciliation procedure and enabling the European Parliament to play a wider and more concrete role in the Community decision-making process, while at the same time establishing a continuous and productive dialogue between the three institutions;
5. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission and Council of the European Communities.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

1. The conciliation procedure, established by the Joint Declaration of 4 March 1975¹, reflects the need for the European Parliament to play a more effective part in the adoption of Community acts of major importance. Even before its election by direct universal suffrage, the European Parliament had sought to attain a triangular decision-making structure together with the Commission and the Council, in keeping with the role which Parliament believes it should play in the European Community.
2. Parliament's desire to achieve effective 'conciliation', particularly vis-à-vis the Council, is expressed in its resolution of 19 February 1975², which nevertheless pointed out that the value of the procedure to be introduced would in practice depend on its 'interpretation by the institutions directly concerned'.
3. The Council has always interpreted the text of the Joint Declaration of 1975 in a restrictive manner, as was made clear in the negative assessment of the procedure given by Mrs Veil at the first meeting between the ten Ministers for Foreign Affairs and the enlarged Bureau of the European Parliament on 17 November 1981: 'Before the elections, only three conciliation procedures were properly completed, while eight remained pending and one was refused by the Council. Since the 1979 elections the situation has worsened further. Thirteen requests have been made and no action was taken on any of them, except for the two - negative - replies I received'.³
4. In its communication of 14 October 1981 on the relations between the Community institutions, which followed the debate on institutional affairs in the European Parliament in July 1981, the Commission too was obliged to acknowledge the inadequacy of the current conciliation procedure, because it failed to provide a genuine dialogue with the members of the Council¹.

¹ OJ No. C 89, 22.4.1975, p. 1

² OJ No. C 60, 13.3.1975, p. 30

³ Speech by Mrs VEIL, EP Bulletin No. 50, 14 December 1981, p. 18

5. The draft Second Joint Declaration submitted by the Commission is designed to bring the conciliation procedure into line with the increasingly influential role which the European Parliament is required to play following its election by direct universal suffrage. In this respect it is part of the efforts continually made by Parliament, even before its election, to acquire budgetary powers and to increase its participation in the Community decision-making process. However, although a certain amount of success has been achieved in respect of the budget with the Joint Declaration of 30 June 1982², no progress has been made as regards conciliation on the most important acts of the Community.

6. The draft Second Joint Declaration can help restore balance to the roles of the Community institutions in the decision-making process. If this is to be achieved, however, it is vital that the conciliation procedure be applied automatically to acts which are essential to the development of the Community, at the request of Parliament or the Council. Furthermore, in cases where the procedure is opened at the request of one of these institutions, it should be compulsory for the respective presidents, in active collaboration with the President of the Commission, to agree on a plan of operation for the conciliation procedure.

7. For its part, Parliament should be able to determine the composition of its own delegation for the conciliation procedure. The chairmanship of the 'Conciliation Committee' should alternate between the Council and Parliament. It is also necessary to define more precisely those cases in which the Council may take definitive action, making this possibility conditional on the reaching of agreement between the European Parliament and the Council.

8. Finally, the draft Second Joint Declaration should stipulate a time limit (not longer than three months) for the completion of the conciliation procedure and lay down the various stages of the procedure, both for cases in which agreement is reached between the Council and Parliament and for cases in which disagreement persists between the two institutions.

¹ Bulletin of the European Communities - Supplement 3/82 'The institutional system of the Community - Restoring the balance'. p. 11

² Joint Declaration by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on various measures to improve the budgetary procedure, OJ No. C 194, 28.7.1982, p. 1 ff.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (DOCUMENT 1-33/80)

tabled by Mr SCOTT-HOPKINS, Lady ELLES,
Mr BEAZLEY, Mr de COURCY LING, Mr PATTERSON,
Sir Fred CATHERWOOD, Mr HUTTON, Mr HOWELL,
Mr PRAG, Mr KELLETT-BOWMAN, Mr DALZIEL,
Mr J. M. TAYLOR, Mr SPENCER, Mr PROUT,
Mr C. JACKSON, Mr WELSH, Lord O'HAGAN,
Mr NEWTON-DUNN, Sir Peter VANNECK, Mr SELIGMAN,
Lord DOURO, Mr JOHNSON and Mr PURVIS
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

on the Report on European Institutions by
the Committee of Three ('Three Wise Men')

The European Parliament,

- concerned to make its position known to the European Council on
the main proposals affecting the Parliament in the Report on
European Institutions by the Committee of Three,

1. Welcomes the suggestion that the European Council should adopt
priorities for Community action before the end of 1980 and
that the European Parliament should discuss them;
2. Endorses the proposal that the President of the European Council
should attend the European Parliament in person once in each
Presidency;

3. Welcomes the proposal that the Presidency of the Council of Ministers should inform the Parliament of progress made at the end of each Presidency, and that a junior Minister should help the Presidency maintain contact with the Parliament;
4. Underlines the emphasis laid by the Committee of Three on the need for the Council of Ministers and the Commission to improve their response to the Parliament's resolutions;
5. Points out that the Committee of Three called for their proposals on improvements in the workings of the institutions to be implemented well in advance of the accession of Greece in January 1981;
6. Calls for the European Council to reach a decision as soon as possible on the principal proposals contained in the Report, and to consult with the European Parliament before decisions are taken on matters affecting the Parliament's relations with the other institutions;
7. In addition to the proposals made in the Report,
 - a) insists that endorsement by the European Parliament should be required when the President of the Commission and the other Commissioners are appointed;
 - b) insists that the Commission should consult the appropriate Committee of the Parliament before making proposals to the Council on the negotiating mandate for agreements with third countries, including Association agreements;
 - c) urges the European Council to make specific proposals to improve the machinery of political cooperation, and in particular to speed up the process of consultation and decision-making;
8. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the European Council, to the Council of Ministers, to the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation, and to the Commission.

OPINION OF THE LEGAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Draftsman: Mrs M. MACCIOCCHI

On 6 June 1983 the Legal Affairs Committee was asked for its opinion.

On 21 June 1983 Mrs Macciocchi was appointed draftsman.

The Legal Affairs Committee considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 28 and 29 September 1983 and 18 and 19 October 1983 and at the latter meeting adopted it by 13 votes to 1. This meeting was attended by Mr De Pasquale, rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee.

Present: Mrs Veil, chairman; Mr Luster and Mr Turner, vice-chairmen; Mrs Vayssade, acting draftsman; Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr Dalziel, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Donnez, Mr Ferri, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Megahy, Mr Prout, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Vetter and Mr Vie.

1. In 1975 the three political institutions of the Community signed a joint declaration which established a procedure for conciliation on certain acts of general application with appreciable financial implications. The declaration (1) provided for the creation of a Conciliation Committee for each procedure, comprising the Council and representatives of the European Parliament and with the active participation of the Commission. The need to involve Parliament more closely in the procedures for adopting Community decisions had become especially relevant since the recent expansion in its powers in relation to the budget procedure. Effective participation by Parliament was also called for in the drafting of decisions with important budgetary implications; more generally, by conferring on Parliament greater powers not only of control but also - however partial and limited - of co-decision-making, the Community was making progress towards democracy, said to be essential by everyone.

2. Some years later, notably after the elections by direct universal suffrage, it was apparent that the expectations to which the joint declaration had given rise had not been fulfilled. The speech made by Mrs Simone VEIL, President of the European Parliament (2), on this question during the meeting of 17 November 1981 between the Foreign Ministers and the enlarged Bureau of the European Parliament outlined three weak points in the conciliation procedure:

- the rigorous restriction of the conciliation procedure to cases with appreciable financial implications, which do not necessarily include questions of major political significance;
- the period of time which sometimes elapses between the European Parliament's request for the procedure to be opened and the reply by the Council, which states its intention to depart from Parliament's opinion and conveys its negotiating position, without which the Conciliation Committee cannot begin its work;

(1) See OJ No. C 89, 22.04.1975, p. 1

(2) See Bulletin of the European Parliament No. 50, 15 December 1981, p. 15 et seq.

- the lack of flexibility on the part of those involved in the work of the Conciliation Committee who at times make no effort to reconcile the positions of the two institutions and to reach an agreement, merely reaffirming the positions expressed by the respective institutions (1).

3. Faced with Parliament's dissatisfaction, the Commission took upon itself to present in early 1982 a communication (2) to the Council and to Parliament containing the adjustments it felt should be made to the conciliation procedure, particularly in the wake of direct elections.

4. The Commission's draft aims on the one hand to extend the scope of the conciliation procedure (3), and on the other hand to ensure that the Council reacts immediately to Parliament's request (4). However, the Commission's proposal concerning the third difficulty mentioned in paragraph 2 appears inadequate: the inflexibility of the two delegations within the Conciliation Committee, which has a tendency to lose its essential characteristic as a body bound to negotiate and reach an agreement.

o

o o

(1) See also:

- communication from the Commission of the European Communities on the relations between the institutions of the Community (COM(81) 581 final of 7 October 1981);

- report of the Three Wise Men of October 1979

(2) See COM(81) 816 final, 4 January 1982

(3) See point 1 of the draft declaration

(4) See point 5(a) of the draft declaration

5. The draft report (PE 83.972/rev.) by Mr De Pasquale succeeds in eliminating some of the obscure aspects of the Commission's draft and aims principally to ensure the improved functioning of the Conciliation Committee, whose fundamental *raison d'être* must be to bring about a rapprochement between the positions of the two institutions (see in particular Amendment No. 7): the task of the Conciliation Committee must be to draft a text for submission to Parliament and the Council.

6. Particularly significant and worthy of support is the idea that the Conciliation Committee may fix a time-limit within which the Council must take definitive action (see Amendment No. 7(d)): this aims to make it more difficult for the Council, in the face of internal and external difficulties, merely to avoid deciding on a proposal which has been the subject of a conciliation procedure. The fixing of such a time-limit should be linked to the possibility open to the European Parliament of initiating the conciliation procedure (1): these provisions as a whole provide an instrument for Parliament to combat with some hope of success the inertia and failure to act of the Council.

7. Broadly speaking, then, the Legal Affairs Committee agrees with the draft report by the Political Affairs Committee and would like merely to make some observations with regard to the text:

- paragraph (1) of the text proposed by the Commission, which the draft report by Mr De Pasquale does not seek to amend, should be modified as follows:

'The conciliation procedure shall be used for Community legislative acts which are of general application and of considerable importance for the Community in the opinion either of the Parliament or of the Council.'

- the wording used in Amendments Nos. 3, 5 and 7(a) ('The procedure shall be initiated at the request'; 'immediately after the request for conciliation'), which has in fact been borrowed from the Commission's draft, should be replaced by the expression: 'on the initiative'. 'Request' could give rise to doubts, however slight, about the automatic nature of the application of the conciliation procedure, which does not require the acceptance of whichever of the two institutions has not taken the initiative;

(1) See point 2 of the Commission's draft and Amendment No. 3 by Mr De Pasquale

- the way in which the delegations of the institutions taking part in the conciliation procedure are constituted is a matter for the institutions themselves. It is therefore recommended that the words 'pursuant to its Rules of Procedure' in the first sentence of Amendment No. 6 should be deleted.
- Amendment No. 6 states that: 'the presidency of the Conciliation Committee shall be held alternately by the Council and Parliament'. Since the conciliation procedure is opened only when the Council intends to depart from the opinion adopted by the European Parliament, the concept of an alternate presidency would be defined as meaning that the President of the Council presides over the first meeting of the Conciliation Committee and the chairman of the Parliament's delegation over the (possible) second meeting;
- paragraph (e) of Amendment No. 7 introduces the idea of the need for a second opinion by Parliament for the Council's final decision to be valid. The Legal Affairs Committee is in complete agreement with the intention of the rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee and proposes, by analogy with Rule 35(3) of Parliament's Rules of Procedure, the following wording:

'(e) should Parliament, acting by a majority of its Members, vote against the text of the proposal submitted to it following conciliation, the motion for a resolution shall not be put to the vote. In such cases, a new agreement between the institutions concerned must be reached before the measures concerned may be adopted.' (1)

8. In addition to the amendments to the text it is necessary to ensure that, once the joint declaration is approved (2), the new conciliation procedure should yield positive results. For Parliament, this implies careful selection of the issues to which the conciliation procedure should be applied. Invoking it on too many questions would be extremely negative: five or six conciliations each year would probably be the maximum practicable at present.

(1) Under the Rules of Procedure, it is the vote on the whole text of the motion for a resolution that constitutes Parliament's opinion on a text on which it has been consulted (see Rule 32(3) 'shall end'). The proposed text implies that the decision of the Conciliation Committee shall be submitted to Parliament by means of a report, as, moreover, indicated in Rule 38(4) of the Rules of Procedure.

(2) If necessary by means of 'conciliation on the conciliation procedure', as suggested by the Commission (see point III of the introduction to the draft second joint declaration).

9. Careful preparation of the conciliation is also essential. This should take place at two levels:

- the meetings of the Conciliation Committee should be preceded by discussions between one representative each from Parliament and the Council, who will be able to prepare effectively for the meeting between the two delegations and to define the main political problems to be resolved;
- it would be also be extremely useful for Parliament's delegation to hold preparatory meetings, in particular before the first meeting of the Conciliation Committee. It could thus give preliminary consideration to the Council's attitude (also on the basis of the outcome of the meeting between the Council representative and the representative of Parliament), and perhaps outline, within its terms of reference, the possible options and the limits it does not wish to exceed.

Although this will at times require a considerable amount of work, the Legal Affairs Committee is convinced that it is absolutely vital for the success of the conciliation procedures.

10. It will then be necessary to transcribe the changes ensuing from the application of the new procedure into Parliament's Rules of Procedure. The Legal Affairs Committee feels that the arrangements for conciliation should be described in greater detail in the Rules of Procedure than currently in Rule 38: initiation of the procedure, preparation by the Parliament's delegation, 'second reading'.

o

o o

11. In conclusion, the Legal Affairs Committee is in full agreement on the need for a second joint declaration on the reform of the conciliation procedure to be signed at the earliest, on the basis of the text contained in the draft report (PE 83.972/rev.) which is being considered by the Political Affairs Committee, together with the amendments suggested in paragraph 7 of this opinion.

