QUESTIONNAIRES

	M	ay 20)12		
	< Pre	vious	Next	>	
Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa	Sι
1	2	3	4	5	6
8	9	10	11	12	13
15	16	17	18	19	20
22	23	24	25	26	27
29	30	31	-	-	-
	C	alend	dar		

Questionnaire on the Charter of Fundamental Rights

Questionnaire on the relations between National Members of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament

Questionnaire on Extension of Qualified Majority

These questionnaires were sent to all Parliaments participating in the Lisbon COSAC.

Questionnaire on the Charter of Fundamental Rights 1. Has the Parliament of your country already pronounced itself about the Charter of Fundamental Rights? □ _{YES} □ NO a) If NOT, do you intend to do it? □ NO YES b) If YES, through: resolution report hearing debate c) If you had hearings, who participated? members of Government academicians trade unions and employer organisations NGO. Which? others

2. In what concerns its legal nature and efficacy, are you for a binding Charter or would you prefer a

Cha	arter with declarative character?
	binding
	declarative
0 D-	way agaided the Charten as
3. Do	you consider the Charter as:
	an instrument to reduce the distance between citizens and community
institu	utions and to have more control on the latter
	a "constitutionalization" of the EU
	other
	one
	ention on Human Rights?
6. Wh	mbourg with that of the furt of Strasbourg?
	ommon to Member ates and to the existing international instruments?
	none
	none
	none some
	none some much

How often do the MEPs meet with the MNPs of their corresponding parties at European level?				
	v is the circulation of information between the MEPs and their corresponding ies?			
	Information about the agenda			
	Instructions to vote			
	Reports / Bulletins			
	Exchange of points of view in meetings			
	Informal means (telephone calls or e-mail)			
2 .l	nstitutional relations			
a) ⊦	low are the relations established between the MEPs and MNPs?			
	Dual mandate			
	Right to participate in the committee meetings with right of discussion and vote			
	Right to participate in the committee meetings with no right of discussion and			
vote Mix				
	Systematically invited			
	Occasionally invited (How many meetings took place in 1999?)			
b) Is	s there a possibility of approving common positions between MEPs and MNPs?			
3.\	Which contacts * were established in order to undertake the review of the:			
	a) creation of the European Central Bank and the democratic accountability of monetary policy?			
	b) broad guidelines relating to the economic policy of the European nmission?			
	c) environmental directives?			
	d) Agenda 2000			
	e) Luxembourg process (directives on employment)			

* . number of meetings held with the Committee on European Affairs

. number of meetings held with other specialized committees . number of meetings held within the party				
Questionnaire on Extension of Qualified Majority				
Amongst the topics concerning institutional reform under analysis by the Inter-Governmental Conference, the European Council of Helsinki identified "the possible extension of votes by a qualified majority in the Council". In fulfilling the Helsinki mandate the presidency of the IGC submitted a series of notes (documents CONFER 4705/1/00, 4706/1/00, 4707/1/00, 4708/1/00, 4709/1/00, 4710/1/00, 4737/00) on this subject for the appreciation of the Conference. The European Parliament and the European Council, as well as some member States, presented contributions on the subject.				
1. Has this question already been debated in your Parliament (through debate, report or resolution), whether in terms of matters likely to become the subject of a decision by qualified majority in the Council, or in terms of the implications of such a step?				
□ _{YES} □ _{NO}				
2. Do you agree that in all the current processes of co-decision the Council should vote by qualified majority?				
□ _{YES} □ _{NO}				
3. It has been argued that, in all cases where the Council adopts acts of a legislative nature, the decisions should be taken by qualified majority and in codecision with the European Parliament (according to the procedure set out in article 251 of the European Community Treaty). Do you think the Treaty should be altered in this respect?				
□ _{YES} □ _{NO}				
4. Do you think that there are areas, not of a "constitutional" nature, in which reinforced cooperation could be more convenient in European deepening than the extension of votes by qualified majority?				
T YES NO				
5 . Amongst the areas which have been singled out as being likely to become the subject of a decision by qualified majority, there are specifically the following:				
Tax provisions				

Social policy

Social security

	Environment
	Culture
	Industry
	Structural funds and the cohesion fund
□ citize	Visas, asylum, immigration and other policies relating to the free circulation of ns (Title IV of part III of the European Community Treaty)
	Police and judicial co-operation in penal matters (Title VI of the European Treaty)
	External relations
	CSFP
	European Monetary Union
	Reinforced cooperation (article 11 of the TEC and article 40 of the TEU)
	Some autonomous areas in the scope of article 308 of the TEC
	Measures against discrimination (article 13 of the TEC)
□ (articl	Serious and persistent violation of fundamental rights in a member State e 7 of the TEU)
Europ Instar	Nominations (President and members of the Commission, Secretary General Assistant Secretary General of the Council, the Executive Committee of the Dean Central Bank, members of the Court of Justice, the Court of First Ince, the Court of Auditors, the Committee of the Regions and the Economic Social Committee).
	ou think it is useful and desirable for decisions in all or some of these areas to ken by qualified majority?
	YES NO