

NOTE

Subject : Summary report on the plenary session ¹
– Brussels, 27 and 28 February 2003

I. Debate on the amendments to Articles 1 to 4 of the draft Constitution

Article 1

1. Chairman Giscard d'Estaing presented the amendments received, pointing out that, unsurprisingly, Article 1 and Article 2 had given rise to many amendment proposals. Article 1 is the article which defines the Union and is the foundation of the whole construction. The Chairman reminded the meeting that the Treaty is establishing a constitution. The substance of the text under discussion is a constitution, but one which takes the legal form of a treaty since, in contrast to a national constitution, the powers conferred on the Union derive from the States which conclude the Treaty. The Chairman stated that the Praesidium was willing to clarify this point by means of more appropriate wording if the Convention so wished. However, given that Article 1 was already an integral part of the constitution, it was not necessary to mention the High Contracting Parties again in that article, since they would appear in the preamble.
2. As regards the actual definition of the nature of the Union, the Chairman pointed out that a large number of Convention members found it too weak, while an equal if not larger number were opposed to the term "federal".

¹ The verbatim record of the plenary session is available on the website:
<http://european-convention.eu.int>

3. The Chairman also noted that several members of the Convention had expressed an opinion on the name to be given to the subject of the Constitution. The results of this initial survey showed a preference for the title "European Union". However, he suggested that this question be looked at again when the whole of the draft Constitutional Treaty was available.
4. Many members of the Convention took part in the debate (see attached list):
 - a number of Convention members wanted Article 1 to place more emphasis on the fact that the decision to set up a Union was the direct result of the will of the States and peoples of Europe. They suggested that Article 1 should include the words "High Contracting Parties and "Treaty". On the other hand, a large number said they were satisfied with use of the word "Constitution";
 - many members rejected the reference to "on a federal basis". They felt that it went further than the current reality or that it might be interpreted differently in different countries. On the other hand, an equally large number supported the proposed wording because they felt that it was appropriate and reflected the reality of the European Union. Some members proposed alternative definitions, such as "federation of nation States", which they felt was a better reflection of the European situation and was likely to meet with broader consensus. Other members proposed replacing the concept of "federal basis" by "supranational" or "Community";
 - several Convention members regretted the fact that the words "ever closer union" no longer appeared in the draft submitted by the Praesidium. They pointed out that the words appeared in the founding text of the European Community (Treaty of Rome) and had been retained ever since. The Chairman wondered whether they should be retained and whether the wording of the new Constitution had not robbed them of their effect;
 - a very large number of Convention members stated that they were committed to the name "European Union", which was very familiar to the public. They hoped it would be retained and incorporated in the final text;

- several Convention members asked that there be an additional article or paragraph relating to the Union symbols (for example, anthem, flag, motto, currency, holiday). The Chairman said he was interested in this proposal but stressed that the Convention should first of all give an opinion on the precise content of some of the proposed symbols (anthem in particular);
- many Convention members wanted the concept of national identity in Article 1(1) to be amplified by the addition of further terms (structures, nature and basis of Member States' political systems);
- a number of members proposed replacing the word "peoples" by "citizens", or adding the latter term to the current Article 1(1). The Chairman drew attention to the semantic difference between the two terms;
- some members of the Convention suggested that the very first article should mention the right of a Member State to leave the Union in exceptional circumstances and in accordance with an exceptional procedure. While stating that he agreed with the principle of including such an article, the Chairman said it would be more appropriate to place it among the final provisions of the Constitution.

Article 2

5. The Chairman stated that the proposed Article 2 had also provoked a very large number of reactions. He noted two main types of question in relation to this article:

- the first related to the definition and content of the values mentioned. The Chairman drew the Convention's attention to a point which seemed to him of particular importance. Article 2 must be read keeping in mind its close association with Article 45 of the Constitution, which establishes the procedure for suspending rights to Union membership in the event of a breach of the principles and values of the Union by a Member State. He reminded members that the same type of relationship existed in the current Treaty between Articles 6 and 7 TEU. To include in Article 2 values such as "equality" or "solidarity", which would not have watertight legal definitions might lead to proceedings being initiated against Member States without justification;
- a second type of debate related to the possible introduction of a reference to religion. The Chairman noted that there were a significant number of amendments along these lines. While the proposed wordings were varied, the general sense was clear. The Chairman said that the Praesidium had also held a discussion on the subject and had come to the conclusion that, if a reference were to be introduced recognising the contribution of religions to European civilisation, it would be more appropriate to insert it in the preamble than in the main body of the Constitution. He also said that the Praesidium was willing to incorporate into the structure of the Constitution the content of Amsterdam Declaration 11 on respect for the status of churches, religious associations and non-confessional organisations and to consider mentioning the contribution of churches and religious associations in the Title of the Constitution dealing with the democratic life of the Union;

- on the first point raised by the Chairman, many Convention members insisted that the list of values in Article 2 should be supplemented, in particular by adding "equality" or "equality between men and women". Others said they were satisfied with the wording adopted. Some members thought that the wording of the second sentence ("It's aim is a society at peace, through the practice of justice, tolerance, and solidarity") expressed objectives and should not therefore be included in this article. It would be more appropriate in the preamble;
- the debate on the possible inclusion of a reference to religious values was lively. Many Convention members favoured making such a reference in Article 2. They thought it necessary as a reminder of the bases of the common values in that article. These members felt that it should be possible to adopt a wording which did not discriminate against anyone. Various drafting proposals were made. Many other members were strongly against such a proposal, whatever the wording adopted. While emphasising the importance of recognising religious freedom in the Constitution, they thought that it was not the appropriate place for a reference to religious values. They pointed out that the Charter of Fundamental Rights already contained provisions guaranteeing religious freedom. Finally, other members said that they agreed with the Praesidium's proposal to consider introducing a reference to the contribution made by religions in the preamble to the Constitution. They stressed that this would be more appropriate in Article 2.

Article 3

6. The Chairman opened the debate by saying that, although a large number of suggestions for additions or clarification of various objectives had emerged from the many amendments submitted for this article, very few of them involved opposition to the basic approach adopted by the Praesidium. He noted that it would probably not be possible to incorporate all the proposed additions without making the text unreadable, but the debate could serve to define the main points which should be rendered more clearly in this text.
7. The main topics emerging from the debate were as follows:
 - a large number of Convention members proposed referring in Article 3(2) to "the social market economy" or, at the suggestion of others, "the European social model"; it was also pointed out that, subject to such an addition, the existing draft did achieve a basic political balance;
 - without necessarily disagreeing with the previous suggestion, some speakers suggested adding a reference to an "open market economy in which there is free competition", and to the objective of "non-inflationary growth";
 - a large number of speakers asked for a fuller statement of the objective of protecting and improving the environment pursuant to the principle of sustainable development;
 - many speakers wanted to add the idea of "territorial cohesion";
 - there was a heated debate about the objective of "full employment", which many members would like to replace by a reference to a "high level of employment", while a number of other speakers said that they were happy with the current wording chosen by the Praesidium, which they qualified as moderate;

- some speakers suggested that the types of discrimination to be combated by the Union should be specified;
- others felt that express mention should be made of various elements of the "European social model", such as combating social exclusion, promoting the quality of work and/or access to high education and training, and high-quality services of general interest;
- a number of speakers opposed the reference to the "discovery of space" so as to avoid discriminating against other equally important areas of research;
- there were also calls to include a reference to cross-border cooperation among regions;
- some speakers suggested mentioning in paragraph 3 not only respect for cultural diversity, but also linguistic diversity, and even the rights of minorities;
- with respect to paragraph 4, several members called for a wording that was more "open" to the world. Others suggested including a reference to the security and/or integrity of Europe. A number of speakers suggested simply referring to "respect for international law" and/or mentioning the United Nations and its Charter. Moreover, several contributors argued that the text should refer to fundamental rights in general, and not just children's rights;
- several speakers wanted the Constitution to incorporate the clauses obliging the Union to take account of environmental protection requirements and to promote equality between men and women in all its policies;
- finally, some contributors underlined the importance of the principle of the Union providing itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies.

Article 4

8. The debate confirmed that there was broad consensus on this provision giving legal personality to the Union.

II. Debate on the amendments to Articles 5 to 7 of the draft Constitution

Article 5

9. Vice-Chairman Dehaene introduced the debate on this article by underlining that the Praesidium had attempted to express, in a single provision, the two elements of the consensus that had been reached, i.e. the integration of the Charter into the Constitution and a clause allowing the Union to accede to the European Convention on Human Rights.
10. The debate confirmed that there was broad agreement on these two elements. Moreover, a large number of speakers expressed their preference for either inserting the Charter into the first part of the Constitution (which they argued would facilitate the wording of Articles 2 and 3 or – and this second alternative was acceptable only as a compromise solution to some members - establishing that the Charter constituted a second part of the Constitution, to be inserted between the first part and the part on the Union's policies. Some members supported including the text of the Charter as a protocol. Others emphasised the importance of the amendments to the wording of the Charter suggested by Working Group II and of completing the "Explanations" on the Charter drawn up by the Praesidium of the previous Convention.
11. Various speakers wanted paragraph 2 strengthened by laying down an obligation for the Union to apply for accession to the ECHR, with a view to minimising the risk of accession being blocked under the unanimity rule. Some speakers also called for mention to be made in this paragraph of possible accession to other international conventions on human rights.

Articles 6 and 7

12. In presenting the amendments made to the draft wording of Article 6, and also in relation to Article 7, Vice-Chairman Dehaene highlighted the major question of whether – and to what extent – these provisions overlapped with those of the Charter. He explained that the Praesidium had nonetheless considered it appropriate to include these provisions on non-discrimination and citizens' rights in the first part, in view of their overriding importance. He also pointed out that, with its draft Article 6, the Praesidium wished to confirm exactly how the law stood at present.
13. The question of overlapping was at the heart of the debate, and a number of speakers argued that if the Charter was integrated into the first part or into a new part 2, then the current Article 6 could be deleted and Article 7 could be considerably shortened since it would no longer have to list citizens' rights. Others favoured keeping such a list. Some speakers observed that, in addition to the articles in the Charter, it would be necessary in any event to establish the necessary legal bases by incorporating those of Articles 12, 13 and 18 to 22 TEC, which could be done in the part of the Constitution on policies.
14. In relation to Article 6, a number of speakers called for the prohibition to be extended to other forms of discrimination.

III. Presentation of draft Articles 24 et seq. on the instruments

15. The President underlined that in drawing up its draft for Title V, the Praesidium had kept in view the important objective of simplification as set out in the Laeken declaration. It had based its drafting on the results of the Working Group, as well as the debate in plenary on this issue.

16. Article 24 reflected the wide consensus in support of a reduction in the number of instruments available to the Union in the exercise of its competences. The new instruments would apply across all policy areas, although with specific procedures, where this was considered necessary by the Convention. At the same time the Praesidium was proposing a simplification of the names of the instruments. The articles introduced a clearer distinction between legislative and non-legislative acts, and renamed the procedure for the adoption of legislative acts as the "legislative procedure". It was clear that there would be some exceptions to this rule, and the Praesidium would submit proposals to the Convention on the proposed scope of this procedure, and potential exceptions.
17. As recommended by the Working Group, and despite certain doubts which had been expressed during the plenary debate, the Praesidium proposed the creation of a new type of act – the "delegated act". An important aspect of simplification was ensuring that the legislator concentrated on the essential, and left more detailed and technical aspects to the Commission, whilst retaining the power to call back legislation should that prove necessary. The provisions had also been drafted in an effort to achieve greater clarity, and specified that the choice of legal instrument should be guided by the principle of proportionality. The set of articles concluded with the necessary references to publication and entry into force.
18. The President invited members of the Convention to send comments and suggestions for changes to this set of draft articles. Those arriving by 8 March would be taken into account in the analysis of amendments which would be circulated in advance of the debate on these articles to take place at the plenary on 17 and 18 March.

IV. Debate on the amendments to Articles 8 to 16 of the draft Constitution

19. Vice President Amato introduced the debate by noting that in general Articles 8 and 9 had been well received, although several amendments had called for a further express mention of the fact that the Union's powers flow directly from competences transferred by the Member States. Some had called for the deletion of the reference to the primacy of EU law; there had also been a call for combining Articles 8 and 9.

20. Articles 10 to 15 dealt with the delimitation of competences. None of the proposals for amendment had challenged the approach taken by the Praesidium. Some of them questioned the need for lists in all three categories, or proposed including additional areas in one or more of the categories. In particular a considerable number had questioned the suggested inclusion of the four freedoms within the area of exclusive competence. Some had questioned the need for a separate paragraph covering research and development cooperation, and wished to see these transferred either to the areas of shared competences or to the list of supporting actions. Others called for the deletion of the separate article on economic policy coordination and/or the following article on CFSP; while some suggested redrafting these articles. On Article 16, most members of the Convention seemed to support its inclusion, although some sought to modify the suggested procedure.

Articles 8 and 9: principles and application of principles

21. In opening the debate, certain members of the Convention noted that the articles on competences should make clear that it was not the Constitution which was conferring competences on the Union, but rather the Member States "in" the Constitution. Some raised the possibility of defining the principle of subsidiarity in greater detail, particularly as regards its more "positive" dimension, or to make this principle applicable even to the exercise of exclusive competences.
22. A number of suggestions were made on the structure of the articles, particularly with a view to avoiding repetition as regards the principle of loyal cooperation and national identity. Several speakers suggested merging Articles 8 and 9. Others proposed dealing with the principles of loyal cooperation and primacy, as well as respect for national identity, in a broader context than that of the competences, for example, in Title I of the Convention. With respect to the principle of primacy, one member drew attention to the risks of formalising and rigidly defining a principle developed by the Court of Justice.

Article 10: Categories of competence

23. On the whole, the approach and definition of the categories of competence was well received. Some members queried the need for paragraphs 3 and 4 (coordination of economic policies and CFSP), as they did not define categories of competence in the strict sense.

Article 11: Exclusive competences

24. A number of Convention members suggested that "exclusive" competences should be renamed the Union's "own" or "conferred" competences. Others expressed a preference for "exclusive". Some of those members preferring "own competences" suggested that these might cover additional areas, in particular the internal market, economic and social cohesion and the financing of the Union. CFSP and the area of freedom, security and justice were also mentioned by some members. However, other members had misgivings about the Union having exclusive competence for certain areas, in particular the four freedoms of movement and some aspects of commercial policy perceived as sensitive.

Article 12: Shared competences

25. Some Convention members did not want the category of shared competences, which is a residual category, to provide a list of the principal areas of application. Others, on the contrary, proposed adding areas, such as combating discrimination, equality between men and women, immigration policy, services of general interest, tax aspects of the internal market, disaster protection, animal protection, and so on. A few members took the view that public health was an area for supporting action.

Article 13: The coordination of economic policies

26. Many Convention members proposed that the coordination of economic, social and employment policies be taken together as a whole. Some indicated that it was not the Union as such that coordinated economic policies but the Member States or at the very least the Council. Others stressed the need not to move backwards in this area, recalling in particular that the current Treaty refers to "economic policy" and not just to coordination.

Article 14: The common foreign and security policy

27. A number of Convention members were in favour of mentioning the common defence policy in this Article.

Article 15: Areas for supporting action

28. Several Convention members suggested making the system more flexible by not having an exhaustive list of areas for supporting action. Certain members did not wish to rule out in advance the possibility of harmonisation, albeit minimal, in the areas for supporting action, while others wanted it to be made clear that certain shared competences might also give rise to supporting action. Some members expressed a preference for the name "complementary competences" rather than "areas for supporting action".

Article 16: Flexibility clause

29. Several members made alternative proposals as regards the procedure for adopting measures under this clause, in particular concerning the role of the European Parliament and the Council vote (qualified majority). Certain members proposed redrafting the clause so that it could work in both directions, i.e. also to curtail a Union competence. Others favoured limiting in time the applicability of acts adopted by this procedure (*sunset clause*). Finally, some members proposed changing the name "flexibility clause".

Article on mainstreaming

30. A number of Convention members called for certain horizontal competence clauses affecting all policy areas (*mainstreaming*), particularly matters concerning the environment and the equality of men and women, to be included in Part I of the Constitution.

V. Next meeting of the Convention

31. The President announced that the next meeting of the Convention would take place on the afternoon of Monday 17 March and the morning of Tuesday 18 March. It would be devoted to a discussion of the Title V, (Articles 24 et seq.). He also drew attention to an indicative note from the Praesidium (CONV 586/03) showing the proposed future work programme.
-

THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION

Plenary session on Thursday 27 and Friday 28 February 2003

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Thursday 27 February

I. Debate on draft Articles 1 to 7

- (a) Nature of the Union, conferral of powers by Member States and respect for national identities**
- (b) Definition and articulation of the Union's values and objectives**
- (c) Charter articulation and integration**
- (d) Scope of the non-discrimination clause**
- (e) Definition of citizenship and the rights flowing therefrom**

Mr Jens-Peter BONDE, European Parliament

Mr Josef ZIELENIEC - Czech Rep. (Parliament)

Mr Ben FAYOT - Luxembourg (Parliament)

Mr Gianfranco FINI - Italy (Government)

Mr Erwin TEUFEL - Germany (Parliament)

Mr Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS – Lithuania (Parliament) (interpreter)

Mr Antonio VITORINO - Commission

Ms Sandra KALNIETE - Latvia (Government)

Mr Caspar EINEM - Austria (Parliament)

Mr Alain LAMASSOURE - European Parliament

Mr Hannes FARNLEITNER - Austria (Government)

(Blue cards : Spini, MacCormick, Dybkjaer, Wuermeling)

Mr Alberto COSTA - Portugal (Parliament)

Mr Jürgen MEYER - Germany (Parliament)

Mr Dominique de VILLEPIN - France (Government)

Ms Linda McAVAN - European Parliament

Mr Goran LENNMARKER - Sweden (Parliament)

Mr Joschka FISCHER - Germany (Government)

Mr Lamberto DINI - Italy (Parliament)

Mr Elio DI RUPO - Belgium (Parliament)

Ms. Lenka ROVNA - Czech Rep. (Government)

Mr Olivier DUHAMEL - European Parliament

(Blue cards : Kiljunen, Roche, Maclellann, Borrell-Borrell)

Ms Pervenche BERÈS, European Parliament

Mr Oguz DEMIRALP - Turkey (Government)

Ms Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN - European Parliament

Mr Manuel Lobo ANTUNES - Portugal (Government)

Mr Marco FOLLINI - Italy (Parliament)

Mr Pat CAREY - Ireland (Parliament)

Mr Pierre LEQUILLIER - France (Parliament)

Baroness SCOTLAND - United Kingdom (Government)

Mr Alexandru ATHANASIOU - Romania (Parliament)

Mr Péter BALÁZS - Hungary (Government)

Mr René van der LINDEN - Netherlands (Parliament)

Mr Louis MICHEL - Belgium (Government)

(Cartons bleus : Abitbol, Duff, Barnier, Van Lancker, Heathcoat-Amory)

Elmar BROK - European Parliament

Mr Timothy KIRKHOPE - European Parliament

Mr Matti VANHANEN - Finland (Parliament)

Ms Ana PALACIO - Spain (Government)

Mr Andrew Nicholas DUFF, European Parliament

Ms Lena HJELM-WALLÉN - Sweden (Government)

Mr Michel BARNIER - Commission

Ms Elena PACIOTTI - European Parliament

Ms Cristiana MUSCARDINI - European Parliament

Mr Peter SKAARUP - Denmark (Parliament)

Ms Neli KUTSKOVA - Bulgaria (Government)

Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)

Jozsef SZÁJER - Hungary (Parliament)

Mr Dimitrij RUPEL - Slovenia (Government)

Mr Johannes VOGGENHUBER - European Parliament

Mr Peter SERRACINO-INGLOTT - Malta (Government)
Mr Jan FIGEL - Slovak Rep. (Parliament)
Mr Dick ROCHE, Ireland (Government)
Mr Adrian SEVERIN - Romania (Parliament)
(Blue cards : Baroness Scotland, Tiilikainen, Van Lancker, Nagy, Kiljunen)
Mr Jens-Peter BONDE - European Parliament
Ms Marietta GIANNAKOU - Greece (Parliament)
Mr Jelko KACIN - Slovenia (Parliament)
Mr Antonio TAJANI - European Parliament
Mr Edmund WITTBRODT - Poland (Parliament)
Mr Mihael BREJC - Slovenia (Parliament)
Mr Hubert HAENEL - France (Parliament)
Mr Henrik HOLOLEI - Estonia (Government)
Ms Eduarda AZEVEDO - Portugal (Parliament)
Mr Alexander ARABADJIEV – Bulgaria (Parliament)
Ms. Sylvia-Yvonne KAUFMANN - European Parliament
Mr Proinsias DE ROSSA - Ireland (Parliament)
Mr Michael ATTALIDIS - Cyprus (Government)
Mr Danny PIETERS- Belgium (Parliament)
Ms Helle THORNING-SCHMIDT - European Parliament
Mr Jacob SÖDERMAN - Mediator
Mr Manfred DAMMEYER - Committee of the Regions

THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION
Plenary session on Thursday 27 and Friday 28 February 2003

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Friday 28 February

III. Debate on draft Articles 8 to 16

- (a) The concept of categories of competence; the three lists (two exhaustive and one indicative)**
- (b) The content of the lists and the specific cases of economic policy, CFSP, research and development and development aid**
- (c) The principles governing the use of competences, including subsidiarity and proportionality**

Mr David HEATHCOAT-AMORY - United Kingdom (Parliament)

Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)

Mr Alain LAMASSOURE - European Parliament

Ms Teija TIILIKAINEN - Finland (Government)

Mr Joschka FISCHER - Germany (Government)

Mr Michel BARNIER - Commission

Mr Klaus HÄNSCH - European Parliament

Ms Lena HJELM-WALLÉN - Sweden (Government)

Mr Josep BORRELL - Spain (Parliament)

Ms Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN - European Parliament

Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament

Mr Paraskevas AVGERINOS - Greece (Parliament)

Mr Manuel Lobo ANTUNES - Portugal (Government)

Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finland (Parliament)

Mr Alfonso DASTIS - Spain (Government)

(Blue cards : Speroni, Van Eekelen, Lopez-Garrido, MacCormick)

Mr Jürgen MEYER - Germany (Parliament)

Mr Carlos CARNERO - European Parliament

Mr Luis MARINHO - European Parliament

Ms. Pascale ANDREANI - France (Government)

Mr William ABITBOL - European Parliament

Mr Valdo SPINI - Italy (Parliament)

Mr Ben FAYOT - Luxembourg (Parliament)

Mr Algirdas GRICIUS - Lithuania (Parliament)

interpreter

Mr Dick ROCHE - Ireland (Government)

Mr Nicolas SCHMIT - Luxembourg (Government)

Mr Joachim WUERMELING - European Parliament

Sir Neil MACCORMICK - European Parliament

(Blue cards : Baroness of Scotland, Paciotti, Duff, Van Lancker, Severin)

Ms Maria BERGER - European Parliament

Mr Pierre LEQUILLIER - France (Parliament)

Baroness SCOTLAND - United Kingdom (Government)

Mr Alberto COSTA - Portugal (Parliament)

Ms Genowefa GRABOWSKA - Poland (Parliament)

Mr Erwin TEUFEL - Germany (Parliament)

Ms Anne VAN LANCKER - European Parliament

Mr Göran LENNMARKER - Sweden (Parliament)

(Blue cards : Fayot, Wuermeling, Queiró, Barnier, Severin, MacCormick, Berès, Farnleitner)

Mr Peter SERRACINO-INGLOTT - Malta (Government)

Ms Marta FOGLER - Poland (Parliament)

Mr Reinhard BÖSCH - Austria (Parliament)

Mr Henrik HOLOLEI - Estonia (Government)

Mr Esko SEPPÄNEN - European Parliament

(Blue cards : Lord Tomlinson, Lennmarker, Kauppi, Méndez de Vigo, Baroness of Scotland, Abitbol, Duff, Barnier)

Mr Emilio GABAGLIO, Social partners

Mr Elmar BROK - European Parliament

Baroness SCOTLAND - United Kingdom (Government)

Ms Anne VAN LANCKER; European Parliament

Mr Michel BARNIER - Commission

Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament

Sir Neil MACCORMICK - (European Parliament)

Ms Teija TIILIKAINEN - Finland (Government)

Baroness SCOTLAND - United Kingdom (Government)

Mr Elmar BROK - European Parliament

Mr Göran LENNMARKER - Sweden (Parliament)

Mr Emilio GABAGLIO - Social partners

=====