

**NOTE**

---

Subject :           **Summary Report of the Plenary Session**  
                          **- Brussels, 24 and 25 April 2003**<sup>1</sup>

---

**1.     Presentation of new draft Articles**

**Institutions**

The President informed the Convention that the European Council meeting in Athens on 16 April had confirmed that the results of the Convention should be presented to the next European Council in Salonika on 20 June. This was therefore now the firm deadline to which the Convention must work.

Noting that the Convention now faced the most difficult phase of its work, the President presented draft articles on Institutions (articles 14 - 23). The various interventions so far had underlined the existence of differences of view over the type of Europe which the Convention wanted. Some preferred modest improvements to the institutional system, considering that existing arrangements in general best protected their rights. Others were more ambitious, seeking a more federal model, with new transfers of powers to the Commission and Parliament. A third group took a middle position, searching for the best balance between the exercise of powers at European and national levels. Yet, despite these differences, the Convention had built up a sense of common identity, and common purpose, on which it must now draw.

Progress would depend on a number of factors. Firstly the Convention had to keep in mind that it was proposing a Constitution, not simply rewriting the detailed provisions of the existing treaties.

---

<sup>1</sup>     A verbatim record of the plenary meeting is available on the website  
[www.european-convention.eu.int](http://www.european-convention.eu.int).

Secondly, we must produce a single coherent structure, encapsulating the twin nature of the Union, that of a Union of peoples and states, which meant that we could not resort to the simplicities of a centralised state. Thirdly, there was a need to provide for future flexibility. But, finally we had to be ambitious about the possible life-span of our Constitution; the work of the founding fathers had produced progress over the next fifty years: we must give Europe a durable framework for its development over the next fifty years.

The President said that the Praesidium's proposals had been based on three main principles which had been cited by all during the course of the Convention's discussions on institutional issues, including the major debate in January.

First, the principle of equality of citizens and of Member States. The proposed articles reflected both aspects. For example the European Council and Council of Ministers reflected the equality of rights of the Member States; the European Parliament represented the equality of citizens; whereas the Commission defined and expressed the general European interest. Respect for both aspects of equality was the right way to avoid an artificial opposition between large and small Member States.

Second, the need to preserve and reinforce the institutional triangle. Enlargement called for reform of all three main institutions, to enable them to fulfil their respective missions. It was wrong to see each institution as defending a particular vision of the Union: each had a specific role, and reform of all three should ensure the maintenance of the proper balance.

Third, the need to reinforce the Community method. This implied strengthening not simply of one or other institution, but the system as a whole. Some important decisions had already been taken by the Convention which would have implications for the institutions – for example the issues of judicial and security cooperation and economic governance, as well as the establishment of a Foreign Minister with a double role. The effectiveness of the new aspects of these policy areas would depend crucially on the ability of the institutions to deliver.

The President then took the Convention, article by article, through the texts on institutions, as set out in document CONV 691/03.

A number of interventions from members of the Convention followed this presentation. Several welcomed the proposed articles, which they considered a useful basis for the Convention's work. Certain others considered that the text as a whole did not accurately reflect the balance of views already expressed within the Convention. Several complained about the fact that the press had been made aware of the content of the articles. One member suggested that time be set aside on 25 April for a preliminary debate on them, and several asked about the subsequent timetable envisaged by the Praesidium for their discussion of the articles.

The President agreed that time was short; but repeated the deadline fixed by the European Council had to be respected. He noted that the Convention had now received all sections of the draft of Part I of the Constitution, as promised. The text would be revised by the Praesidium to take into account the written amendments received, as well as the debates in plenary, which on the institutional articles would take place on 15 May, and would then be circulated in time for the plenary session at the end of May. Similarly, a full text of Part II, incorporating those new elements already discussed by the Convention, would be circulated by the end of May. An introductory debate on institutions on 25 April would be possible, but only if time allowed: there were other important issues on the agenda for discussion.

### **External Action**

Vice President Jean-Luc Dehaene presented the draft articles on external action (CONV 685/03), which included draft texts for articles 29 and 30 of Part I, draft articles for title B of Part II and a proposal for a "solidarity clause" for Parts I and II of the Constitution.

The draft articles took into account the results of working group VII on external action, working group VIII on defence, as well as the debates of the Convention on these issues.

Vice President Dehaene underlined that the objective of the new texts was to introduce institutional and procedural arrangements which would strengthen solidarity among Member States and create the necessary political will for the Union to act collectively on the international stage, as well as promote the coherent and effective use of instruments in support of common interests.

On the structure of the text, Vice President Dehaene indicated that all the legal bases for the different policy areas of external action were now grouped under one title in Part II. This included at the beginning two horizontal articles which set out the principles and objectives of the EU's external action, and provided for the use of instruments which could cover the full range of external policy. He stressed that the aim of the new structure was to present a coherent overview of the means available to enable the Union to act effectively on the international stage. The aim was not however to harmonise instruments or procedures: different modalities would continue to exist for different policy areas falling under this title.

The proposal to create an EU Minister for Foreign Affairs represented a major change in the institutional arrangements, with important implications for the formulation and implementation of the EU's external policy. The Minister would have specific responsibilities in the areas of CFSP and ESDP, where he would act within the framework of a mandate from the European Council or the Council. The Minister would at the same time be a member of the Commission with responsibilities in the field of external action. As a Vice President of the Commission, the Minister would oversee the co-ordination within the Commission of the different aspects of external action falling under its responsibility. Decisions in these areas would continue to be subject to the normal Commission procedures, whereas the Minister's proposals in the area of CFSP/ESDP would not be subject to the principle of collegiality. It was also proposed that Commission delegations be turned into EU delegations, operating under the authority of the Minister.

Vice President Dehaene highlighted the main changes proposed for individual policy areas, as set out in the cover note to CONV 685/03. He drew attention in particular to the proposals for extending the use of QMV, the introduction of new forms of flexibility under ESDP, the creation of a new legal base for humanitarian assistance, the new consolidated article on restrictive measures (sanctions), and the proposed single legal base covering international agreements.

The President invited members of the Convention to submit written amendments to both the Institutions and External Action articles before the next plenary session. However he underlined that only amendments received by Monday 5 May could be taken into account in the analyses drawn up by the secretariat.

## 2. Debate on draft Articles on:

### (a) **Title VI: The democratic life of the Union (CONV 650/03, CONV 670/03)**

The Chairman introduced the debate on Articles 33 to 37, Title VI of Part One of the Constitution, on the democratic life of the Union. A total of 235 amendments concerning these draft articles were submitted in time to be taken into account in the summary sheet (CONV 670/03). Apart from amendments directly concerning the draft articles, some Convention members had also submitted amendments proposing to add other articles to this Title, e.g. on "citizens' legislative initiatives", "the right of petition", "the European referendum", "the social dialogue" and "the role of the social partners in defining the social dimension of the Union", "media pluralism", the principles of good administration" and "dialogue with the regions and local authorities". Others proposed adding elements relating to some of these areas to Articles 33 to 37.

During the debate, there was little discussion of Article 33 which posits the principle of democratic equality. A number of Convention members wanted to specify that "citizens" referred to "European citizens". Others suggested adding "equality between Member States" to the principle of equality of citizens to take account of the dual legitimacy of the Union, as a Union of peoples and of States.

A large number of Convention members spoke on Article 34 on the principle of participatory democracy. Most speakers wanted the role of the social partners and independent social dialogue to be mentioned in this article, or in a separate article in this Title. Some also wanted Article 34, or a separate article, to mention representative democracy, notably by adding references to European referenda, European Parliament elections, the right of petition, or references to the European Parliament and to the Council as well as to the role of national parliaments. A few Convention members suggested mentioning the dialogue with regional and local authorities. Two speakers proposed adding a reference to youth associations.

As regards Article 35, several speakers wanted it stated that the European Ombudsman is appointed by the European Parliament, and some of them expressed their preference for stating that he is elected by the European Parliament. Certain Convention members wanted to reproduce other aspects of the current Article 195 TEC, such as the Ombudsman's independence, mandate or the exclusion the Court of Justice and the Court of First Instance from his field of action. One speaker proposed adding to the text that the European Ombudsman was to cooperate with the Member States' ombudsmen. Two speakers suggested that a reference be made to the ombudsman in the Title on the institutions.

Various requests were made in relation to Article 35a on political parties at European level. A number of Convention members wanted the whole of the current Article 191 TEC to be reproduced, and a legal basis to be added for the establishment of European political parties. Others wanted the text to state that the internal organisation of parties should be democratic or that they should respect the values of the Union.

Many Convention members expressed their support for Article 36 on the transparency of the proceedings of the Union's institutions and Article 36a on the protection of personal data. However, some suggested that the text of Article 36 be amended to cover all the Union's institutions, and some wanted it also to cover the bodies and agencies established by the Constitution (the existing text mentions the bodies and agencies established by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission). Some others called for clear definition of the exceptions to the transparency of Council meetings or for an addition stating that the minutes of Council meetings should be public. A few Convention members wanted Article 36 to mention the freedom of expression of staff members of the Union's institutions. One speaker suggested that Article 36 should provide not only for access to the documents drawn up by the Union's institutions, but also to those they have in their possession.

There were many interventions on Article 37 which lays down the status of churches and non-confessional organisations and essentially reproduces the wording of Declaration 11 annexed to the Treaty of Amsterdam. Most of the Convention members who took the floor expressed their

satisfaction with the wording chosen by the Praesidium and indicated their desire to maintain such a provision. Several members noted that it was in keeping with the conclusions of the contact group with civil society devoted to culture held in May 2002, which had been chaired by Mr Peterle.

Another smaller group, while not questioning the validity of Article 37, expressed doubts about the wording chosen. Some members wanted Article 37 to be limited to churches and not to cover "philosophical and non-confessional organisations". Several speakers found the term "philosophical" difficult to understand and suggested replacing it with "cultural". One Convention member was worried about the legal consequences of such a provision for national law. Lastly, several Convention members wanted to specify somehow that the dialogue envisaged in paragraph 3 should not involve confessional or non-confessional organisations which endangered the integrity of the individual and did not respect the values enshrined in this Constitution.

Several Convention members regretted that no draft article had been submitted concerning the open method of coordination and insisted on the importance of drafting such an article. Some members proposed setting up a technical group to draft it. Moreover, a few Convention members requested that the principle of good administration be mentioned either in this Title or elsewhere in the Constitution.

Other speakers mentioned the duplication of parts of articles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights in this Title and called for the deletion of the identical parts in the articles under discussion.

In his conclusions, the Chairman took note of the comments made by a number of Convention members on the duplication of parts of articles of the Charter in this Title. He pointed out, however, that some highlighting of questions also raised in the Charter in these articles might be entirely legitimate.

The Chairman noted that although some members had suggested adding "equality between Member States" to the text, Article 33 on the principle of democratic equality had not been challenged. The most frequent call during the debate was to reflect the role of the social partners and independent

social dialogue in Article 34 on the principle of participatory democracy. The Chairman drew attention to the fact that the provisions of the existing treaties on the role of the social partners and social dialogue would be included elsewhere in the Constitution, but appreciated the desire to add a reference to this article in Part One. The Chairman also noted the proposals by certain Convention members to include aspects of representative democracy in this Title.

The Chairman found that most of those who mentioned the European Ombudsman (Article 35) wanted it stated clearly that he is appointed by the European Parliament, and some also requested that his role be made explicit. The Chairman made the point that a range of different requests had been made in relation to Article 35a on political parties at European level. Some Convention members wanted the whole of Article 191 TEC to be reproduced and others had suggested additions concerning the democratic nature of the internal organisation of parties and their respect for the Union's values. The Chairman pointed out that it did not seem appropriate to intervene in the rules governing the internal organisation of political parties, and that the issue was rather a matter for the Member States. The Chairman subsequently identified fairly broad support for Article 36 on the transparency of the proceedings of the Union's institutions and Article 36a on the protection of personal data.

Regarding Article 37 on the status of churches and non-confessional organisations, the Chairman noted explicit support among many Convention members for this provision in the Treaty, but also that some had doubts about paragraph 3 on the organisation of a structured dialogue.

Lastly, the Chairman noted the fact that a number of Convention members had expressed regret that no article on the open method of coordination had been included among the draft texts. The Praesidium would resume its discussion on this issue before submitting revised versions of the draft articles submitted to date.



**(b) Title IX: The Union and its immediate environment (CONV 649/03, CONV 671/03) of Part I of the Constitutional Treaty**

The Convention briefly debated draft Article 42 on the Union and its immediate environment.

Whilst several members of the Convention questioned whether such an article should be placed in Part I of the Constitution (some suggested that the concept could be subsumed within the Part II external relations articles), most considered that the Union's relationship with its neighbours was sufficiently important to warrant a separate Title and article as put forward by the Praesidium.

Several speakers proposed that the article should include a reference to the need for such a relationship to be governed by basic democratic principles, the respect for human rights and the rule of law. A number wished to include a reference to the role of the Council of Europe and perhaps other international organisations as a bridge between the Union and its neighbouring countries, many of whom were members of the Council of Europe.

The President concluded that there was broad support from the Convention for the inclusion of such an article. The Praesidium would reflect on the other elements put forward in the debate.

**3. Debate on draft Articles on:**

**(a) Title X : Union membership (CONV 648/03, CONV 672/03) of Part I of the Constitutional Treaty**

Some speakers asked that in Article 43, the requirement that the peoples of the candidate State should respect the values of the Union should be deleted, since respect of those values by the candidate State should suffice. One speaker asked that Article 43 should include the Copenhagen criteria. Others asked that the sentence stating that accession to the Union implied acceptance of its Constitution should be deleted, as they considered it to be superfluous. One speaker asked that the whole provision should be deleted, or, if retained, that a reference to the objectives of the Union and to the Charter of Fundamental Rights should be added.

According to one speaker, the agreement referred to in Article 44 should be between the candidate State and the Union and not between the candidate State and the Member States individually. This would make it possible to recognise the role of the Commission in the accession negotiations, by aligning the accession procedure with the procedure for the conclusion of international agreements.

One speaker asked that the decisions referred to in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Article 45 should be adopted following the assent of the European Parliament.

Article 46 attracted most attention. A majority of speakers asked that it should be retained, in the belief that any Member State should be able to leave the Union. However, several asked that the right to withdraw should be subject to stricter conditions and procedures than those proposed by the Praesidium: the right to withdraw should not be unilateral, but subject to a decision by the Union and to the conclusion of an agreement between the Union and the withdrawing Member State. Some also raised the possibility of creating the status of associated State, for States which left the Union.

Some speakers were in favour of limiting the right to withdraw to exceptional cases, for example on occasions when the Constitution was being amended. Some asked for a link to be made between Article 46 and Article F, granting the right to leave the Union to Member States who would not ratify an amendment to the Constitution. One speaker opposed the establishment of such a link, believing that this would change the right of voluntary withdrawal into a clause on expulsion from the Union.

As regards procedure, some speakers suggested that the European Council or the Council should unanimously adopt a decision on a request by a Member State to leave the Union. Others proposed that the same procedure should be followed for withdrawal as for accession to the Union. One speaker asked that the Council should act following the assent of the European Parliament.

Some other speakers asked that this provision should be deleted, believing that since this possibility already existed by virtue of the Vienna Convention, there was no need to provide for it expressly in the Constitution; if, on the other hand, the Vienna Convention was not applicable, the addition of this provision would change the nature of the Union.

**(b) Part Three: General and final provisions (CONV 647/03, CONV 673/03)**

Vice-President Amato introduced the debate, drawing attention to the fact that since the Convention had not yet debated this question, the procedure proposed by the Praesidium in Article F reproduced that existing in the current Treaties. However, he pointed out that the text could be amended to take account of views emerging during the plenary session.

The debate concentrated on Articles F and G. As regards Article E, some members of the Convention were in favour of also giving the right of initiative to amend the Constitution to the European Parliament. Some argued that this right of initiative should also be granted to the national parliaments.

The great majority of members of the Convention suggested that a new paragraph should be inserted into Article F, laying down that the Intergovernmental Conference should be prepared for by a Convention convened by the European Council or the Council, composed of representatives of the European Parliament, of national parliaments, of the Governments of the Member States and of the Commission, along the lines of the procedure followed for drawing up the Constitution. However, some favoured proposals for amendments being examined by the Intergovernmental Conference alone.

Amongst the majority who favoured the incorporation of the Convention method into the Constitutional Treaty, some members of the Convention would like to retain some flexibility for purely technical or minor amendments, stipulating that recourse should not be had to the Convention for that type of amendment. In this context, it was proposed that it should be possible for the European Council to decide unanimously not to convene a Convention in the case of technical or minor amendments, unless there was a request to the contrary by some minimum number of Member States.

Some proposed that there should be different revision procedures for Part One and Part Two. They felt that whilst Part One should be revised by an Intergovernmental Conference prepared by a Convention, Part Two could be revised by a simplified procedure (e.g. by the Council following the consultation or assent of the European Parliament, or by the Parliament and the Council in accordance with the legislative procedure). Two members of the Convention proposed different revision procedures, not for each Part but for each area, along the lines of the former Article 95 of the ECSC Treaty. They felt that amendments to the constitutional elements of the Treaty and of the Charter on Fundamental Rights should always be made by the fuller procedure.

On the other hand, for the revision of Part Two, some proposed replacing the rule of common accord by the Member States with a more flexible rule (e.g. 4/5 of the Member States). However, others favoured maintaining the unanimity rule. A number of members of the Convention indicated that they were unable to accept different revision procedures for different Parts, or procedures which replaced the requirement for ratification by the Member States.

As regards the entry into force of agreed amendments, some speakers felt that in a Europe of 25 members, a single Member State could not be allowed to prevent the others from applying a new Treaty. They therefore proposed that future amendments to the Constitutional Treaty should come into force once a certain threshold of ratifications had been achieved. Some mentioned a threshold of 4/5 of Member States. Some asked that a requirement for ratification by national parliaments and/or the European Parliament should be added.

As regards Article G, some members of the Convention observed that, while some degree of flexibility was desirable for the entry into force of future amendments to the Constitution, such flexibility could not be applied for the entry into force of the Constitution itself, given that the current Treaties did not contain provisions to that effect. As a result, ratification by all the Member States would be necessary for the Constitution to enter into force. One member proposed that a Declaration should be attached to the Final Act of signature of the Constitutional Treaty, with the same content as Article G(3) proposed by the Praesidium.

Some members of the Convention felt that it would be desirable for the new Constitution to be submitted to a referendum in all the Member States.

As regards Article B, some members asked that the wording of the reference to the case-law of the Court of Justice should be reviewed, or that the reference should be deleted.

On Article C, one member asked that the outermost regions and the OCT should appear in Part One of the Constitution. Others proposed that the principle of territorial cohesion should be included in the Constitution. One member of the Convention asked that a Protocol on the Åland Islands should be annexed to the Constitutional Treaty.

As regards Article I, one member proposed that a new Article on the status of languages in the Union should be incorporated into the Constitution.

At the end of the debate, Vice-Chairman Amato concluded that the Convention would examine on a case-by-case basis those provisions of the Constitution which might be subject to a simplified revision procedure; this procedure would then be referred to in the relevant specific articles. He felt that the role of the European Parliament in the procedure for revising the Constitutional Treaty and the voting rule for the adoption of future amendments to the Treaty should also be examined.

#### **4. Next meeting of the Convention**

Vice-Chairman Amato reminded the Convention that the next plenary meeting would take place on Thursday 15 and Friday 16 May and last for the two full days, starting at 09:30 and ending at 20:00. It would be devoted to discussions on the draft articles on institutions, and on external action/defence.

---

List of speakers following order of intervention.

**Plenary meeting 24 and 25 April 2003  
LIST OF SPEAKERS  
(following order of intervention)**

**Thursday 24 April**

**Presentation of new draft Articles**

*(Blue cards: HAENEL, EINEM, FISCHER, FAYOT, KATIFORIS, BROK, SPINI, MALJ-WEGGEN, KILJUNEN, FARNLEITNER, DUFF, LEQUILLER, VOGGENHUBER)*

**Title VI: The democratic life of the Union: general debate**

1. Mr Göran LENNMARKER - Sweden (Parliament)
  2. Mr Jan KOHOUT - Czech Republic (Government)
  3. Mr Joschka FISCHER - Germany (Government)
  4. Mr Pierre LEQUILLER - France (Parliament)
  5. Ms Lena HJELM-WALLÉN - Sweden (Government)
  6. Mr Alojz PETERLE - Slovenia (Parliament)
  7. Mr Jozef OLEKSY - Poland (Parliament)
  8. Mr Valdo SPINI - Italy (Parliament)
  9. Mr Caspar EINEM - Austria (Parliament)
  10. Mr Panayotis DEMETRIOU - Cyprus (Parliament)
  11. Mr Nikiforos DIAMANDOUROS - (European Ombudsman) Observer
  12. Mr Michel BARNIER - Commission
- (Blue cards: VAN LANCKER, MACLENNAN)*
13. Ms Linda McAVAN - European Parliament
  14. Mr Alexandru ATHANASIU - Romania (Parliament)
  15. Mr Hubert HAENEL - France (Parliament)
  16. Mr Alberto COSTA - Portugal (Parliament)
  17. Mr Michael ATTALIDES - Cyprus (Government)
  18. Mr Antonio TAJANI - European Parliament
  19. Mr Reinhard BÖSCH - Austria (Parliament)
  20. Mr Emilio GABAGLIO - (European Trade Union Confederation) Observer
  21. Mr Josef CHABERT - (Committee of the Regions) Observer
  22. Mr Manuel LOBO ANTUNES - Portugal (Government)
  23. Mr Timothy KIRKHOPE - European Parliament
  24. Mr Oguz DEMIRALP - Turkey (Government)
  25. Mr Proinsias DE ROSSA - Ireland (Parliament)
  26. Mr Henrik Dam KRISTENSEN - Denmark (Parliament)
  27. Mr Antti PELTOMÄKI - Finland (Government)
  28. Mr Elmar BROK - European Parliament
  29. Ms Claude DU GRANRUT - (Committee of the Regions) Observer
  30. Mr Roger BRIESCH - (Economic and Social Committee) Observer
  31. Mr Carlos CARNERO - European Parliament
  32. Mr Pat CAREY - Ireland (Parliament)
  33. Ms Pascale ANDREANI - France (Government)
- (Blue cards: BARNIER, CISNEROS)*

34. Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)
35. Ms Marie NAGY - Belgium (Parliament)
36. Mr Alain LAMASSOURE - European Parliament
37. Mr Hannes FARNLEITNER - Austria (Government)
38. Mr Josep BORRELL - Spain (Parliament)
39. Ms Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN - European Parliament
40. Mr Dimitrij RUPEL - Slovenia (Government)
41. Mr Ben FAYOT - Luxembourg (Parliament)
- (*Blue cards: MacCORMICK, DE ROSSA, SERRACINO-INGLOTT, MACLENNAN, VAN LANCKER*)
42. Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament
43. Mr Jürgen MEYER - Germany (Parliament)
44. Mr Ivan KORCOK - Slovakia (Government)
45. Mr Adrian SEVERIN - Romania (Parliament)
46. Mr Georges KATIFORIS - Greece (Government)
47. Mr Erwin TEUFEL - Germany (Parliament)
48. Mr Gijs de VRIES - Netherlands (Government)
49. Mr Jan FIGEL - Slovakia (Parliament)
50. Mr Esko HELLE - Finland (Parliament)
51. Mr David HEATHCOAT-AMORY - United Kingdom (Parliament)
52. Mr William ABITBOL - European Parliament
53. Mr Francesco SPERONI - Italy (Government)
54. Ms Helle THORNING-SCHMIDT - European Parliament
55. Mr Edmund WITTBRODT - Poland (Parliament)
56. Mr Gijs de VRIES - Netherlands (Government)

## **Friday 25 April**

### **Title IX : The Union and its immediate environment**

1. Mr Josep BORRELL - Spain (Parliament)
  2. Mr Caspar EINEM - Austria (Parliament)
  3. Mr Peter SERRACINO-INGLOTT - Malta (Government)
  4. Mr Michael ATTALIDES - Cyprus (Government)
  5. Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)
  6. Mr René van der LINDEN - Netherlands (Parliament)
  7. Mr Hubert HAENEL - France (Parliament)
  8. Mr Jens-Peter BONDE - European Parliament
  9. Mr József SZÁJER - Hungary (Parliament)
  10. Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finland (Parliament)
  11. Mr Rihards PIKS - Latvia (Parliament)
- Blue cards: DEMETRIOU, KORHONEN*

## **Title X: Union membership**

1. Ms Danuta HÜBNER - Poland (Government)
2. Mr Lamberto DINI - Italy (Parliament)
3. Ms Anne VAN LANCKER - European Parliament
4. Ms Pascale ANDREANI - France (Government)
5. Mr Antonio VITORINO - Commission
6. Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)
7. Mr Peter BALÁZS - Hungary (Government)
8. Mr Jürgen MEYER - Germany (Parliament)
9. Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finland (Parliament)
10. Ms Gisela STUART - United Kingdom (Parliament)

*Blue cards: KVIST, STOCKTON, EINEM, THORNING-SCHMIDT, DYBKJAER, BERES, MacCORMICK, ROCHE, DE GUCHT, BONDE*

11. Mr Henrik HOLOLEI - Estonia (Government)
12. Mr Hubert HAENEL - France (Parliament)
13. Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament
14. Mr Francesco SPERONI - Italy (Government)
15. Ms Hildegard PUWAK - Romania (Government)
16. Mr Josep BORRELL - Spain (Parliament)
17. Mr Elmar BROK - European Parliament
18. Mr Manuel LOBO ANTUNES - Portugal (Government)
19. Ms Sandra KALNIETE - Latvia (Government)
20. Mr Frans TIMMERMANS - Netherlands (Parliament)
21. Mr Dimitrij RUPEL - Slovenia (Government)
22. Ms Marta FOGLER - Poland (Parliament)
23. Mr Peter SKAARUP - Denmark (Parliament)
24. Mr Oskaras JUSYS - Lithuania (Government)
25. Mr Karel DE GUCHT - Belgium (Parliament)
26. Mr John GORMLEY - Ireland (Parliament)
27. Mr Luis MARINHO - European Parliament
28. Ms Liene LIEPINA - Latvia (Parliament)
29. Mr Gijs de VRIES - Netherlands (Government)

*Blue cards: KORHONEN, McAVAN, ABITBOL*

## **Part Three: General and final provisions**

1. Mr Hannes FARNLEITNER - Austria (Government)
2. Mr Olivier DUHAMEL - European Parliament
3. Mr Hans Martin BURY - Germany (Government)
4. Mr Peter HAIN - United Kingdom (Government)
5. Mr Elmar BROK - European Parliament



6. Mr Antonio VITORINO - Commission
7. Ms Meglena KUNEVA - Bulgaria (Government)
8. Mr Alain LAMASSOURE - European Parliament
9. Mr Dick ROCHE - Ireland (Government)
10. Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)
11. Mr Jan ZAHRADIL - Czech Republic (Parliament)
12. Mr Adrian SEVERIN - Romania (Parliament)
13. Mr Jürgen MEYER - Germany (Parliament)
14. Mr Hubert HAENEL - France (Parliament)
15. Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament
- Blue cards: de VRIES, d'OLIVEIRA, CARNERO*
16. Mr Alberto COSTA - Portugal (Parliament)
17. Ms Gisela STUART - United Kingdom (Parliament)
18. Ms Riitta KORHONEN - Finland (Parliament)
19. Ms Pascale ANDREANI - France (Government)
20. Ms Danuta HÜBNER - Poland (Government)
21. Ms Elena PACIOTTI - European Parliament
22. Mr Francesco SPERONI - Italy (Government)
23. Mr Manuel LOBO ANTUNES - Portugal (Government)
24. Mr Antti PELTOMÄKI - Finland (Government)
25. Mr Gundars KRASTIS - Latvia (Parliament)
26. Ms Lenka ROVNÁ - Czech Republic (Government)
27. Mr Gintautas SIVICKAS - Lithuania (Parliament)
28. Ms Marie NAGY - Belgium (Parliament)

*Blue cards: ABITBOL, DUFF, VOGGENHUBER, BARNIER; MACLENNAN, MacCORMICK, BRUTON, DYBKJAER*

---