

NOTE

Subject : **Summary Report of the Plenary Session**
 - Brussels, 15 and 16 May 2003 ¹

1. Working method of the Convention during its last phase and consensus building process
(CONV 720/03 and 721/03)

Working method

The Chairman briefly outlined the agenda for the plenary session, which this time lasted two full days to allow the Convention more time to discuss the Institutions and external action of the Union.

Before embarking on discussion of these two topics, the Chairman indicated the working methods which would be used to reach a consensus. Before the next session on 30 and 31 May, members of the Convention would have received the full draft Constitution. That would make it possible to:

- examine the provisions on the policies frequently referred to in discussion of Part One;
- discuss the new version of those sections which had been revised by the Praesidium in the light of plenary debates;
- discuss the new arrangements finalised by the Praesidium for starting up Working Groups or discussion circles.

¹ A verbatim record of the plenary meeting is given on the website
 www.european-convention.eu.int

The Chairman insisted on the need in the first two weeks of June to step up the Convention's work, inter alia through fuller attendance by Convention members in Brussels so that work could also continue within "political families", components and possibly certain discussion circles. In the meantime, the Chairman and the two Vice-Chairmen would hold consultations and the Praesidium would, as often as possible, assess the progress made in achieving consensus.

In the brief discussion which followed, several Convention members insisted on the need to examine Part Three of the Constitution in detail. Some indicated their doubts about the feasibility of completing that work in the time available to the Convention. One Convention member proposed that the members should submit amendments to the full text and that these amendments could be voted on by the Convention.

In response to these comments, the Chairman pointed out that the Convention's working method as established by the Laeken Declaration was that of consensus and excluded voting, which would not be representative in an assembly of the present type. As for Part Three of the Constitution, the Chairman suggested that if it did prove difficult to finalise by the deadline, consideration would be given to the possibility of continuing work solely on that Part for a few weeks more.

2. Discussion of draft articles on the Institutions (Part I -- Title IV) (CONV 691/03 and CONV 709/03)

Introductory remarks

The Chairman in his introduction stressed the large number of amendments received by the Secretariat on Title IV of the draft Constitution, which were accompanied by an article to be inserted in Title VI on democratic life.

The Chairman pointed out that the articles on the Institutions in Part One would be accompanied by provisions for insertion in Part Three. Some of the remarks, comments or proposed amendments were intended to supplement and enhance the texts submitted. They would be dealt with when the articles in Part Two were available.

The Chairman also noted that two types of amendment emerged from the mass of comments received:

The first type, which were the most numerous and most important, did not call into question the overall architecture of the draft submitted by the Praesidium. They were intended to clarify the proposed provisions. Some would considerably improve the wording adopted, e.g. by confirming or making clearer the Praesidium's approach.

The second type, somewhat fewer in number, but a significant quantity nevertheless, amounted directly or indirectly to maintaining existing texts as they stood. Such a request had been made, more or less vigorously, for nearly all the most important articles on institutional provisions, i.e. the composition of the European Parliament, the role and Presidency of the European Council, the calculation of the qualified majority, the method of appointing the Commission and the appointment or composition of the Commission. The Chairman wondered whether such a status quo approach was compatible with the mandate which the Convention had received at Laeken. He referred to some of the questions raised by the Heads of State or Government and quoted a number of them: "The first question is how we can increase the democratic legitimacy and transparency of the present institutions, a question which is valid for the three institutions" or "How can the authority and effectiveness of the European Commission be enhanced?" or "What of the six-monthly rotation of the Presidency of the Council?".

The plenary debate prompted many speakers to take the floor. Nearly 90 Convention members took part in the discussion, which also included interventions using the "blue cards". The debate was lively and highly instructive. A number of general remarks may be noted before examining the points most frequently raised (to make the present note more readable, comments on the Minister for Foreign Affairs have been grouped together with those on the debate concerning external action of the Union).

General comments by Convention members

Before giving their statements, a large number of Convention members made general comments or expressed certain principles. These include:

A considerable number of Convention members felt that the overall institutional architecture should respect certain principles, with the principle of equality between Member States being the one most frequently mentioned. The Community method was also mentioned.

In their statements, many Convention members either generally or specifically expressed their attachment to the current Treaty provisions as they emerge from the Nice Treaty. They felt that the provisions would make it possible to meet the challenges of the enlarged Europe and that negotiators had at the time reached a satisfactory compromise. It was also pointed out that the parliaments and people of the candidate countries were either in the process of or had recently been called upon to state their position, with a view to accession, on the current institutional provisions. It was therefore difficult to justify far-reaching changes to the institutional provisions in the eyes of public opinion in these countries. Other Convention members highlighted for their part that the convening of the Convention by the Heads of State and Government and the adoption of the Laeken Declaration in December 2001 showed that the outcome obtained in Nice had been considered insufficient to respond to the challenge of enlargement.

Lastly, a number of Convention members highlighted in their statements that the Convention was entering the most delicate and most significant stage of its proceedings. They called for the Convention to be a success and felt that this would only be the case if each Convention member endeavoured to demonstrate both the spirit of compromise and that of ambition, giving priority to seeking an agreed solution acceptable to all. These Convention members called upon their colleagues to leave aside their initial positions influenced by their membership of one or other institution, "small or large country", nationality or political group, and give priority to the common good. Several Convention members warned the Convention that if it was not able to reach an overall agreement it would be unrealistic to think that the ensuing Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) would fare any better. Europe was at a crossroads.

Comments on the various institutional proposals from the Praesidium

The question of the European Council and its Presidency was raised by almost all Convention members. The Praesidium's proposal for a stable Presidency for a period of two and a half years renewable once, received the support of a significant proportion of Convention members. These Convention members felt that this would serve the interests of efficiency and better organisation of the European Council, an institution which, unlike the Commission or the Parliament, did not currently have a continuous Presidency. They responded to their colleagues' concerns that the duties of the permanent President of the European Council would not differ from the duties currently performed on the basis of the six-monthly rotation. Another group of Convention members argued in favour of keeping the rotation system, on the grounds that it complied with the principle of equality between States and had the advantage of strengthening the feeling of European integration when Member States took it in turn to hold the Presidency. A number of Convention members sought to reconcile the differing opinions and put forward various summary proposals. One Convention member, therefore, supported by several colleagues, proposed that the President of the European Council be directly elected by European citizens without any change to the duties performed. This would make it possible to strengthen or create a genuine "European demos". Several others felt that they could support the idea of a permanent President of the European Council provided that the possibility of a merger of his duties and those of the President of the Commission be left open in future. Other Convention members, without questioning the Praesidium's proposals, felt that the proposals could usefully be clarified in a number of areas, in particular the duties of the President of the European Council in respect of foreign policy. Would these not be in danger of encroaching upon those of the President of the Commission or of the future Minister for Foreign Affairs? The question of the administrative structure responsible for supporting the future President of the European Council was raised on a number of occasions, with some Convention members warning against any risk of overlapping. Several Convention members wondered about the democratic legitimacy of a President of the European Council elected only by his peers.

Opinion was also divided on the composition of the Commission, which was one of the most frequently raised issues. A large number of Convention members made the case for the principle that the Commission should include at least one national from each Member State. This was a fundamental principle which gave substance to equality between the Member States and enabled each of them to be satisfied that their "particular sensitivities" were taken into account. The compromise on this issue reached at Nice ought also to be respected. Another group argued the opposite view and approved the principle of a smaller Commission, as proposed by the Praesidium. The latter Convention members stressed that the Commission's purpose was to serve as a venue where the general interest found expression, and not one for representation of the States. The efficiency and independent nature of that Institution should be bolstered. Some feared that it would in practice become a sort of Permanent Representatives Committee (Coreper) if the principle of one Commissioner per State were preserved. Some Convention members who defended the principle of one Commissioner per State thought they could live with a smaller Commission if access to the office of Commissioner were open on the basis of "equitable rotation". Others proposed that the Praesidium's provisions should enter into force after a transitional period, to be determined. Some members, responding in particular to the doubts expressed by some Convention members from candidate countries, pointed out that in practice that would be the case since the next Commission, which was to take up office in November 2004, would be governed by the provisions of the Treaty of Nice. Some suggested that no numerical threshold should be included in the Constitution and that the President should be free to form his College.

The question of the nomination and election of the Commission President was also raised by numerous Convention members. Several of them wanted the European Parliament to designate the Commission President directly and thought that the Praesidium's proposals did not change the status quo. Others put forward or presented various compromise proposals which adjust the Praesidium's proposals without calling them into question. Several Convention members argued for it to be possible for the European Parliament to be dissolved, automatically or not, if it adopted a motion of censure regarding the Commission.

The Praesidium's proposal in Article 17b on the definition of a qualified majority did not elicit as many comments as the previous items. A certain number of Convention members, however, expressed their attachment to the system derived from the Treaty of Nice and warned against undoing the difficult compromises achieved at the time. Others replied that the Nice voting mechanism was particularly complicated and difficult for the public to grasp. They commended the Praesidium's effort to simplify and clarify this area.

With regard to the Council, most comments centred on the six-monthly rotation. A large body of Convention members called for it to be maintained. Some suggested that the consecutive Presidencies could be incorporated into a multiannual programme in order to allay the concerns of those who highlighted the risks of a lack of continuity or change in priorities from one Presidency to the next. Several Convention members suggested that the Commission President chair the General Affairs Council. With regard to the number of Council formations, the Praesidium's proposals were deemed too restrictive by several Convention members who did not think it necessary to go any further than the reduction made at the Seville European Council.

The proposal to create a special Council formation called the Legislative Council in which all legislation would be deliberated was also debated. A certain number of Convention members, basing themselves in particular on recent positions adopted by ministers for economic and financial affairs, found this a dangerous suggestion since, with regard to European cohesion, it would lead to specialist ministers having little involvement in European legislation. Others, however, gave the proposal a warm reception since it would introduce a necessary and welcome element of coordination and clarity. They reasoned that the specialist ministers could in fact participate in that formation and that their contributions would be vital. Lastly, in response to one concern expressed, the President pointed out that the Council in legislative formation would operate not permanently, but in periodic meetings, which would allow the representative of ministerial rank designated by each Member State to maintain ties with his or her capital and to return there regularly.

The European Parliament was raised less often. Most comments concerned the prospect of setting a ceiling. A number of members of the Convention backed the Praesidium's proposal to introduce a ceiling and to limit the number of Members of the European Parliament to 700. One member wanted the ceiling to be set at a lower level, at 600 or 650. Conversely, other members of the Convention wanted the ceiling of 732 introduced in the Nice provisions to be retained. Several members said that they wanted to keep the allocation among Member States laid down in Nice. This allocation was the result of compromise and it should be left unchanged.

A number of members wanted each institution to be free to decide its seat independently. The present situation where the seats of the institutions were split between several places was, in their view, not satisfactory.

Article X of Title VI on a Congress of the Peoples of Europe was not raised by many members. Most of those who did say something about it were critical and asked that this proposal from the Praesidium should not be adopted. These members felt that it amounted to creating a new institution, and they were not in favour of this.

There were a limited number of comments on the European Central Bank. However, some members of the Convention had doubts about the Praesidium's proposal to include it among the Union's institutions in Article 14. Some members, recalling the conclusions of the Group on Social Policy, wanted its competences not to be limited to price stability, but also to cover promotion of economic growth and action against unemployment, on the model of the Central Bank of the United States. One member, however, thought that the Central Bank's current brief was satisfactory and should not be changed.

The bodies of the Union, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions were rarely raised by members of the Convention, except those who were members of or had observer status with those bodies. In their contributions, those members argued that these bodies played an important role and should therefore be granted full status as institutions and be included

in Article 14. This demand was supported by a number of members of the Convention. Conversely, certain other members questioned the usefulness of these bodies, considering that their contribution and the value they added to the European Union's activities were open to question. One member of the Economic and Social Committee felt that the Committee should be mentioned before the Committee of the Regions as it was older.

On the Court of Justice, members of the Convention welcomed the draft article submitted by the Praesidium. As regards the term of office of the judges and advocates-general of the Court, some argued that a single, longer term of office would strengthen the guarantee of independence, but others felt that the present system worked well and should be left unchanged. Some suggested that a specific remedy for a breach of the Charter of Fundamental Rights might be included in the Constitution. One member emphasised that the Court of Justice should not have jurisdiction over acts adopted in the area of the CFSP.

The Court of Auditors was raised principally with reference to its composition by certain members of the Convention. They argued for a reduced number of members, less than 25, consisting of persons of a high level of professionalism without any account being taken of nationality.

3. Debate on draft articles on External Action **(CONV 685/03 and CONV 707/03)**

Introduction

Vice President Dehaene introduced the debate on external action, and mentioned that nearly 850 amendments had been received on the draft articles.

The debate, in which more than 70 speakers took the floor, showed that the Convention broadly welcomed the draft texts on external action presented by the Praesidium. A large number of speakers recalled the importance for the Union to act collectively on the international stage in order

to promote common values and defend collective interests. A number of them underlined that Union action depended in the first place on political will and solidarity among Member States. At the same time, many acknowledged that the Constitution should seek to formulate mechanisms and institutional arrangements that promote convergence of views among Member States and foster effective decision making and a coherent use of instruments.

Members of the Convention felt that the new structure, which grouped all the legal basis in one title, helped to present a more coherent overview of the different instruments that the EU could use to act on the international stage. The Convention also acknowledged that the grouping of articles in one title of the Constitution did not entail a harmonisation of instruments and procedures, but that different modalities would continue to be applicable for the different policy areas within external action.

There was a broad consensus on the proposal to create an EU Minister of Foreign Affairs, who would combine functions in CFSP under the authority of the Council with responsibilities in other areas of external action managed by the Commission. There were however differences of views among members of the Convention as to the consequences of this institutional change on a number of issues, such as the role of the Commission in CFSP, external representation and the chairing of the Foreign Affairs Council. It was therefore agreed that the role of the Minister and his relation with the Commission and the Council needed to be worked out in more detail.

Some speakers proposed to include provisions for the establishment of an EU diplomatic service, with staff seconded from the Council secretariat, the Commission and the diplomatic services of Member States, which would work under the authority of the EU Minister of Foreign Affairs. A number of speakers indicated that they would prefer another title than "EU Minister of Foreign Affairs", suggesting "Secrétaire de l'Union", "EU external representative" or "Foreign Secretary of the Union".

Horizontal articles

As regards the horizontal article on principles and objectives of EU external action, several members of the Convention underlined the importance of ensuring coherence both within the area of external action and between this field and internal policies. Several members pointed in particular to the need to reflect in more direct terms the need to ensure that internal policies do not run contrary to development cooperation aims and recommended that the content of current Article 178 TEC, which stipulates that the objectives of development cooperation should be taken into account in the implementation of policies that are likely to affect developing countries, be incorporated in the relevant paragraph of Article 1. Some members suggested additional objectives or principles that they wished to see included in the article, such as peace, solidarity between Member States, security of the Union, cultural diversity, or international cooperation in managing migration flows and in combating crime.

Members of the Convention agreed on the need to have dispositions in the Constitution, which would allow the Union to deploy instruments covering different fields of external action in pursuit of a common objective. The role of the European Council was highlighted in this respect. However, some members expressed strong reservations against the possibility for the EU Minister and the Commission to make joint proposals, and in particular to applying decision making by qualified majority voting to these joint proposals.

Common foreign and security policy

In general, members of the Convention welcomed provisions in the draft articles that encouraged Member States to consult and inform at EU level before taking a position on the international stage. This would help to create a "European reflex", reduce risks of confrontation on the international arena, and help forge common positions. Some felt that the provisions should be further reinforced, while others recalled that in the absence of an agreed position, Member States retained their competence to act on a national basis.

The main issue with regard to CFSP concerned the decision making procedure. A large number of speakers felt that unanimity caused inertia in CFSP and argued in favour of making qualified majority voting (QMV) in the Council the general rule, except for decisions with military and defence implications which should be taken by unanimity. Different models were put forward. Some proposed that QMV should not apply to proposals that were not put forward by the EU Minister of Foreign Affairs. There was a general agreement that a Member State whose vital interests were at stake, should be allowed to prevent a decision taken by voting. In such a situation the EU Minister should try to formulate a proposal acceptable to the Member State involved. As an alternative to QMV, some suggested that the Council take decisions by super qualified majority. Others saw merit in applying reinforced cooperation in all areas of CFSP, as a means to make it more pro-active.

Others speakers were opposed to making QMV the general rule and pointed out that the provisions in the current treaty for decision making by QMV were hardly ever used. They argued in favour of a better use of these provisions, as well as of the ones on constructive abstention. Forging of political will and convergence of views were in their view the key issues to making CFSP more effective. Some speakers proposed, as an alternative, to maintain unanimity as a general rule but to gradually increase the list of subjects to which QMV applied, starting by decisions on sanctions and on CFSP actions up to a certain financial ceiling to be set by the Council. In this respect the importance of the new clause which enabled the European Council to extend the use of QMV on CFSP decisions in the Council was highlighted.

With respect to the right of initiative in the area of CFSP, different positions were expressed. Some felt that the disposition which allowed the EU Minister to introduce a proposal jointly with the Commission was in contradiction with the proposed creation of a "double hatted" EU Minister. They argued that this would make CFSP proposals by the EU Minister subject to the principle of collegiality, which was contrary to the recommendation of working group VII on external action. Others considered that the Commission should retain the right of proposal.

These members of the Convention felt in any case that it was inappropriate to provide for QMV in case of joint COM/Minister proposal or CFSP.

On the issue of democratic control of CFSP, some members spoke in favour of reinforcing the role of the European parliament, while others requested that national parliaments should be associated as well. Vice President Dehaene informed that a reference to CFSP and ESDP would be included in the protocol on national parliaments.

Common Security and Defence Policy

Several members of the Convention welcomed the Praesidium's ambitious approach for the Common Security and Defence Policy which was crucial for the Union's credibility on the international stage. Many members applauded the fact that the Common Security and Defence Policy was an integral part of the CFSP, and many also argued that the policy must be backed by military and civilian capabilities that were appropriate and adequate to fulfil the tasks placed upon it. Some members also argued that balanced relations must be maintained with the Atlantic Alliance and that the commitments entered into by certain Member States in this context must be respected.

Several members supported the idea of updating the list of tasks which the Union can undertake, and some suggested, inter alia, including the fight against terrorism outside the Union in this framework.

Many members argued that the level of the capabilities made available to the Union should be strengthened. Thus, the idea of setting up an Armaments or Capabilities Agency received wide support, although one member suggested that it should not be given the task of evaluating Member States' capabilities commitments.

Several members welcomed the possibility of structured cooperation in the area of capabilities with a view to the most exacting tasks. Some argued that it was necessary to permit coalitions of volunteers which now acted outside the Treaty to act within the Union framework and with its backing. Some members, however, were concerned that such cooperation might be too closed. One member felt that including a clause providing for the possibility of undertaking tasks outside the framework of the Union was not appropriate in the Constitution. Some members suggested that, in order to make such cooperation more inclusive, it should be possible to apply the provisions on enhanced cooperation in this case and more generally in the area of defence. Others proposed that military capabilities criteria should be established by the Council and set out in a legally binding protocol. One member suggested that one of the tasks of the Armaments Agency should be to establish such criteria.

As regards other forms of flexibility proposed, most members of the Convention welcomed the possibility of enabling some Member States to carry out a task decided on unanimously by the Council. In their view, such a provision would enable a pragmatic practice which already operates outside the Treaty to be enshrined in the Constitution. One member suggested that it should be possible to invite States that were not members of the Union to act jointly with the Member States of the Union to carry out a task. Some members of the Convention also argued that the Constitution should include a clause allowing mutual defence commitments between Member States. Those members felt that mutual defence was a key factor of solidarity between citizens and States; such commitments already existed between most of them, but outside the Treaty. It would therefore be legitimate to enshrine this commitment in the Constitution. Others, however, had misgivings about including mutual defence in the Union framework; they felt that such a commitment might duplicate the commitments that many States had undertaken in the NATO framework. Some members of the Convention also voiced their concern that such a clause might jeopardise the neutral or non-aligned status of certain Member States.

Other subjects were also raised by certain members of the Convention, such as the question of funding activities linked to the Common Foreign and Security Policy, including the Common Security and Defence Policy; some members proposed that it should fall within the scope of the Union's budget.

Other matters relating to the Common Security and Defence Policy were also raised, such as the setting up of a Security and Defence Union.

Some members of the Convention also proposed including in the provisions on external action a stronger presence of national parliaments than in the area of defence.

Common commercial policy

A certain number of members of the Convention argued for the need for efficiency in the common commercial policy and the need to be able to adopt decisions by qualified majority in all areas, including the conclusion of all agreements, while some other members were of the view that trade in cultural and audiovisual services should continue to fall within the shared competence of the Union and Member States and that the negotiation of such agreements should thus continue to require the common accord of Member States. Several members considered that the role of the European Parliament should be further reinforced in the field of trade policy and argued that both negotiation mandates and the conclusion of agreements should be subject to the assent of the European Parliament. Some also underlined the need to keep the European Parliament fully informed throughout the negotiation process.

Development cooperation and humanitarian aid

In relation to the articles on development cooperation, several members of the Convention considered it essential that the specific objectives of poverty reduction, and eventually eradication, be referred to in the specific sub-chapter devoted to development cooperation. Several members furthermore argued in favour of the budgetisation of the European Development Fund, and requested that the reference to the specificity of the relations with ACP countries be deleted from Article 26. Some members expressed reservations about the proposal to establish a voluntary humanitarian peace corps, as suggested in Article 30 on humanitarian aid, and referred to the difficulty of the task of delivery of assistance in this field and the need for trained staff.

Restrictive measures

The articles on restrictive measures were raised by few. Some underlined the need to ensure respect for fundamental rights of individuals and compliance with internal law and raised the issue of jurisdictional control by the Court of Justice. Others suggested to widen the scope of the article to include visa restrictions.

International Agreements

As regards international agreements, most of the interventions concerned the role of the European Parliament in the negotiation and conclusion of agreements. Several members proposed to extend the consultation of the European Parliament to all phases of the procedure of negotiation and conclusion of international agreements.

On the external competence of the Union, some members of the Convention proposed to spell out in the Constitution that the Union is competent to conclude an international agreement each time this agreement contributes to the exercise of an internal competence.

Several members pleaded in favour of giving the Commission the mandate to negotiate international agreements except for agreement dealing exclusively with CFSP matters while other members were in favour of giving to the Commission the mandate to negotiate all agreements even those relating to CFSP. Others considered that the EU Minister should be in charge of the negotiations while others believed that this task should be attributed to the Presidency. Some interventions pleaded for an extension of the qualified majority voting for the procedure of conclusion of agreements in all areas.

Relations of the Union with international organisations

As regards the relations of the Union with international organisations, some considered that the Union should strive to become a member of international organisations, starting with the IFIs. Some argued for developing in further detail the provisions on the relations with international organisations, and certain suggested that the list of organisations referred to in Article 35 should include NATO.

Solidarity clause

Many members of the Convention warmly welcomed the inclusion of the solidarity clause in the Constitution as a key expression of solidarity between Member States and citizens. Some members argued that the scope of such a clause should be broadened to include other threats or dangers such as natural disasters of human or natural origin. The Vice-President pointed out that there was a provision in the Constitution (Article 15) for protection against disasters among the support measures.

Conclusions

Vice President Dehaene concluded that the Convention welcomed the proposed new structure of the external action articles. He noted a broad support for the horizontal article on principles and objectives, as well as several requests to reinforce its paragraph on coherence.

He further noted a general consensus on the creation of an EU Minister of Foreign Affairs, although views on the implications of this institutional change diverged. This applied in particular to the right of initiative in CFSP. He indicated that the position of the Minister and his relationship with the Council and the Commission needed to be worked out in more detail.

On decision making in CFSP he noted on the one hand a demand for more QMV and on the other hand an opposition to move into that direction.

On security and defence policy, he noted that the Convention supported many proposals by the Praesidium, such as the inclusion of this policy as integral part of CFSP, the update of the Petersberg tasks and the creation of an Agency, while on other issues, such as mutual defence and different forms of flexibility, views were not entirely convergent.

Vice President Dehaene took note of the different points of view expressed with regard to the common commercial policy, with some wishing to abolish existing derogations, while others clearly requested that such derogations be maintained.

On development cooperation he noted that several speakers requested to specify in the related chapter the main policy objectives and to suppress the specific reference to the ACP countries.

With respect to international agreements, he noted that different views existed on who should negotiate on behalf of the Union, and that a number of speakers wished to extend the role of the European Parliament.

On the solidarity clause, the Vice-President took note of several requests to enlarge its scope also to natural or man-made disasters. He informed the Convention that a specific legal base for on civil protection would find their place elsewhere in the Constitution.

List of speakers following order of intervention.

Plenary meeting 15 and 16 May 2003

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Thursday 15 May

Working method of the Convention during its last phase and consensus building process
(CONV 720/03 and 721/03)

*(Blue cards: BERGER, BROK, BONDE, DUFF, DUHAMEL, MAJJ-WEGGEN,
HEATHCOAT-AMORY, TEUFEL, ROCHE, PAPANDREOU)*

Debate on draft articles on Institutions (Part I - Title IV)
(CONV 691/03 and CONV 709/03)

1. Mr Gianfranco FINI - Italy (Government)
2. Mr Alain LAMASSOURE - European Parliament
3. Mr Alberto COSTA - Portugal (Parliament)
4. Mr Dimitrij RUPEL - Slovenia (Government)
5. Mr Elmar BROK - European Parliament
6. Mr Caspar EINEM - Austria (Parliament)
7. Mr Jacques SANTER - Luxembourg (Government)
8. Mr Hubert HAENEL - France (Parliament)
9. Mr Josep BORRELL - Spain (Parliament)
10. Mr Georges PAPANDREOU - Greece (Government)
- (Blue cards: SPINI, VOGGENHUBER, DINI, HOLOLEI, LEQUILLER, BRUTON)*
11. Mr Josef ZIELENIEC - Czech Republic (Parliament)
12. Mr Michel BARNIER - Commission
13. Ms Anne VAN LANCKER - European Parliament
14. Mr Peter HAIN - United Kingdom (Government)
15. Mr Edmund WITTBRODT - Poland (Parliament)
16. Mr Jens-Peter BONDE - European Parliament
17. Mr Alfonso DASTIS - Spain (Government)
18. Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament
19. Mr Erwin TEUFEL - Germany (Parliament)
20. Ms Danuta HÜBNER - Poland (Government)
21. Mr Lamberto DINI - Italy (Parliament)
22. Ms Lena HJELM-WALLÉN - Sweden (Government)
23. Mr Olivier DUHAMEL - European Parliament
24. Mr Paraskevas AVGERINOS - Greece (Parliament)
25. Mr Frans TIMMERMANS - Netherlands (Parliament)
26. Mr Alojz PETERLE - Slovenia (Parliament)
27. Ms Teija TIILIKAINEN - Finland (Government)
28. Mr Jan FIGEL - Slovakia (Parliament)
29. Mr Rihards PIKS - Latvia (Parliament)

30. Mr Henrik Dam KRISTENSEN - Denmark (Parliament)
31. Ms Meglena KUNEVA - Bulgaria (Government)
32. Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament
33. Ms Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN - European Parliament
34. Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finland (Parliament)
35. Ms Helle THORNING SCHMIDT - European Parliament
36. Mr Timothy KIRKHOPE - European Parliament
37. Mr Jürgen MEYER - Germany (Parliament)
38. Mr Dick ROCHE - Ireland (Government)
39. Mr Göran LENNMARKER - Sweden (Parliament)
40. Ms Liene LIEPINA - Latvia (Parliament)
41. Mr Joschka FISCHER - Germany (Government)
42. Mr Marco FOLLINI - Italy (Parliament)
43. Mr Abdullah GÜL - Turkey (Government)
44. Mr António VITORINO - Commission
45. Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finland (Parliament)
46. Lord Mac LENNAN OF ROGART - United Kingdom (Parliament)
47. Mr Reinhard RACK - European Parliament
48. Mr Olivier DUHAMEL - European Parliament
49. Ms Anne VAN LANCKER - European Parliament
50. Mr Hannes FARNLEITNER - Austria (Government)
51. Ms Eduarda AZEVEDO - Portugal (Parliament)
52. Mr Ben FAYOT - Luxembourg (Parliament)
53. Mr Jozef OLEKSY - Poland (Parliament)
54. Mr Ernâni LOPES - Portugal (Government)
55. Mr Panayotis DEMETRIOU - Cyprus (Parliament)
56. Mr Peter HAIN - United Kingdom (Government)
57. Mr Alfonso DASTIS - Spain (Government)
58. Mr Dick ROCHE - Ireland (Government)
59. Mr Neil MacCORMICK - European Parliament
60. Mr William ABITBOL - European Parliament
61. Mr David HEATHCOAT-AMORY - United Kingdom (Parliament)
62. Mr Péter BALÁZS - Hungary (Government)
63. Mr Puiu HASOTTI - Romania (Parliament)
64. Mr Jari VILÉN Finland - (Parliament)
65. Mr Karel de GUCHT - Belgium (Parliament)
66. Mr Michael ATTALIDES - Cyprus (Government)
67. Mr Henning CHRISTOPHERSEN - Denmark (Government)
68. Mr Reinhard BÖSCH - Austria (Parliament)
69. Mr Peter SERRACINO-INGLOTT - Malta (Government)
70. Mr John BRUTON - Ireland (Parliament)
71. Ms Hildegard PUWAK - Romania (Government)
72. Mr József SZÁJER - Hungary (Parliament)
73. Ms Marietta GIANNAKOU - Greece (Parliament)
74. Mr Rytis MARTIKONIS - Lithuania (Government)
75. Ms Lone DYBKJAER - European Parliament
76. Mr Proinsias de ROSSA - Ireland (Parliament)
77. Ms. Cristiana MUSCARDINI - European Parliament
78. Mr Antonio TAJANI - European Parliament
79. Mr Kemal DERVIS - Turkey (Parliament)
80. Mr Jan KOHOUT - Czech Republic (Government)

81. Ms Cristiana MUSCARDINI - European Parliament
 82. Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)
 83. Ms Linda McAVAN - European Parliament
 84. Mr Pierre LEQUILLER - France (Parliament)
 85. Mr Josef CHABERT - (Committee of the Regions) Observer
 86. Mr Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS - Lithuania (Parliament)
 87. Mr Proinsias DE ROSSA - Ireland (Parliament)
 88. Mr Jelko KACIN - Slovenia (Parliament)
 89. Mr Gabriel CISNEROS LABORDA - Spain (Parliament)
 90. Mr Dominique de VILLEPIN - France (Government)
 91. Mr Luis MARINHO - European Parliament
 92. Ms Sandra KALNIETE - Latvia (Government)
 93. Mr Algirdas GRICIUS - Lithuania (Parliament)
 94. Mr Johannes VOGGENHUBER - European Parliament
- (Blue cards: ALMEIDA-GARRETT, TOMLINSON, SEVERIN, HAIN)*

Friday 16 May

Continuation of the debate on draft articles on Institutions (Part I - Title IV)
(CONV 691/03 and CONV 709/03)

95. Mr Henrik HOLOLEI - Estonia (Government)
96. Mr Esko SEPPANEN - European Parliament
97. Mr Alexandre ARABADJIEV - Bulgaria (Parliament)
98. Mr Juraj MIGAS - Slovakia (Government)
99. Mr Reinhard RACK - European Parliament
100. Ms. Elena PACIOTTI - European Parliament
101. Mr Péter ECKSTEIN-KOVACS - Romania (Parliament)
102. Mr Roger BRIESCH - (Economic and Social Committee) Observer
103. Mr Manfred DAMMEYER - (Committee of the Regions) Observer
104. Ms Claude DU GRANDRUT - (Committee of the Regions) Observer
105. Mr Caspar EINEM - Austria (Parliament)
106. Ms Lone DYBKJAER - European Parliament
107. Mr Georgios KATIFORIS - Greece (Government)
108. Ms. Piia-Nora KAUPPI - European Parliament
109. Mr Francesco SPERONI - Italy (Government)
110. Mr Guilherme OLIVEIRA-MARTINS - Portugal (Parliament)
111. Mr René van der LINDEN - Netherlands (Parliament)
112. Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finland (Parliament)
113. Mr Adrian SEVERIN - Romania (Parliament)
114. Ms Helle THORNING SCHMIDT - European Parliament
115. Mr Josef CHABERT - (Committee of the Regions) Observer
116. Mr George JACOBS - (European Social Partners) Observer
117. Mr Emilio GABAGLIO - (European Trade Union Confederation) Observer
118. Mr Manfred DAMMEYER - (Committee of the Regions) Observer

Debate on draft articles on External Action and Defence
(CONV 685/03 and CONV 707/03)

1. Ms Linda McAVAN - European Parliament
2. Mr Lamberto DINI - Italy (Parliament)
3. Mr Jan FIGEL - Slovakia (Parliament)
4. Mr Elmar BROK - European Parliament
5. Mr Antonio VITORINO - Commission
6. Mr Jürgen MEYER - Germany (Parliament)
7. Mr Gijs de VRIES - Netherlands (Government)
8. Mr Dominique de VILLEPIN - France (Government)
9. Mr Hannes FARNLEITNER - Austria (Government)
10. Ms Marietta GIANNAKOU - Greece (Parliament)
11. Mr Alfonso DASTIS - Spain (Government)
12. Mr Jozef OLEKSY - Poland (Parliament)
13. Mr Peter HAIN - United Kingdom (Government)
14. Mr Luis MARINHO - European Parliament
15. Mr Gianfranco FINI - Italy (Government)
16. Mr Jelko KACIN - Slovenia (Parliament)
- (Blue cards: SPINI, BONDE, DUFF, Van EEKELEN)*
17. Mr Hans Martin BURY - Germany (Government)
18. Ms Eduarda AZEVEDO - Portugal (Parliament)
19. Mr Gabriel CISNEROS LABORDA - Spain (Parliament)
20. Ms Danuta HÜBNER - Poland (Government)
21. Mr Göran LENNMARKER - Sweden (Parliament)
22. Mr Algirdas GRICIUS - Lithuania (Parliament)
23. Mr Dick ROCHE - Ireland (Government)
24. Ms Cristiana MUSCARDINI - European Parliament
25. Mr Henning CHRISTOPHERSEN - Denmark (Government)
26. Mr Pierre LEQUILLER - France (Parliament)
27. Ms Lena HJELM-WALLÉN - Sweden (Government)
28. Mr René van der LINDEN - Netherlands (Parliament)
29. Mr Andrew DUFF - European Parliament
30. Ms Sandra KALNIETE - Latvia (Government)
31. Mr Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finland (Parliament)
32. Mr Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS - Lithuania (Parliament)
33. Mr Ernâni LOPES - Portugal (Government)
34. Ms Teija TIILIKAINEN - Finland (Government)
35. Mr Hubert HAENEL - France (Parliament)
36. Mr Jan KOHOUT - Czech Republic (Government)
- (Blue cards: VOGGENHUBER, SEVERIN, BONDE, WUERMEILING, HAIN, LENNMARKER, DINI)*
37. Mr Rytis MARTIKONIS - Lithuania (Government)
38. Mr Eduard MAINONI - Austria (Parliament)
39. Mr Sören LEKBERG - Sweden (Parliament)
40. Mr Tunne KELAM - Estonia (Parliament)
41. Mr Jari VILÉN - Finland (Parliament)
42. Mr Dimitrij RUPEL - Slovenia (Government)
43. Mr Alain LAMASSOURE - European Parliament
44. Mr Caspar EINEM - Austria (Parliament)
45. Mr Puiu HASOTTI - Romania (Parliament)

46. Mr Louis MICHEL - Belgium (Government)
47. Ms Sylvia-Yvonne KAUFMANN - European Parliament
48. Mr Alberto COSTA - Portugal (Parliament)
49. Mr Antonio VITORINO - Commission
(Blue cards: MacCORMICK, LENNMARKER, McDONAGH)
50. Mr Carlos CARNERO - European Parliament
51. Mr William ABITBOL - European Parliament
52. Mr Henrik HOLOLEI - Estonia (Government)
53. Mr Oguz DEMIRALP - Turkey (Government)
(Blue cards: GORMLEY, Van LANCKER, PACIOTTI, LENMARKER, MACLENNAN, HAENEL, SCOTLAND)
54. Mr Diego LOPEZ GARRIDO - Spain (Parliament)
55. Ms Renée WAGENER - Luxembourg (Parliament)
(Blue cards: VITORINO, DUFF, HAENEL)
56. Mr Jens-Peter BONDE - European Parliament
57. Mr Caspar EINEM - Austria (Parliament)
-