

NOTE

Subject : **Summary report on the plenary session**
 – Brussels, 30 and 31 May 2003

I. INTRODUCTION

The Chairman briefly presented the documents which had been submitted to Convention members during the days preceding the plenary session. For the first time, Convention members had an overview of the draft Constitution with its Parts I, II, III and IV and the Preamble.

The Chairman stated that the Praesidium had given a thorough reading to the texts initially submitted and made a number of amendments to them in order to take account of the amendments tabled by Convention members. The Chairman described the main changes made to the texts of the Articles.

As regards the Institutions, the text had not been amended, the Praesidium having considered that, given the number and above all the nature of the comments made by Convention members on the text, further time for reflection on this matter was required.

The Chairman then presented the Convention work programme for the next few weeks. In order to obtain maximum data for the evaluation of institutional issues, the Praesidium agreed that the Chairman and the two Vice-Chairmen would consult each of the component groups of the Convention on Wednesday 4 June. The plenary session on 5 and 6 June would be devoted to the debate on Part I of the Constitution (with the exception of institutional issues) so as to provide the Praesidium with the necessary pointers for any subsequent amendments.

II. DEBATE ON THE DRAFT TEXTS ON ENHANCED COOPERATION (CONV 723/03)

Introductory remarks

The Chairman gave a reminder of the principal features of the enhanced cooperation mechanism created by the Treaty of Amsterdam and amended by the Treaty of Nice, but which had yet to be used.

The draft Articles presented by the Praesidium are basically aimed at simplifying the structure and wording of the current provisions on enhanced cooperation. This involves Article 32b (32 ter in French), which has become Article I-43 under the new numbering system. Other provisions appear in Part III of the Constitution, in Articles I to P, which have become Articles III-318 to III-325 under the new numbering system.

The Praesidium also proposed a number of substantive amendments aimed in particular at facilitating the procedure for activating enhanced cooperation and at strengthening the Commission's role in the management of such cooperation. The last resort condition has been somewhat clarified, while the minimum threshold for participation has been set at one third of the Member States, which is in keeping with the spirit of the Treaty of Nice, which had set it at eight Member States.

Further, the reference to possible objective conditions for participation tends to restrict the discretionary power of the Commission or the Council in relation to Member States' requests to them to participate in enhanced cooperation after its creation, which is more in line with the principle of openness.

Among the amendments received, the Chairman suggested that the one proposed by a Convention member to abolish the mechanism should not be adopted. In this connection, he stressed the reasons which had prompted the creation of such a mechanism, i.e. to set up an instrument which could prove useful in the long term, in particular to take account of the increasingly heterogeneous nature of the Member States in an enlarged Union. The mechanism should allow a group of Member States to act within the Union framework rather than outside, which would be in the interests of the Union and of all its Member States. He pointed here to the open and inclusive nature of enhanced cooperation, which had been designed as an instrument of progressive integration.

As regards the other amendments, some were aimed at facilitating recourse to enhanced cooperation, especially by lowering the minimum threshold for participation. Others, on the other hand, were aimed at returning to the texts of the Treaty of Nice. In the light of today's discussions, Convention members will have the opportunity to submit other amendments, the Secretariat will draw up a summary sheet, and then the Praesidium will produce the final version of the texts.

o

o

o

The draft Articles were generally welcomed, (except for one Convention member who proposed that all provisions relating to enhanced cooperation be deleted), particularly as regards their simplified drafting. The argument that the development of cooperation between certain Member States should be promoted within a Union framework rather than outside it was frequently advanced. Another argument in favour of this instrument was its inclusive nature, even though some Convention members stressed Member States' freedom of choice as to whether or not to participate and even to withdraw.

However, many Convention members stressed that enhanced cooperation should not be an alternative to general use of qualified majority voting, particularly as regards the CFSP, which remained a priority.

Several questions were raised as to substance.

Minimum threshold for participation:

Differing views were voiced on this subject. Some supported the Praesidium's proposal that it be set at one third, others suggested lowering the threshold further, particularly in the area of the ESDP, yet others wanted a return to a fixed number of eight Member States on the model of the Nice Treaty, while yet others suggested raising the threshold to half of the Member States. One Convention member suggested that no threshold be set and that a decision be taken in each individual case, depending on the areas concerned, by the same procedure as the initial authorisation procedure.

Initial authorisation procedure:

Several Convention members were in favour of relaxing the initial authorisation procedure and of strengthening the Commission's role. In particular, the Commission should be able, on its own initiative (except as regards CFSP issues), to propose the creation of enhanced cooperation, independently of a prior formal request by certain Member States. As regards police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, one Convention member suggested on the other hand that Member States interested in enhanced cooperation should be able to apply to the Council irrespective of a Commission proposal (and without the assent of the European Parliament), particularly in order to create a European Public Prosecutor's Office.

Some members, on the contrary, advocated unanimity for activating enhanced cooperation.

Enhanced cooperation in the area of CFSP:

Some Convention members were sceptical as to the possibility of initiating enhanced cooperation in the CFSP framework beyond the implementation of joint action or a common position as provided for in the Treaty of Nice. Some pointed to the constructive abstention mechanism, which already offered the kind of flexibility required in this area. Others wished to return to the Treaty of Nice as regards the possibility of raising the activation of enhanced cooperation in that field before the European Council, acting unanimously.

Several Convention members, however, stressed that it was important not to restrict the scope of enhanced cooperation within the CFSP framework and even less so if unanimity remained the rule.

Enhanced cooperation in the area of ESDP:

This issue gave rise to many differing statements.

Several members approved the Praesidium's text, which did not exclude defence from the scope of enhanced cooperation but whose provisions would not apply to specific forms of cooperation already provided for in this area (see Articles I-40 and III- 205 to 209). However, some among them did not wish to exclude out of hand application of the provisions on enhanced cooperation as regards the creation of an armaments agency (Article III-207), while others wanted only the general mechanism for enhanced cooperation, on account of its more inclusive nature, to apply to defence, to the exclusion of specific forms in that area (in particular for "structured" cooperation, Article III-208, and mutual defence, Article III-209).

Certain Convention members, however, were opposed to any flexibility with regard to defence whether it be enhanced cooperation or other specific forms provided for in Article I-40.

Principle of openness and conditions for participation:

A number of Convention members had misgivings regarding possible conditions of participation, fearing that the principle of openness could be jeopardised. Others, however, stressed that these objective conditions, which were the same at the time of establishing enhanced cooperation as at any subsequent point in time, curtailed discretionary power in relation to requests for subsequent participation and hence strengthened the principle of openness.

Some Convention members suggested building in a "cohesion" clause to help Member States which wished to participate but were unable to do so immediately.

III. DEBATE ON THE DRAFT TEXTS ON ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE

The Chairman opened the discussion by presenting the text of the revised articles on economic governance. These had been drawn up on the basis of the conclusions of the Economic Governance

Working Group, taking into account also the subsequent debate in plenary in November 2002, as well as recommendations from the Working Group on Simplification. The Chairman invited the Convention to include the issue of taxation in the debate, since this had been part of the discussions in the Economic Governance Working Group.

A large number of members of the Convention acknowledged that the draft articles put forward by the Praesidium represented progress compared with the current situation, even though some of them regretted that the texts did not go further. A number underlined that strengthening the provisions on economic policy coordination was an essential part of a properly functioning Economic and Monetary Union. A few considered that the proposed texts were too ambitious, or at the limit of what they could accept.

There were specific requests from a number of members of the Convention for a greater role for both the Commission and the European Parliament in economic policy coordination. Whilst the proposal to move from a Commission recommendation to a proposal in the article on the excessive deficit procedure was largely welcomed, a large number of those who spoke on this subject wanted to include this provision also in the procedures on the Broad Economic Policy Guidelines. There was also a call for a greater involvement of the European Parliament in the elaboration of the Guidelines, principally through giving it the right to be consulted. However, several members were opposed to extending the role of either the Commission or the Parliament in these areas.

A number of speakers welcomed the proposed Protocol on the Eurogroup, though several commented that it was not really necessary. Some wished to go further either by establishing a formal "Eurozone ECOFIN" or by extending and clarifying the extent of the exclusive decision-making powers of those Member States within the Eurozone. A few speakers considered that the current proposal in Article III-86(3) for a limited extension to the decision-making powers of the Eurozone countries was insufficiently clear. Others considered that any such moves would be seen as divisive, and should therefore be avoided.

A number of speakers broadly welcomed the provisions on the external representation of the euro. However, several called for this provision to state explicitly that this role should be given to the Commission. A proposal was also made that this should rather be for the President of the Eurogroup.

One speaker, subsequently supported by several others, called for a permanent post combining the existing functions of Commissioner responsible for Economic and Financial issues and ECOFIN chairman.

Several speakers referred to Part I of the Constitution. Some proposed amending the text of Article I-14 on the coordination of economic and employment policies, considering that it still did not sufficiently reflect the fact that it was the Member States which coordinate their policies. Others called for the text to reflect a better balance between economic and social policy.

A number of speakers welcomed the proposal to maintain the independent status and existing functions of the European Central Bank. However, a few wished to see a widening of the mandate of the ECB along the lines of that of the US Federal Reserve.

On taxation, a number of speakers regretted that the proposed text did not provide for further extension of qualified majority voting. Some expressed concern that the proposed text was even a retrograde step compared with existing provisions. Several speakers, however, underlined that any move to QMV in this area was unacceptable; for some of them the text as put forward was unacceptable; for others it was at the limit of what they could accept.

The Chairman concluded the discussion by underlining that the text put forward by the Praesidium had as far as possible taken into account the differing views on the range of issues covered, including the specific provisions applying to those Member States within the Eurogroup. There was, however, certainly scope for improving the text, and the Praesidium would look into how this might be done. It would also look again at the draft articles on taxation, taking into account the different points of view expressed during the debate. In order to assist it on this and other issues, the Praesidium would find it useful to have contributions from the component groups.

IV. DEBATE ON THE DRAFT TEXTS CONCERNING OWN RESOURCES AND THE BUDGETARY PROCEDURE

The draft Articles concerning Union finances, in both Part I and Part III of the Constitution, have been generally well received although differences remain on some points.

There seems to be broad consensus on the budgetary principles proposed by the Praesidium in Article 39. Some Convention members would like the principle concerning sound financial management and its supervision to be strengthened.

With regard to the procedure for adoption of the system of own resources, some Convention members oppose the procedural distinction, provided for in Article I-53, between setting the ceiling of resources and creating new resources on the one hand and the arrangements for such resources on the other. Those Convention members would like to keep the current procedure for the whole system. Other Convention members consider that it is necessary to go further and delete the requirement of national ratification or even switch to qualified majority in the case of all measures concerning resources and strengthen the European Parliament's role in this procedure. Some Convention members would like the Constitution to provide for the possibility of creating new resources of a fiscal nature. Others are opposed to this.

Some speakers expressed opposition to the reference to the principle of sufficient means in Article I-53. Others endorsed it and also asked for the idea of equity to be introduced into this Article.

There is broad consensus on formalising the financial perspective – the multiannual financial framework – as a binding framework for budgetary discipline in the Constitution. Some differences nevertheless remain with regard to the procedure. Some Convention members propose the codecision procedure. On the other hand, some consider that it is the Council which should decide and that the decision should be taken unanimously. Certain Convention members are opposed to the idea of extending the last year of the previous financial framework when the new financial framework has not yet been adopted on expiry of the previous one.

With regard to the annual procedure, there seems to be consensus on elimination of the distinction between compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure, under the conditions specified by several provisions – formalisation of the financial framework in the Constitution (Article I-54) and defining of legally compulsory expenditure (III-315) – of the draft Constitution. There is broad support for the proposal for an annual procedure. Nevertheless, some Convention members would prefer that, in the event of disagreement between the Council and Parliament, the lowest amount of those proposed should be entered in the budget.

Some speakers wanted provision to be made for specific procedural arrangements with regard to common foreign and security policy.

V. DEBATE ON DRAFT PART II OF THE CONSTITUTION

The incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and its Preamble into Part II of the Constitution was largely endorsed by Convention members, although some would have preferred the Charter to constitute Part I, and others that it should be incorporated into a protocol annexed to the Treaty.

For several Convention members, the adaptations of the final horizontal clauses of the Charter made by Working Group II and the updating of the Praesidium's explanations are an essential condition for being able to agree on conferring a legal value upon it. Some would also like to confer a legal value on the explanations themselves, or at the very least to refer explicitly to them in the text of the Constitution. Mr Vitorino, the Chairman of the Working Group on the Charter, stated that work on updating the explanations of the Charter was under way.

VI. DEBATE ON THE DRAFT ARTICLES IN PART III OF THE CONSTITUTION

Several Convention members said they would like to be able to examine in greater depth certain questions in Part III, especially from a more technical point of view. The main questions raised at this preliminary debate were as follows:

Extension of qualified majority voting

One of the main themes discussed was the extension of qualified majority voting. A great many Convention members thought that the extension to date was not sufficient, and some said that cases subject to unanimity should be strictly limited to exceptional instances. Others pointed to the need

to retain unanimity in some policies, mainly in fiscal and social matters. In this context, some members suggested that provision be made for augmented qualified majority voting to replace unanimity.

On the subject of commercial policy, some Convention members stressed the need to provide for agreements in the field of cultural and audiovisual services, as well as education and health services, to be negotiated and concluded on the basis of unanimity. Others expressed their support for the Praesidium's proposal, stressing that effective negotiations of the enlarged Union called for decisions to be taken by qualified majority.

In the case of CFSP decisions, a number of Convention members regretted unanimity being kept as a general rule. They consider that unanimity weakens the Union's capacity for expressing its opinion and acting on the international scene. These Convention members would like qualified majority voting to become the general rule whilst providing for a safeguard clause to prevent a Member State whose vital interests are at stake from being placed in a minority position. Other Convention members, without calling into question the general rule of unanimity, argued in favour of an extension of the list of cases in which the Council, by derogation from the general rule, may adopt decisions by qualified majority; in particular, when the Council acts on a joint proposal from the Union Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Commission, when it adopts decisions concerning restrictive measures, and when it adopts decisions concerning CFSP actions below a certain financial threshold. Other Convention members, however, considered that the Praesidium's proposals on the decision-making procedure in the CFSP field were satisfactory and that the provisions of Article III-196(3) allowed for switching to qualified majority voting without having recourse to amendment of the Treaty.

Area of freedom, security and justice

Convention members' contributions on the provisions concerning the area of freedom, security and justice have tended to be positive. However, some claimed still to have difficulty in accepting use of the ordinary legislative procedure for establishing minimum rules in matters of criminal procedure. Several Convention members also stressed, on the subject of Article III-161 on immigration, that they wanted the unanimity rule to apply to access to the labour market (and

hence to social security) for third-country nationals legally resident in Union territory. Certain Convention members expressed their disagreement with the provision stipulating the creation of a European Public Prosecutor's Office from Eurojust. However, others thought this latter provision did not go far enough and that it was necessary to clear the way towards enhanced cooperation, according to less rigorous procedures than for enhanced cooperation in general.

Certain Convention members welcomed the application of the unanimity rule to family law, the abolition of the ordinary legislative procedure for parental responsibility, and the provision allowing for the possibility of unanimously identifying those aspects of family law having cross-border implications which might be the subject of instruments adopted in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure.

Defence

With regard to defence policy, certain Convention members expressed misgivings as to the inclusion in the Constitution of the possibility of structured cooperation in advanced military capabilities with a view to the most demanding tasks, judging in particular that it should be more open. Some others, however, were not in favour of the amendment made to the text of the provisions on structured cooperation concerning the replacement of the declaration by a protocol. The possibility of closer cooperation in mutual defence also met with some reluctance. However, some Convention members welcomed the inclusion of such clauses in the Constitution.

Several speakers expressed satisfaction at the extension by the Praesidium of the scope of the solidarity clause, with some wishing to extend it still further, for example to include everyday accidents. Others expressed doubts regarding the need to include the clause in the Constitution.

Services of general interest

Several Convention members expressed the desire for more open recognition of the importance of services of general interest, with some in favour of a legal basis aimed at promoting them. Some

Convention members stated in this connection that such recognition by no means prevented the public authorities from entrusting the management of such services to the private sector.

New legal bases

The drafts of new legal bases resulting from the title on competence in Part I of the Constitution have in general been well received. They are legal bases concerning sport, energy, civil protection, intellectual property, administrative cooperation and space. Some reservations were expressed with regard to the legal basis on energy. Other additional legal bases have been proposed – for example, for cross-border cooperation or for the European Company Statute.

Euratom

On the Euratom Treaty, some Convention members said they could not endorse the Praesidium's proposal to incorporate the Euratom Treaty as it stood, merely adapting the institutional and financial provisions of that Treaty. They would like the Treaty to be substantially amended and adapted to the current situation by making provision in particular for the ordinary legislative procedure. Other Convention members, however, pointed out that it did not seem realistic to carry out a substantial revision of the Euratom Treaty. Some put forward the idea of including a rendez-vous clause for amending the Euratom Treaty, or drawing up a "sunset clause" which would put an end to the Treaty on a predetermined date.

Other institutional questions

Several Convention members proposed improving direct access by citizens to the Court of Justice (Article III-266) and strengthening legal protection in the CFSP field, or in matters of asylum (emergency procedures).

One Convention member spoke of the need for the Constitution to specify the exceptional cases in which the Council and not the Commission adopted implementing regulations and the Commission's statutory power as regards exemptions by category.

o

o

o

The Chairman confirmed to Convention members his intention of organising consultations with "the component groups". These would be held at 9.30 on Wednesday 4 June with the representatives of the National Parliaments, at 15.00 with the representatives of the Governments, at 17.00 with the representatives of the European Parliament and at 19.00 with the representatives of the Commission.

Session plénière vendredi 30 et samedi 31 mai 2003

LISTE DES ORATEURS

suivant l'ordre des interventions

Vendredi 30 mai (11h00)

**1. Débat sur les projets de textes concernant les coopérations renforcées
(CONV 723/03).**

1. M. Pierre LEQUILLER - France (Parlement)
2. M. Jozef OLEKSY - Pologne (Parlement)
3. Mme Lena HJELM-WALLÉN - Suède (Gouvernement)
4. M. Andrew DUFF - Parlement européen
5. Mme Marietta GIANNAKOU - Grèce (Parlement)
6. M. Jari VILÉN - Finlande (Parlement)
7. M. Marco FOLLINI - Italie (Parlement)
8. M. Frans TIMMERMANS - Pays Bas (Parlement)
9. M. Peter SKAARUP - Danemark (Parlement)

(Carton bleu : Voggenhuber)

10. M. Jens-Peter BONDE - Parlement européen
11. M. Peter HAIN - Royaume Uni (Gouvernement)
12. M. Jelko KACIN - Slovénie (Parlement)
13. M. Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finlande (Parlement)
14. M. Michael FRENDÓ - Malte (Parlement)
15. M. Hubert HAENEL - France (Parlement)
16. M. René van der LINDEN - Pays Bas (Parlement)
17. M. Dick ROCHE - Irlande (Gouvernement)
18. M. Paraskevas AVGERINOS - Grèce (Parlement)
19. Mme Teija TIILIKAINEN - Finlande (Gouvernement)
20. M. Jan ZAHRADIL - Rép. Tchèque (Parlement)
21. M. Edmund WITTBRODT - Pologne (Parlement)
22. M. Proinsias DE ROSSA - Irlande (Parlement)
23. M. Rytis MARTIKONIS - Lituanie (Gouvernement)
24. M. Göran LENNMARKER - Suède (Parlement)
25. M. Alexandru ATHANASIU - Roumanie (Parlement)
26. M. Eugen BÖSCH - Autriche (Parlement)
27. M. Tunne KELAM - Estonie (Parlement)
28. Mme Sandra KALNIETE - Lettonie (Gouvernement)
29. M. Joschka FISCHER - Allemagne (Gouvernement)

(Cartons bleus : Dini, Voggenhuber)

30. M. Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS - Lituanie (Parlement)
31. M. Luis MARINHO - Parlement européen
32. Mme Eduarda AZEVEDO - Portugal (Parlement)
33. M. Michel BARNIER - Commission
34. M. Josef ZIELENIEC - Rép. Tchèque (Parlement)
35. M. Ernani LOPES - Portugal (Gouvernement)

SUPPLÉANTS

- 36. M. Pierre CHEVALIER - Belgique (Gouvernement)
 - 37. M. Adrian SEVERIN - Roumanie (Parlement)
 - 38. Mme Pascale ANDREANI - France (Gouvernement)
 - 39. M. Peter GOTTFRIED - Hongrie (Gouvernement)
 - 40. Mme Pervenche BERÈS - Parlement européen
- (Carton bleu : Vitorino)

- * suppléant M. Michel
- * suppléant M. Hasotti
- * suppléante M. de VILLEPIN
- *suppléant M. Balázs
- * suppléante M. Duhamel

Vendredi 30 mai (15h00)

2. Débat sur les projets de textes concernant

- la gouvernance économique et
 - les ressources propres et la procédure budgétaire
- (CONV 724/03, CONV 725/03, CONV 727/03)

- 1. M. Lamberto DINI - Italie (Parlement)
 - 2. M. René van der LINDEN - Pays Bas (Parlement)
 - 3. M. Hannes FARNLEITNER - Autriche (Gouvernement)
 - 4. M. Jürgen MEYER - Allemagne (Parlement)
 - 5. M. Jelko KACIN - Slovénie (Parlement)
 - 6. M. Michel BARNIER - Commission
 - 7. M. Andrew DUFF - Parlement européen
 - 8. M. Gijs DE VRIES - Pays Bas (Gouvernement)
 - 9. M. Sören LEKBERG - Suède (Parlement)
 - 10. M. Caspar EINEM - Autriche (Parlement)
 - 11. M. Ben FAYOT - Luxembourg (Parlement)
 - 12. Mme Teija TIILIKAINEN - Finlande (Gouvernement)
 - 13. M. Alain LAMASSOURE - Parlement européen
 - 14. M. Gianfranco FINI - Italie (Gouvernement)
- (Cartons bleus : Kauppi, Katiforis, Kauffman, Bonde, Mendez de Vigo)
- 15. M. Josep BORRELL - Espagne (Parlement)
 - 16. M. Proinsias DE ROSSA - Irlande (Parlement)
 - 17. M. Ernani LOPES - Portugal (Gouvernement)
 - 18. Mme Sandra KALNIETE - Lettonie (Gouvernement)
 - 19. M. Pierre LEQUILLER - France (Parlement)
 - 20. M. Erwin TEUFEL - Allemagne (Parlement)
 - 21. M. Jens-Peter BONDE - Parlement européen
 - 22. M. Peter HAIN - Royaume Uni (Gouvernement)
 - 23. Mme Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN - Parlement européen
- (Cartons bleus : Dastis, Wuermeling, Duff)
- 24. M. Dick ROCHE - Irlande (Gouvernement)
 - 25. M. Klaus HAENSCH - Parlement européen
 - 26. M. Rein LANG - Estonie(Parlement)
 - 27. Mme Cristiana MUSCARDINI - Parlement européen
 - 28. M. Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finlande (Parlement)
 - 29. M. Göran LENNMARKER - Suède (Parlement)
 - 30. M. Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS - Lituanie (Parlement)

31. Mme Linda McAVAN - Parlement européen
 32. Mme Hildegard PUWAK - Roumanie (Gouvernement)
 33. M. Jan FIGEL - Rép. Slovaque (Parlement)
 34. Mme Anne VAN LANCKER - Parlement européen
 35. Mme Danuta HÜBNER - Pologne (Gouvernement)
 36. M. Alberto COSTA - Portugal (Parlement)
 37. M. Jari VILÉN - Finlande (Parlement)
 38. M. John BRUTON - Irlande (Parlement)
- Cartons bleus : Duff, Roche, Van Lancker, MacCormick, Barnier)*

SUPPLÉANTS

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 39. M. David O'SULLIVAN - Commission | * suppléant M. Vitorino |
| 40. M. Hans-Martin BURY - Allemagne (Gouvernement) | * suppléant M. Fischer |
| 41. Lord TOMLISON - Royaume Uni (Parlement) | * suppléant Mme Stuart |
| <i>(Cartons bleus : Christophersen, de Vries, Duhamel)</i> | |
| 42. M. Pierre CHEVALIER - Belgique (Gouvernement) | * suppléant M. Michel |
| 43. M. Carlos CARNERO - Parlement européen | * suppléant M. Marinho |
| 44. Mme Lenka ROVNA - Rép. Tchèque (Gouvernement) | * suppléante M. Kohout |
| 45. Mme Pervenche BERÈS - Parlement européen | * suppléante M. Duhamel |
| 46. M. Adrian SEVERIN - Roumanie (Parlement) | * suppléant M. Hasotti |
| 47. Mme Pascale ANDREANI - France (Gouvernement) | * suppléante M. De Villepin |
| 48. M. Valdo SPINI - Italie (Parlement) | * suppléant M. Follini |
| 49. M. Henrik HOLOLEI - Estonie (Gouvernement) | * suppléant M. Meri |
| 50. M. Antonio NAZARÉ PEREIRA - Portugal (Parlement) | * suppléant Mme Azevedo |
- (Cartons bleus : Barnier, Fayot, Kiljunen, Lenmarker, Van Lancker)*

OBSERVATEURS

M. Emilio GABAGLIO - Partenaires sociaux

Samedi 31 mai

3. Débat sur le projet des parties II et III de la Constitution (CONV 725/03, CONV 726/03, CONV 727/03)

1. M. Hannes FARNLEITNER - Autriche (Gouvernement)
 2. M. Jan FIGEL - Rép. Slovaque (Parlement)
 3. Mme Anne VAN LANCKER - Parlement européen
 4. M. Göran LENNMARKER - Suède (Parlement)
 5. M. Ernani LOPES - Portugal (Gouvernement)
 6. M. Kimmo KILJUNEN - Finlande (Parlement)
 7. M. Antonio TAJANI - Parlement européen
 8. M. Antonio VITORINO - Commission
 9. M. Sören LEKBERG - Suède (Parlement)
 10. Mme Teija TIILIKAINEN - Finlande (Gouvernement)
 11. M. Pierre LEQUILLER - France (Parlement)
 12. M. Dick ROCHE - Irlande (Gouvernement)
 13. M. Hubert HAENEL - France (Parlement)
- (Cartons bleus : Voggenhuber, Fayot, Hain, Rack, Paciotti, Vitorino)*
14. M. Andrew DUFF - Parlement européen
 15. M. Pierre CHEVALIER – Belgique (Gouvernement)

16. M. Jürgen MEYER - Allemagne (Parlement)
17. M. Peter HAIN - Royaume Uni (Gouvernement)
18. M. Olivier DUHAMEL - Parlement européen
19. M. Michel BARNIER - Commission
20. M. Aloiz PETERLE - Slovénie (Parlement)
21. Mme Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN - Parlement européen
22. M. Proinsias DE ROSSA - Irlande (Parlement)
23. M. Gianfranco FINI - Italie (Gouvernement)
24. M. Caspar EINEM - Autriche (Parlement)
25. M. Jelko KACIN - Slovénie (Parlement)
26. M. Elmar BROK - Parlement européen
27. Mme Sandra KALNIETE - Lettonie (Gouvernement)
- (Cartons bleus : Berès, Kvist, Carey, Lenmarker, Van der Linden, Barnier, Maij-Weggen, Roche, Van Lancker, Thorning Schmidt, Gormley, Bruton)*
28. M. Vytenis ANDRIUKAITIS - Lituanie (Parlement)
29. M. Erwin TEUFEL - Allemagne (Parlement)
30. M. Alain LAMASSOURE - Parlement européen
31. M. Peter SERRACINO-INGLOTT - Malte (Gouvernement)
32. M. Panayiotis DEMETRIOU - Chypre (Parlement)
33. M. Lamberto DINI - Italie (Parlement)
34. M. Ben FAYOT - Luxembourg (Parlement)
35. M. Jan ZAHRADIL - Rép. Tchèque (Parlement)
36. M. Gijs DE VRIES - Pays Bas (Gouvernement)
37. Mme Eduarda AZEVEDO - Portugal (Parlement)
38. Mme Hildegard PUWAK - Roumanie (Gouvernement)
39. Mme Sylvia-Yvonne KAUFMANN - Parlement européen

SUPPLEANTS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 40. M. Adrian SEVERIN - Roumanie (Parlement) 41. M. Diego LOPEZ GARRIDO - Espagne (Parlement) 42. Mme Pascale ANDREANI - France (Gouvernement) 43. M. Hans-Martin BURY - Allemagne (Gouvernement) 44. Mme Elena PACIOTTI - Parlement européen 45. Mme Maria BERGER - Parlement européen 46. M. Valdo SPINI - Italie (Parlement) 47. M. Joachim WUERMELING - Parlement européen 48. M. Eduard MAINONI - Autriche (Parlement) 49. Mme. Marta FOGLER - Pologne (Parlement) 50. M. William ABITBOL - Parlement européen 51. M. Istvan SZENT-IVANY - Hongrie (Parlement) 52. M. Esko HELLE - Finlande (Parlement) <i>(Carton bleu : Lennmarker, De Rossa, Cisneros, Vilen)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * suppléant M. Hasotti * suppléant M. Borrell * suppléante M. De Villepin * suppléant M. Fischer * suppléante Mme McAvan * suppléante M. Hänsch * suppléant M. Follini * suppléant de M. Kirkhope * suppléant M. Bösch * suppléante M. Oleksy * suppléant M. Bonde * suppléant M. Vastagh * suppléant M. Vilén |
|--|--|

OBSERVATEURS

- M. Emilio GABAGLIO - Partenaires sociaux
M. Josef CHABERT - Comité des régions
(Carton bleu : McLennan, Dybkjaer, Wagener, Bonde)