

Constitutional Council

Decision n° 2009–584 DC of 16 July 2009

Hospital Reform Act and on Patients, Health and Territories

The Constitutional Council was seized, within the provisions of article 61, second paragraph of the Constitution, on the *Hospital Reform Act and on Patients, Health and Territories*, on 2 July 2009, by Mr Jean-Marc AYRAULT, Mrs Patricia ADAM, Messrs Jean-Paul BACQUET, Claude BARTOLONE, Jacques BASCOU, Christian BATAILLE, Jean-Louis BIANCO, Mrs Gisèle BIÉMOURET, Messrs Serge BLISKO, Jean-Michel BOUCHERON, Mesdames Marie-Odile BOUILLÉ, Monique BOULESTIN, Messrs François BROTTES, Alain CACHEUX, Thierry CARCENAC, Christophe CARESCHE, Laurent CATHALA, Jean-Paul CHANTEGUET, Alain CLAEYS, Mrs Marie-Françoise CLERGEAU, Mr Gilles COCQUEMPOT, Mesdames Catherine COUTELLE, Pascale CROZON, Messrs Pascal DEGUILHEM, Guy DELCOURT, Bernard DEROSIER, Tony DREYFUS, William DUMAS, Jean-Louis DUMONT, Yves DURAND, Mrs Odette DURIEZ, Messrs Philippe DURON, Olivier DUSSOPT, Christian ECKERT, Henri EMMANUELLI, Laurent FABIUS, Albert FACON, Mesdames Aurélie FILIPPETTI, Geneviève FIORASO, Messrs Michel FRANÇAIX, Jean-Claude FRUTEAU, Jean-Louis GAGNAIRE, Jean GAUBERT, Mrs Catherine GÉNISSON, Messrs Jean-Patrick GILLE, Jean GLAVANY, Daniel GOLDBERG, Gaëtan GORCE, Mrs Pascale GOT, Mr Marc GOUA, Mrs Élisabeth GUIGOU, Mr David HABIB, Mrs Danièle HOFFMAN-RISPAL, Mr François HOLLANDE, Mrs Monique IBORRA, Mr Jean-Louis IDIART, Mrs Françoise IMBERT, Messrs Michel ISSINDOU, Serge JANQUIN, Armand JUNG, Mesdames Marietta KARAMANLI, Conchita LACUEY, Messrs Jérôme LAMBERT, Jack LANG, Jean LAUNAY, Jean-Yves LE BOUILLONNEC, Jean-Marie LE GUEN, Mrs Annick LE LOCH, Mr Bruno LE ROUX, Mesdames Marylise LEBRANCHU, Catherine LEMORTON, Messrs Bernard LESTERLIN, François LONCLE, Jean MALLOT, Mesdames Jacqueline MAQUET, Marie-Lou MARCEL, Messrs Jean-René MARSAC, Philippe MARTIN, Mesdames Martine MARTINEL, Frédérique MASSAT, Mr Didier MATHUS, Mrs Sandrine MAZETIER, Messrs Michel MÉNARD, Didier MIGAUD, Pierre MOSCOVICI, Pierre-Alain MUET, Philippe NAUCHE, Henri NAYROU, Alain NÉRI, Mrs Françoise OLIVIER-COUCHEAU, Mr Michel PAJON, Mrs George PAU-LANGEVIN, Messrs Christian PAUL, Germinal PEIRO, Jean-Luc PÉRAT, Jean-Claude PEREZ, Mrs Marie-Françoise PÉROL-DUMONT, Messrs François PUPPONI, Jean-Jack QUEYRANNE, Mrs Marie-Line REYNAUD, Messrs Alain RODET, Bernard ROMAN, Alain ROUSSET, Patrick ROY, Michel SAINTE-MARIE, Mrs Marisol TOURAINÉ, Messrs Philippe TOURTELIÉ, Jean-Jacques URVOAS, Daniel VAILLANT, Jacques VALAX, André VALLINI, Manuel VALLS, Jean-Michel VILLAUMÉ, Jean-Claude VIOLLET, Philippe VUILQUE, Guy CHAMBEFORT, Gérard CHARASSE, René DOSIÈRE, Mesdames Jeanny MARC, Dominique ORLIAC, Martine PINVILLE, Messrs Simon RENUCCI, Marcel ROGEMONT and Mrs Christiane TAUBIRA, Members of Parliament,

and, the same day, by Mr Jean-Pierre BEL, Mesdames Jacqueline ALQUIER, Michèle ANDRÉ, Messrs Alain ANZIANI, David ASSOULINE, Claude BÉRIT-DÉBAT, Jacques BERTHOU, Jean BESSON, Mrs Marie-Christine BLANDIN, Mr Yannick BODIN, Mrs Nicole

Translation provided by the Lawyers Collective (New Delhi, India) and partners for the Global Health and Human Rights Database

BONNEFOY, Mr Didier BOULAUD, Mrs Alima BOUMEDIENE–THIERY, Mr Martial BOURQUIN, Mrs Bernadette BOURZAI, Mr Michel BOUTANT, Mesdames Nicole BRICQ, Claire–Lise CAMPION, Mr Jean–Louis CARRÈRE, Mrs Françoise CARTRON, Mr Bernard CAZEAU, Mrs Monique CERISIER–ben GUIGA, Mr Yves CHASTAN, Mrs Jacqueline CHÈVE, Messrs Gérard COLLOMB, Pierre–Yves COLLOMBAT, Roland COURTEAU, Yves DAUDIGNY, Marc DAUNIS, Jean–Pierre DEMERLIAT, Claude DOMEIZEL, Mrs Josette DURRIEU, Messrs Jean–Claude FRÉCON, Bernard FRIMAT, Charles GAUTIER, Jean–Pierre GODEFROY, Jean–Noël GUÉRINI, Didier GUILLAUME, Edmond HERVÉ, Mesdames Odette HERVIAUX, Annie JARRAUD–VERGNOLLE, Mr Claude JEANNEROT, Mesdames Bariza KHIARI, Virginie KLÈS, Messrs Yves KRATTINGER, Serge LAGAUCHE, Serge LARCHER, Jacky LE MENN, Mrs Raymonde LE TEXIER, Mr André LEJEUNE, Mrs Claudine LEPAGE, Messrs Jean–Jacques LOZACH, Roger MADEC, Marc MASSION, Louis MERMAZ, Jean–Pierre MICHEL, Gérard MIQUEL, Jean–Jacques MIRASSOU, Robert NAVARRO, Jean–Marc PASTOR, Georges PATIENT, Jean–Claude PEYRONNET, Bernard PIRAS, François REBSAMEN, Mrs Patricia SCHILLINGER, Messrs Michel SERGENT, Jean–Pierre SUEUR, Simon SUTOUR, Mrs Catherine TASCA, Messrs Michel TESTON, René TEULADE, Jean–Marc TODESCHINI, Richard TUHEIAVA, Mrs Dominique VOYNET, Mr Richard YUNG, Mesdames Nicole BORVO, Éliane ASSASSI, Marie–France BEAUFILS, Messrs Michel BILLOUT, Jean–Claude DANGLLOT, Mesdames Annie DAVID, Michelle DEMESSINE, Évelyne DIDIER, Messrs Guy FISCHER, Thierry FOUCAUD, Robert HUE, Gérard LE CAM, Mrs Odette TERRADE, Messrs Jack RALITE, Ivan RENAR, Jean–François VOGUET and François AUTAIN, senators.

The Constitutional Council,

Considering the Constitution;

Considering the modified decree n°58-1067 of 7 November 1958 establishing an organic law on the Constitutional Council;

Considering the *Public Health Act*;

Considering the *Social Security Act*;

Considering law n°86-33 of 9 January 1986 establishing statutory provisions on public hospital service;

Considering law n°2004-806 of 9 August 2004 on public health policies;

Considering the Government's observations, registered on 8 July 2009;

The rapporteur having been heard;

1. Considering that the Members of Parliament and senators who authored the claim refer to the Constitutional Council the *Hospital Reform Act and on Patients, Health and Territories*; that with their claim, they criticize the conformity to the Constitution of its articles 1, 10, 23, 84, 91 and

133; that they also claim that Parliament adopted provisions which do not belong within the deferred law; that furthermore, the senators contest its articles 11 and 129;

- ON THE PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE HEALTH ESTABLISHMENTS IN THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE MISSIONS:

2. Considering that as provided by article L. 6112-1 of the *Public Health Act*, as results from article 1 of the law, public or private health establishments can be called upon to ensure, in full or in part, one or many of the fourteen public service missions provided by this article; that as provided by its article L. 6112-2, the public service missions that are entrusted to an establishment are registered in the contract for objectives and means concluded with the regional health agency; that as provided by the first four paragraphs of article L. 6112-3: “The health establishment, or any person in charge of one or many public service missions defined by article L. 6112-1, guarantees to every patient received within the framework of such missions: - 1° Equal access to quality healthcare; - 2° The permanent reception and treatment, or orientation towards another establishment or another institution, within the framework defined by the regional health agency; - 3° The treatment according to the rates set by the administrative authority or to the rates provided by 1° of I of article L. 162-14-1 of the *Social Security Act*”; that finally, as provided by the two first paragraphs of article L. 6112-3-1: “Any patient from a public health establishment benefits from guarantees defined at 1° and 2° of article L. 6112-3. – Public health establishments apply the rates provided by articles L. 162-20 and L. 162-26 of the *Social Security Act* to socially insured persons”;

3. Considering that, according to the claimants, by choosing to “integrate private establishments to carry out the public service missions... whilst leaving them the possibility to choose on an on-demand basis the effective missions they wish to ensure”, the law does not offer sufficient legal guarantees in order for “the constitutional requirement of the right to health for all and its corollary that is an equal access to healthcare to be fully satisfied”;

4. Considering, firstly, that no constitutional requirement imposes on private health establishments exercising public service missions to ensure all public health missions likely to be entrusted to a health establishment;

5. Considering, secondly, that it results from the aforementioned provisions that private health establishments exercising public service missions will be required, for the accomplishment of such missions, to guarantee equal access to all to quality healthcare and to ensure its implementation with the regulated rates and fees; that, therefore, the criticized provisions do not infringe upon the equality before public service principle that results from article 6 of Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789;

6. Considering, thirdly, that as provided by 2° of article L. 6112-3, these private health establishments will guarantee the permanency of the reception and treatment, or orientation towards another establishment or another institution, “within the framework defined by the regional health agency”; that it will be the responsibility of the latter, through the defining of the modalities of this participation and the coordination with the activity of public health establishments, to see that is ensured the continuous exercise of the public health service’s

Translation provided by the Lawyers Collective (New Delhi, India) and partners for the Global Health and Human Rights Database

missions taken as a whole; that, subject to this limitation, these provisions do not infringe upon neither the requirements of the eleventh paragraph of the Preamble of the Constitution of 1946 relating to the protection of health, nor the continuity of public service principle;

- ON THE GOVERNANCE OF PUBLIC HEALTH ESTABLISHMENTS:

7. Considering that articles 10, 11 and 23 of the deferred law modify the *Public Health Act* and the aforementioned *Law of 9 January 1986*, which are related to the status and the governance of public health establishments;

8. Considering that, according to the claimants, the powers delegated to the regional health agency on public health establishments would limit their autonomy thus infringing upon the constitutional requirements in terms of contractual freedom, in particular as concerns the conclusion of the multi-annual objectives and means contract with the regional health agency and for the conclusion of cooperation conventions between numerous establishments; that would be contrary to the Constitution the provisions of article L. 6143-7-2 of the *Public Health Act* as well as those of article 3 of the *Law of 9 January 1986*, which provide that the establishment directors are appointed, depending on the situation, by the general director of the regional health agency or according to his or her proposition; that would also be contrary to the Constitution the provisions of article L. 6131-2 of the *Public Health Act* that allow the general director of the regional health agency to ask public health establishments to conclude a convention leading to the cooperation or a greater integration between establishments and, if this demand is not followed through by effect, authorize him or her to reduce the financial allocations; that, finally, they claim that the “hierarchical guardianship” of regional health agencies on public health establishments “ignores the existence of genuine sanitary counter-powers of which the role would have been of a nature to prevent serious risks”;

9. Considering that no constitutional requirement guarantees the management autonomy of public health establishments; that, furthermore, the powers of the regional health agency do not themselves infringe upon the freedom to contract of these establishments; that, therefore, the grievances raised lack in fact;

- ON THE NOMINATION OF PERSONS WITHOUT THE QUALIFICATION OF CIVIL SERVANT FOR THE PUBLIC ESTABLISHMENT DIRECTOR POSITIONS:

10. Considering that the 1° of I of article 11 of the deferred law modifies article 3 of the aforementioned *Law of 9 January 1986* relating to hospital public service; that it allows, through a derogation to article 3 of title 1 of the general civil servant statute, that the persons which are not qualified as civil servants be appointed to the position of public health establishments or social or medico-social establishments directors;

11. Considering that, according to the claimant senators, the possibility of such nominations in the absence of precise criteria as to the talents and the competences of the persons appointed would infringe upon the equal access to public positions principle;

12. Considering that according to article 6 of the 1789 Declaration, all citizens “are equally admissible to all public dignities, places and positions, according to their capacity, and without any other distinction than that of their virtues and their talents”; that the principle of equal access to public positions does not prohibit the legislator from anticipating that persons who are not civil servants can be appointed to permanent management positions in public establishments that are in theory occupied by civil servants; that, however, these provisions cannot be interpreted as allowing to proceed to recruitment measures that infringe upon article 6 of the 1789 Declaration; that, therefore, on one part, it will be to the regulatory powers, in charge of implementation measures, to set the rules of a nature to guarantee equal access of candidates to these positions and to specify the modalities upon which their aptitudes will be examined; that, on the other part, it will be to the competent authorities to base their nomination decisions on the capacity of the interested parties to accomplish their mission; that, under this double limitation, these provisions will not infringe upon the equal access to public positions principle;

- ON THE PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE COMPANIES TO THE ACTIONS AND THERAPEUTIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

13. Considering that the second sentence of article L. 1161-4 of the *Public Health Act*, as results from article 84 of the deferred law, allows that companies exploiting a medication, persons responsible for the marketing of a medical device or of an in vitro diagnostic medical device or companies offering services related to health take part to therapeutic education actions or programs of patients, in particular for their financing, when these programs or actions are elaborated and implemented by health professionals or licensed associations representing the healthcare users;

14. Considering that, according to the claimants, by allowing the pharmaceutical industry and distribution companies to participate in the therapeutic education actions or programs of patients, article L. 1161-4 of the *Public Health Act* would infringe upon the right to health protection;

15. Considering, however, that the contested provisions are limited to providing for the direct or indirect contribution of private companies to the financing of an action or a therapeutic education program of patients and are submitted to the conditions set by articles L. 1161-1 to L. 1161-4 of the *Public Health Code*; that they are not contrary to the requirements of the eleventh paragraph of the Preamble of the Constitution of 1946 relating to the protection of health; that, therefore, the grievance must be dismissed.

- ON THE EDUCATION OF PSYCHOTHERAPISTS:

16. Considering that article 91 of the deferred law, relating to the use of the psychotherapist title, modifies article 52 of the aforementioned *Law of 9 August 2004*; that it provides, in particular, that the access to theoretical and practical training in clinical psychopathology that must have acquired the professionals wishing to be registered in the national registry of psychotherapists is “reserved to persons holding a doctorate level diploma granting the right to exercise medicine in France or a Master’s level diploma for which the specialty or mention is psychology or

psychoanalysis”;

17. Considering that, according to the claimants, by imposing such diploma conditions without providing for any apparatus allowing to be granted the title of psychotherapist on the basis of an initial training in psychotherapy or within the framework of the validation of professional experience, such provisions infringe upon the equality before the law principle;

18. Considering that the legislator is free to amend entrepreneurial freedom, which derives from article 4 of the 1789 Declaration, with limitations related to constitutional requirements or justified by general interest, to the condition that it does not result from this disproportionate infringements in view of the pursued objective; that furthermore, the equality principle is not opposed to the legislator regulating differently different situations provided that the difference in treatment which results from this are in direct relation to the object of the law which establishes it;

19. Considering that by reserving the access to the training leading to the right to use the psychotherapist title to persons that hold a doctorate in medicine or a Master’s in psychology or psychoanalysis, the legislator ensured a conciliation between entrepreneurial freedom and the requirements of the eleventh paragraph of the Preamble of the Constitution of 1946 relating to the protection of health which is not disproportionate and does not infringe upon the equality principle;

- ON THE HARMONIZATION THROUGH ORDERS OF THE PROVISIONS IN EFFECT:

20. Considering that article 133 of the deferred law authorizes the Government to proceed by orders to the modification of legislative parts of the codes and the non-codified provisions in order, on the one part, to ensure their coherency with the law in question and the respect of the hierarchy of norms and, on the other part, to repeal the provisions without object; that this authorization is given for a period of nine months; that a ratification bill must be deposited within three months of the order’s publication;

21. Considering that, according to the claimants, by enabling the Government to harmonize the legislative provisions in effect with those of the deferred law, Parliament would not have exhausted its jurisdiction; that, therefore, it would have infringed upon the objective of intelligibility and accessibility to the law;

22. Considering that pursuant to article 38 of the Constitution, the Government can, to execute its program, ask Parliament the authorization to take, through orders, for a limited period and within the conditions provided by its second paragraph, the measures that are normally within the law’s jurisdiction; that it must, accordingly, state to Parliament with precision, in order to justify the demand presented, the purpose of the measures it wishes to undertake through orders as well as their intervention field;

23. Considering that, as set out from the parliamentary proceedings, by adopting article 133 of

the deferred law, the legislator has only wished to authorize the Government to draw the consequences, through orders, of the law it adopted and thus ensure the coordination of the legislative provisions in effect with those of the law; that, therefore, the alleged grievances must be dismissed;

- ON THE ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES TO THE REGIONAL HEALTH AGENCIES:

24. Considering that the II of article 129 of the deferred law sets the modalities for the assignment of State civil servants, hospital or territorial civil servants, hospital practitioners, contractual public or private law agents exercising the functions transferred to these agencies at the date of this transfer, to the regional health agencies;

25. Considering that, according to the claimant senators, this provision would infringe upon the equality principle as such as the law provides for automatic transfers of certain employees whilst prohibiting others from benefiting from this possibility;

26. Considering that nor the equal access to public positions principle nor the equality of treatment during public agent's careers principle are opposed to different treatments being applied to candidates or agents in a different situation when this difference of situation presents an objective character and that it is motivated by the interest related to the continuity of public service;

27. Considering that the personnel exercising their functions within services for which the activity is transferred to regional health agencies at the date of the transfer are in a different situation than the other employees; that the legislator thus could have, without infringing upon the equality principle, provided for their assignment in these agencies without modifying their previous statutory or contractual situation;

28. Considering that it results that article 129 of the deferred law is not contrary to the Constitution;

- ON THE CERTIFICATION OF THE ACCOUNTS OF PUBLIC HEALTH ESTABLISHMENTS:

29. Considering that article 17 of the deferred law, which reformulates article L. 6145-16 of the *Public Health Act*, provides that the accounts of public health establishments defined through decree are certified by an accounts commissioner or by the Accounts Court; that it specifies that the modalities of this certification are "coordinated by the latter" and set through regulations;

30. That it is the responsibility of the legislator to exercise fully the jurisdiction confided in it by the Constitution and, in particular, its article 34; that the objective of constitutional value of intelligibility and accessibility of the law, which results from articles 4, 5, 6 and 16 of the 1789 Declaration, imposes that it adopts sufficiently specific provisions and unambiguous formulations;

31. Considering that, as set out from the parliamentary proceedings, the legislator wished to confide to the accounts commissioners or to the Accounts Court the certification of the accounts of public health establishments and refer to the regulatory powers the task of setting the criteria for their respective interventions as well as the common procedures; that, however, by confiding to the Accounts Court the power to coordinate the certifications modalities by the accounts commissioners, without setting the scope and limits of this power, the legislator has infringed upon the extent of its jurisdiction; that, as a result, the words “coordinated by the latter and” must be declared contrary to the Constitution;

- ON THE EXPERIMENTATIONS:

32. Considering that article 16 of the deferred law adds to the *Public Health Code* an article L. 6152-7 provided for experimentations related to the annualization of the work schedule of part-time hospital practitioners and referring to a ministerial decree the setting of their modalities, including its length;

33. Considering that the II of article 38 provides that: “An experimentation is held in a region with an important rate of abortions leading to authorize a dispensary pharmacist with a specific training to deliver, for three months and without a possibility for renewal, an oestroprogestogenic contraceptive to women over fifteen years of age and less than thirty-five years of age, within the conditions defined through regulations”;

34. Considering that the III of article 50 adds to the the *Public Health Act* an article L. 1111-20 in order for certain health insurance beneficiaries living in certain regions to receive, on an experimental basis, their medical file recorded on a portable computer data collection device;

35. Considering that article 55 adds to the *Social Security Code* an article L. 162-1-18 to allow insured persons or other entitled persons aged sixteen to twenty-five to benefit each year from a prevention consultation, performed by a generalist doctor, for which they are exempted from paying the costs in advance; that it refers to a decree the responsibility to set the contents, modalities and conditions for implementation of the visit; that the second sentence of the second paragraph of this article adds: “These conditions can provide, for a limited period, for an experimentation to the benefit of a part of the population targeted at the first paragraph”;

36. Considering that the III of article 86 of the deferred law states: “After consultation with relevant professionals on the possibility to extend to midwives the practice of abortions through medication, an experimentation is held in a region with a high rate of abortions. During this experimentation, the midwives are authorized to practice these acts only in the cases in which they are accomplished through medication”;

37. Considering that article 118 concerns the regional health agencies; that it adds to the *Public Health Code* an article L. 1432-3 of which the ninth paragraph states: “On an experimental basis, the presidency of the Supervisory Council of the regional health agency can be confided to a qualified person designated by the health minister. A decree determines the region(s) in which

this experimentation is carried out”;

38. Considering that as provided by article 37-1 of the Constitution: “The law and the regulation can include, for a limited object and period, experimental provisions”; that, if, on the basis of this provision, Parliament can authorize, in view of their eventual generalization, experimentations which derogate, for a limited object and period, to the principle of equality before the law, it must define in a sufficiently specific manner the object and conditions and must not infringe upon the other constitutional value requirements;

39. Considering that by adopting the aforementioned provisions of articles 16, 38, 50, 55, 86 and 118, the legislator authorized experimentations without setting a term; that by having decided itself to derogate to the equality before the law principle, it could not, without infringing upon article 37-1 of the Constitution, refer to the regulatory power the responsibility of setting the length of this derogation; that it results from this that the aforementioned provisions are contrary to the Constitution;

- ON THE PLACE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN THE DEFERRED LAW:

40. Considering that as provided by the first paragraph of article 45 of the Constitution: “Without prejudice to the implementation of articles 40 and 41, any amendment is admissible at first reading when it presents a relation, even indirect, with the deposited or transmitted text;

41. Considering, in this case, that the bill included thirty-three articles when deposited on the desk of the National Assembly, the first assembly seized; that, as specified by the title of the four titles of the law, these provisions were aimed at the modernization of the health establishments, the facilitation of access to all to quality healthcare, the favouring of public health prevention and, finally, modifying the territorial organization of the health system;

42. Considering that article 44, included in the bill through an amendment adopted in first reading by the Senate on 4 June 2009, modifies the *Social Security Act* to change the name of the National Superior School of Social Security [*École nationale supérieure de sécurité sociale*];

43. Considering that this provision, which does not relate, even indirectly, to those in the *Hospital Reform Act and on Patients, Health and Territories*, was adopted according to a procedure contrary to the Constitution; that, as a result, it is appropriate to declare contrary to the Constitution article 44 of the deferred law;

44. Considering that it is not relevant for the Constitutional Council to raise any other question of conformity to the Constitution:

DECIDES:

Article first. - Are declared contrary to the Constitution the following provisions of the *Hospital Reform Act and on Patients, Health and Territories*:

- article 16;

- at the third paragraph of article 17, the words: “coordinated by the latter and”; - the II of article 38; - article 44; - the III of article 50;

- the second sentence of the last paragraph of article 55; - the III of article 86; - at article 118, the ninth paragraph of article L. 1432-3 of the *Public Health Act*.

Article 2. – Subject to the reservations stated at the recitals 6 and 12, the articles L. 6112-1 to 6112-3-1 of the *Public Health Act*, as result from article 1st of the deferred law, as well as its article 11, are not contrary to the Constitution.

Article 3. – The articles L. 1161-4, L. 6131-2 and L. 6143-7-2 of the *Public Health Act*, as result from articles 10, 23 and 84 of the same law, as well as its articles 91 and 129, are not contrary to the Constitution.

Article 4. – This decision will be published to the Official Journal of the French Republic.

Deliberated by the Constitutional Council during its session of 16 July 2009, in which were seated: Mr Jean-Louis DEBRÉ, President, Messrs Guy CANIVET, Renaud DENOIX de SAINT MARC and Olivier DUTHEILLET de LAMOTHE, Mrs Jacqueline de GUILLENCHMIDT, Messrs Pierre JOXE and Jean-Louis PEZANT, Mrs Dominique SCHNAPPER and Mr Pierre STEINMETZ.

Official journal of 22 July 2009, p. 12244 (@2)
Collection, p. (awaiting publication)