

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is now time to open the third panel of the colloquium.

This panel is devoted to “Access to the Supreme Court”. The topic has been evoked yesterday. We have now to consider it more deeply. This session is the longest of the conference; for this reason it is divided into two parts, the first one this morning, the second one after lunch.

I have to chair the morning session.

It is a pleasure, of course, but I have to confess that this pleasure is greatly mitigated because I have here and now to replace a great friend, professor Federico Carpi. I was not expected to chair this session. Initially, Federico Carpi had to chair it, but unfortunately an accident prevented him to attend the conference and deprived him of the pleasure to fulfil his commitments. Our friend is currently recovering. I kindly ask our Italian colleagues, and I thank them for that, to express to Federico Carpi our warmest wishes and our affectionate feelings.

I do not know how Federico Carpi would have introduced this session. He maybe would have said that the topic is a very important issue in Italy where the constitutionalisation of the recourse before the *Corte suprema di cassazione* (art. 111) obstructs the system in a certain way and prevents the supreme court from implementing its *funzione nomofilattica*, I mean its proactive role in the unification of the case law and in the development of the law. Luckily, Chiara Besso is here and will explain us, after the coffee break, the Italian approach of the problem. But before that, we will turn our attention to England and Wales, with John Sorabji, and to France, with Soraya Amrani Mekki. These two systems offer opposite models of access to the supreme court. First of all, France has no supreme court in the Common Law sense. Secondly, the English model is a selective model while the French one is an open one. However with 20,000 new cases in 2012 the average duration of the French proceedings before the *Cour de cassation* is about 400 hundred days. It is not so bad. It will be interesting to compare the solutions implemented here and there, in order to combine efficiency and due process, the rising number of cases and the necessity to rule them in a reasonable time. Increasing the numbers of Justices in order to increase the number of rulings does not seem the best way to achieve this goal. But on the other hand the equation “more appeal, less efficiency / less appeal, more efficiency” is a too simple, even simplistic response to the challenge.

I am confident that the reports and the discussion will be rich and lively.

I am happy to welcome John, Soraya and Chiara who are good friends and who are in their respective countries something like rising stars. They are good friends but I ask them firmly to respect the 30 minutes of their lecture so that we have time for discussion.

Dziękuję.
Loïc Cadiet