

Constantinos Simitis

Από: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele [Eva.Heidbreder@EUI.eu]
Αποστολή: Παρασκευή, 1 Ιουνίου 2007 1:31 πμ
Προς: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele; Martonyi, Janos; Dehaene, Jean-Luc; Ziller, Jacques; Prof. Giuliano Amato; jeanluc@dehaene.be; michel.barnier@merieux-alliance.com; S.Collignon@lse.ac.uk; jldehaene@europarl.eu.int; joanna.szychowska@ec.europa.eu; marzena.wypychowska@ec.europa.eu; sandra.kalniete@apollo.lv; kaspars.vecozols@saeima.lv; aliceschutte@planet.nl; helena.riutta@parliament.fi; tapio.pekkola@eduskunta.fi; Inigo.mendezdevigo@europarl.europa.eu; chrispatten@btinternet.com; Rankin@parliament.uk; otto.schily@bundestag.de; csimitis@otenet.gr; emilie@dsk2007.net; patricia.dias@gpcb.pt; antonio.vitorino@gpcb.pt; floriana.sipala@ec.europa.eu; Margot.wallstrom@ec.europa.eu; Isabelle.RICHARD-MISRACHI@ec.europa.eu; Ponzano, Paolo; servizio.studi@libero.it; kok@brouwershoff.nl; paavo.lipponen@eduskunta.fi
Θέμα: ACED comments WALLSTROEM
Συνημμένα: Comments to the draft declaration_WALLSTROEM.doc



Comments to
the draft declarat.

Dear member of the ACED,

Please find attached further comments by M. Wallström.

With kind regards
eva

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----

Von: Floriana.Sipala@ec.europa.eu [mailto:Floriana.Sipala@ec.europa.eu]

Gesendet: Do 31.05.2007 20:37

An: giuliano.amato@iol.it; Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele

Betreff: Comments to the revised draft declaration

Please find attached, on behalf of Mrs Wallström, some comments to the revised draft declaration, in view of the meeting in Brussels.

Kind regards, Floriana

<<ole0>>

Floriana Sipala

Member of the Cabinet of Vice-President Margot Wallström Institutional Relations and Communication Strategy European Commission BERL 12/110

B-1049 Brussels

Telephone: (+32-2) 29.61060

Fax: (+32-2) 29.81899

Please note the change of e-mail address: floriana.sipala@ec.europa.eu

http://europa.eu.int/comm/commission_barroso/wallstrom/index_en.htm

1. Para 2. Penultimate line; replace "unification" by integration.
2. Para 3: the 3rd sentence could usefully be rephrased to avoid any impression of a "top-bottom" approach. Perhaps the best way would be to stick to the facts and to refer, on the one hand, to the successful ratification in 18 Member States, and, on the other hand, to the rejection by the voters in FR and NL.
3. Para 3: We do not need to keep the last sentence. Referenda took place on a national basis, and this assessment does not correspond to the legal reality.
4. Para 5: it is of course very important to quote the Laeken declaration, as we are doing in this paragraph, but we should not give the impression that we overestimate its impact on the general public. Therefore, it would be better to delete or substantially rephrase the 3rd sentence.
5. Para 6, second line. We could say "*to stipulate a new Treaty*", since streamlining the treaty is an issue which is largely addressed in the following paragraph.
6. Para 6, I would like to introduce the idea of a co-ordination of the ratification procedures among the Member States. An additional sentence could be included at the end of the paragraph. "*The Action Committee for European democracy encourages the Member States to coordinate the national ratification procedures, in order to allow the ratification process to be completed in time and to stimulate a real European-wide debate*". This wording is close to the Baron Crespo-Brok report, as voted by the Committee, and it would allow us also to refer concretely to the need to create a debate on policy issues at EU level.
7. Para 7; We could keep this paragraph, since not all the readers will go through the entire feasibility study which addresses these issues, but I propose to slightly rephrase the 1st sentence "*The new Treaty has to be as concise, accessible and readable as possible*".
8. I would advocate in favour of two additional changes in para 7: in the second sentence the word "*repealing*" could be used instead of "*replacing*". The last sentence should in my view be taken out (we already say in paragraph 6 that "*the new Treaty shall preserve the innovations on which all Governments have already agreed*").
9. Para 8: last sentence - I do not see the added value of the words "*to be added to the catalogue of immediate concerns*". I would also like to change the order of the issues mentioned: (1) climate changes, (2) energy, (3) social dimension and (4) Citizen's rights to information. As regards stimulating debate on pan-European issues, while being extremely supportive to this concept, I believe it could be moved to a separate paragraph (see the proposal above).
10. Para 9: I still consider it necessary to delete the entire paragraph, since this concept could be counterproductive in the ratification phase especially in some Member States.

Brussels, 31 May 2007