

Constantinos Simitis

Από: S.Collignon@lse.ac.uk
Αποστολή: Δευτέρα, 28 Μαΐου 2007 12:41 μμ
Προς: Eva.Heidbreder@EUI.eu; Janos.Martonyi@BAKERNET.com; Jean-Luc.Dehaene@Inbev.com; Jacques.Ziller@EUI.eu; giuliano.amato@iol.it; jeanluc@dehaene.be; michel.barnier@merieux-alliance.com; 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; Rankinp@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; Paolo.Ponzano@EUI.eu; servizio.studi@libero.it; kok@brouwershoff.nl; paavo.lipponen@eduskunta.fi

Θέμα: RE: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

Dear Colleagues,

May I come back to para 9.

1. Do we need it? There are two risks involved:
-mentioning a "proper" constitution may trouble those who oppose a constitution in principle. -not mentioning it, it may trouble those who have voted in favor.
I therefore think it is useful to trace a perspective, which keeps the issue open, without renouncing the possibility.
2. Mentioning a "future" constitution has the advantage of making one "present" Treaty smaller. It therefore strengthens the hand of those who do not want to go through a referendum and wish to ratify by parliament.
3. What is the best procedure to keep the process open? The Constitutional Treaty has been criticized for lack of democratic legitimacy, despite the involvement of Civil Society in the Convention. Traditionally, constitutions obtain legitimacy from electing an Asemblee constituante or from approval by referendum. By involving the EP in the process, we could strengthen the legitimacy in the sense of an Asemblee constituante. This idea has been discussed in France. But it requires that citizens are aware of this before the next elections.
4. I do not question that governments are responsible for negotiating Treaties. This is why I suggested that the EP reports after 2009 to the European Council about the future constitutional process. Maybe the notion of a "mandate" is too strong and we can simply say: The European Council will ask the EP elected in 2009 to report on possible future perspectives for a European Constitution.

Kind regards.

Stefan

-----Original Message-----

From: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele [mailto:Eva.Heidbreder@EUI.eu]
Sent: Saturday, May 26, 2007 8:31 AM
To: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele; Martonyi, Janos; Dehaene, Jean-Luc; Ziller, Jacques; Prof. Giuliano Amato; jeanluc@dehaene.be; michel.barnier@merieux-alliance.com; Collignon,S; 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; Rankinp@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
Subject: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

Dear member of the ACED,

Please find below some remarks and questions by Jean-Luc Dehaene on the revised draft.

Best,
Eva

Eva G. Heidbreder
European University Institute
Via dei Roccettini 9
I-50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Tel: +39 339 8687220

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----
Von: Jean-Luc Dehaene [mailto:jeanluc@dehaene.be]
Gesendet: Sa 26.05.2007 08:40
An: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele
Betreff: Re: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION

thanks
some remarks and suggestions:

par 3: delete the last sentence. This gives the (wrong) impression that citizens express themselves only through referenda; quod non. The parliamentary ratification is as well representative for the citizens.

par 7 Although I agree with the principal I am afraid we will never obtain a consensus among us .

If we don't publish the feasibility study these paragraphs are not clear enough. If we publish it we should refer to it in this paragraph and that is probably the best solution

par 8 I suggest we limit it to energy solidarity and climate change. so we should delete the text after six years ago and add a sentence referring to these two issues.

par 9 Do we need that statement ? I don't. On the contrary I think we should avoid any reference to two stages.

We know some of the demands of those who didn't ratify until now . Should we draw some red lines ?

Jean Luc Dehaene

Please access the attached hyperlink for an important electronic communications disclaimer: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/secretariat/legal/disclaimer.htm>

Constantinos Simitis

Από: Wim Kok [kok@brouwershoff.nl]

Αποστολή: Δευτέρα, 28 Μαΐου 2007 10:24 μμ

Προς: giuliano.amato@iol.it; chrispatten

Κοινοποίηση: S.Collignon; Eva.Heidbreder; Janos.Martonyi; Jean-Luc.Dehaene; Jacques.Ziller; jeanluc; michel.barnier; jldehaene; joanna.szychowska; marzena.wypychowska; sandra.kalnieta; kaspars.vecozols; Kok (alice); helena.riutta; tapio.pekkola; Inigo.mendezdevigo; Rankin; otto.schily; csimitis; emilie; patricia.dias; antonio.vitorino; floriana.sipala; Margot.wallstrom; Isabelle.RICHARD-MISRACHI; Paolo.Ponzano; servizio.studi; paavo.lipponen

Θέμα: RE: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

I will also be unable to attend the meeting next weekend in Brussels, but I want to express my sympathy for most of the arguments raised by Chris.

Wim Kok

From: giuliano.amato@iol.it [mailto:giuliano.amato@iol.it]

Sent: Mon 5/28/2007 8:21 PM

To: chrispatten

Cc: S.Collignon; Eva.Heidbreder; Janos.Martonyi; Jean-Luc.Dehaene; Jacques.Ziller; jeanluc; michel.barnier; jldehaene; joanna.szychowska; marzena.wypychowska; sandra.kalnieta; kaspars.vecozols; Kok (alice); helena.riutta; tapio.pekkola; Inigo.mendezdevigo; Rankin; otto.schily; csimitis; emilie; patricia.dias; antonio.vitorino; floriana.sipala; Margot.wallstrom; Isabelle.RICHARD-MISRACHI; Paolo.Ponzano; servizio.studi; Wim Kok; paavo.lipponen

Subject: RE: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

> Despite in Turkey, you won't be ignored, Chris, in our meeting in Brussels. We will carefully consider your remarks.
Giuliano

Constantinos Simitis

Από: Chris Patten [chrispatten@btinternet.com]
Αποστολή: Δευτέρα, 28 Μαΐου 2007 8:39 μμ
Προς: S.Collignon@lse.ac.uk; Eva.Heidbreder@EUI.eu; Janos.Martonyi@BAKERNET.com; Jean-Luc.Dehaene@Inbev.com; Jacques.Ziller@EUI.eu; giuliano.amato@iol.it; jeanluc@dehaene.be; michel.barnier@merieux-alliance.com; 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; Rankinp@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; Paolo.Ponzano@EUI.eu; servizio.studi@libero.it; kok@brouwershoff.nl; paavo.lipponen@eduskunta.fi

Θέμα: RE: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

I am sorry but I am unhappy about the present draft. I would have been content to have signed the previous document while not agreeing with every word. Nevertheless I could have signed it while retaining the political credibility to argue publicly for a new treaty based on Part I of the rejected draft - and opening the way for further constitutional development.

The latest draft is less well written than the previous one. Moreover on every sensitive issue it seems to me to move in an unhelpful direction. It stumbles over the line into "de haut en bas" assessments of the original treaty's rejection. The "No" voters have apparently rejected "a solid and comprehensive base for.... their common future." Most who voted for the treaty (para.3 supported by definition "the European idea" (which is what precisely?). The IGC should be "completed" not "held" before the end of 2007. Para.9 goes well beyond both the previous paragraph and the previous draft.

I can understand why you have pushed the statement in this direction but I hope you will equally understand why I believe it is politically ill-judged and would not be happy to put my name to it. This probably doesn't matter very much. I will not advertise my disagreement. You should be able to make greater progress without me this week-end at a meeting that in any event I cannot attend. I am in Turkey for the next week. Good luck. I hope we get an agreed treaty that will not lock us into new struggles about institutional architecture when what Europe needs is an energy policy, a policy on Russia, a policy on the Middle East, a sensible approach on Turkish membership and so on. These are the sort of issues that will define our relevance to the 21st century. Ever Chris Patten

-----Original Message-----

From: S.Collignon@lse.ac.uk [mailto:S.Collignon@lse.ac.uk]
Sent: 28 May 2007 10:41
To: Eva.Heidbreder@EUI.eu; Janos.Martonyi@BAKERNET.com; Jean-Luc.Dehaene@Inbev.com; Jacques.Ziller@EUI.eu; giuliano.amato@iol.it; jeanluc@dehaene.be; michel.barnier@merieux-alliance.com; 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; Rankinp@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; Paolo.Ponzano@EUI.eu; servizio.studi@libero.it; kok@brouwershoff.nl; paavo.lipponen@eduskunta.fi
Subject: RE: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

Dear Colleagues,

May I come back to para 9.

1. Do we need it? There are two risks involved:
-mentioning a "proper" constitution may trouble those who oppose a constitution in principle. -not mentioning it, it may trouble those who have voted in favor.
I therefore think it is useful to trace a perspective, which keeps the issue open,

without renouncing the possibility.

2. Mentioning a "future" constitution has the advantage of making one "present" Treaty smaller. It therefore strengthens the hand of those who do not want to go through a referendum and wish to ratify by parliament.

3. What is the best procedure to keep the process open? The Constitutional Treaty has been criticized for lack of democratic legitimacy, despite the involvement of Civil Society in the Convention. Traditionally, constitutions obtain legitimacy from electing an Assembly constituante or from approval by referendum. By involving the EP in the process, we could strengthen the legitimacy in the sense of an Assembly constituante. This idea has been discussed in France. But it requires that citizens are aware of this before the next elections.

4. I do not question that governments are responsible for negotiating Treaties. This is why I suggested that the EP reports after 2009 to the European Council about the future constitutional process. Maybe the notion of a "mandate" is too strong and we can simply say: The European Council will ask the EP elected in 2009 to report on possible future perspectives for a European Constitution.

Kind regards.

Stefan

-----Original Message-----

From: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele [mailto:Eva.Heidbreder@EUI.eu]

Sent: Saturday, May 26, 2007 8:31 AM

To: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele; Martonyi, Janos; Dehaene, Jean-Luc; Ziller, Jacques;

Prof. Giuliano Amato; jeanluc@dehaene.be; michel.barnier@merieux-alliance.com;

Collignon,S; 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.mendezdevido@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

Subject: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

Dear member of the ACED,

Please find below some remarks and questions by Jean-Luc Dehaene on the revised draft.

Best,

Eva

Eva G. Heidbreder

European University Institute

Via dei Roccettini 9

I-50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)

Tel: +39 339 8687220

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----

Von: Jean-Luc Dehaene [mailto:jeanluc@dehaene.be]

Gesendet: Sa 26.05.2007 08:40

An: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele

Betreff: Re: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION

thanks

some remarks and suggestions:

par 3: delete the last sentence. This gives the (wrong) impression that citizens express themselves only through referenda; quod non. The parliamentary ratification is as well representative for the citizens.

par 7 Although I agree with the principal I am afraid we will never obtain a

consensus among us .

If we don't publish the feasibility study these paragraphs are not clear enough. If we publish it we should refer to it in this paragraph and that is probably the best solution

par 8 I suggest we limit it to energy solidarity and climate change. so we should delete the text after six years ago and add a sentence referring to these two issues.

par 9 Do we need that statement ? I don't. On the contrary I think we should avoid any reference to two stages.

We know some of the demands of those who didn't ratify until now .Should we draw some red lines ?

Jean Luc Dehaene

Please access the attached hyperlink for an important electronic communications disclaimer:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/secretariat/legal/disclaimer.htm>

Constantinos Simitis

Από: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele [Eva.Heidbreder@EUI.eu]
Αποστολή: Σάββατο, 26 Μαΐου 2007 10:31 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 draft declaration NEW VERSION_comments Dehaene

Dear member of the ACED,

Please find below some remarks and questoins by Jean-Luc Dehaene on the revised draft.

Best,
Eva

Eva G. Heidbreder
European University Institute
Via dei Roccettini 9
I-50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Tel: +39 339 8687220

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----
Von: Jean-Luc Dehaene [mailto:jeanluc@dehaene.be]
Gesendet: Sa 26.05.2007 08:40
An: Heidbreder, Eva Gabriele
Betreff: Re: ACED draft declaration NEW VERSION

thanks
some remarks and suggestions:

par 3: delete the last sentence.This give the (wrong)impression that citizens express them self only threw referenda;quod non.The parlementarian ratfication is as well representative for the citizens.

par 7 Although I agree with the principal I am afraid we will never onbtain a consensus among us .

If we don't publish the feasebilmity studie these paragraaf is not clear enough.If we publish it we should refer to it in this paragraaf and that is probably the best solution

par 8 I suggest we limit it to energy solidarity and climate change. so we should delete the text after six years ago and at a sentence referring to this two issues.

par 9 Do we need that statement ? I don't.On the contrary I think we should avoid any reference to two stages.

We know some of the demands of those who didn't ratify until now .Should we draw some red lines ?

Jean Luc Dehaene