

## **Speech to be given to legal revisers in the EU institutions on the 27th of September 2002.**

### ***The Quality of legislation. The Swedish view***

*by Barbro Ehrenberg-Sundin, Senior Adviser, Ministry of Justice, Sweden*

E-mail: barbro.ehrenberg-sundin@justice.ministry.se

**I am very pleased to have the opportunity to talk to you about the Swedish way of making the Swedish legislation and other official texts more comprehensible and easier to read for everybody concerned, including the ordinary citizen. I hope that what I am going to tell you will give you an insight into different methods of enhancing the linguistic and communicative quality of drafting legislation and that these methods could be of use also in your important work.**

**Mr Sandström has already told you about the Swedish legislative process and given you an idea of the different quality control stations there are in this process. I would like to give you more information about the role of the division for legal and linguistic draft revision in the Ministry of Justice in this process.**

**I would like to speak about**

- the language experts' role and the methods we use**
- the statutes for clear drafting that we have in Sweden**
- the main contents of the guidelines and handbooks for clear drafting that we have developed over the years**
- the specific features of a Swedish law**
- the complaints you may hear about the wording and structure of EC law**
- Sweden's positions so far on the Commission's Action Plan for better lawmaking,**
- the campaigning of the Government's Plain Swedish Group,**
- our setting up of an "EU language service" in our division.**

### **Our approach to clear legislation**

The Swedish way is to start at the very top – to make the language and structure used in legislation as clear as possible. It all started almost 40 years ago, when a Cabinet Minister began to modernise the language in draft bills before they were submitted to parliament. His actual task was to make a final draft revision from a legal and constitutional point of view, but

he also started to cover linguistic matters. The idea was that if legislation were to be written in clear language, this would have an impact on the language used in all administrative documents written at non-senior levels of government. This idea turned out to be a sensible one.

Since 1976, this task has been accomplished by language experts and lawyers working as a team in our division, which has a key role in legislative drafting in Sweden. No Government Bill (including proposed Acts), no Government Ordinance or State Committee Terms of Reference can be sent to the printers without the division's approval.

Five language experts and five legal revisers check the quality of texts from all the ministries. This final revision one or two weeks before the Government decides on the text is an important checkpoint. The legal revisers check the constitutional and formal quality of the texts, and the language experts ensure that the proposed new or amended draft Acts and Ordinances are as easy as possible to read and understand.

In the year 2001 our division revised  
1,306 Acts and Ordinances (including 177 Bills)  
122 Committee terms of reference.

To help you understand this key role of our division, I'll once again refer to the lawmaking process, tell you which legislative instruments we have, where they are drafted and who adopts them.

### **The lawmaking process**

This is the hierarchy of Swedish legislation (bild):

1. All Acts (including amendments) are adopted by the Riksdag (the parliament) in the form of a Government Bill. It is the competent ministry that draws up the bill, but before that, the subject matter usually has been investigated by a government commission, appointed by the Government. The commission's report, including proposed legislation, has been referred for consideration to relevant bodies, like government authorities, organisations, courts, universities, and their comments will be taken into consideration by the ministry while drafting the bill.
2. All ordinances are adopted by the Government itself and are not submitted to Parliament.
3. Very many regulations are drafted and decided upon by central administrative authorities, which are subordinate to, but independent of, the Government. The Parliament and the Government can delegate the power to draft and issue more detailed regulations to such authorities. We do not revise those regulations but we have issued

guidelines on how to draft them and there are ordinances prescribing, for instance, how they should be announced.

Government bills (including new or amended acts) and ordinances are drafted by officials in the different ministries and sent to us for final revision. Every day there are several drafts sent to us. (OH) The drafts are also sent to the Prime Minister's Office and to other ministries for consideration, as there has to be consensus among the ministers before they take the decision as a collective body at the Government meeting.

*-- Five working days for final revision*

The ministries are supposed to give us at least five working days to revise a text. The legal revisers are bound to read all texts and all parts of a text, for instance the explanatory part of a bill, which can amount to several hundred pages. The language experts usually concentrate on the provisions of acts and ordinances and on the full text of committee terms of reference.

When an act has been adopted by the Parliament, the Government has to promulgate it without delay: the laws must be made known to the public as soon as possible. Our division is also responsible for publishing the laws and ordinances in a weekly gazette, The Swedish Code of Statutes, and to keep several data bases. One of them contains the consolidated versions of all acts and ordinances, which means that all recent amendments are included very quickly into the actual text by our division, the day after they have been published in the gazette.

As Mr Sandström told you, some of the draft bills are also revised by the Council on Legislation in the form of preliminary draft bills. Before they are submitted to the council, our division revises them as well. Both the Government and the Riksdag may choose to disregard the Council's objections and comments, but mostly they are seriously considered, and they are always published in the Government Bill itself.

### **Revision alone does not guarantee lucid laws**

The final revision is an important method for checking the quality of the texts. But revision alone does not guarantee lucid laws that are easy to read and understand. At the final revision stage there is little time and the language experts can deal only with sentence structure, archaic or misleading words, phrases and forms, syntax problems, unclear passive voice, nominalization (or the "noun disease" as we call it), incorrect spelling and other details. The structure and presentation of the

contents are difficult to change at such a late stage, but, if there is time, we may do that. Drafters are grateful for our help – by discussing the problems we can often come up with a better solution together. (OH – showing the revision of a text.)

As final revision is not enough, we have, during the last 25 years, developed other methods as well.

We

- offer special seminars and training sessions for legal drafters,
- write handbooks, guidelines and articles on clear drafting,
- give advice by telephone or e-mail and on our website Klarspråk (Clear language),
- take part (as members or special experts) in the work of law commissions.

With such preventive work we can develop and inspire the drafters to carry out new strategies for making laws and other important texts more readable.

When the task of a law commission is to redraft old and complicated legislation, one of the language experts may join the commission and work for it part-time. In the 90's, I was a member of the Income Tax Law Commission and this was of course a huge task redrafting very old income tax laws with thousand of amendments over the years into one new and more comprehensible Income Tax Act. Right now one of my colleagues is working with the social insurance legislation, which is extremely complicated and the rewrite looks very promising. Earlier I have helped commissions to redraft the Church Act, the Civil Defence Act, the Local Government Act and the Rent Act.

At such an early stage of the legislative process, we have more influence on the drafting of the text. We can help to make the law well structured and easier to navigate so that people can easily find what they are looking for: through contents lists, informative headings, short summaries at the beginning of each chapter telling you what to find there, bullet lists where appropriate, and more information in references to say what the provision referred to is about, among other things.

In short: We can use the whole range of plain-language principles in the redraft.

### **Statutes for clear drafting**

The legal basis for the plain language work in Sweden is stated in three statutes.

The first is the Ordinance on the Duties of the Government Offices (adopted first time in 1982). This (article 26) prescribes that the Director-General for Legal Affairs at the Prime Minister's Office shall together with the senior civil servant at the Ministry of Justice, who is publisher of the Swedish Code of Statutes,

“encourage the greatest possible simplicity and clarity in the language used in statutes and other decisions.”

The second is the Law of Administration (1986:223, article 7). This says that government authorities

“must endeavour to express themselves in a comprehensible manner”.

Thirdly, there is the Government Authorities and Agencies Ordinance (1995:1322, article 7). This requires the director-general to ensure that the authority uses a plain-Swedish approach when drafting official documents.

So these are the legal basis for our work.

Similar provisions can be found in ancient Swedish legislation, from the times of King Charles XII at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (1713). – So, we have a long tradition here.

“Ordinance for the Royal Chancery:

His Majesty the King requires that the Royal Chancellery in all written documents endeavour to write in clear and plain Swedish and not to use, as far as possible, foreign words.”

### **Guidelines and handbooks for clear legal language**

The first guidelines for clear language in laws appeared as early as in 1967. They look very unpretentious, but their recommendations were sensational at the time, at least for most lawyers.

The title is *Language in acts and other statutes* and it is stated there that “if the language in acts and other statutes is simple and clear, this will have an impact on the language used in other official texts”. By this statement the Government meant to say that from a democratic point of view all official texts must be clear and user-friendly. If they are not, you can guarantee neither openness nor efficiency in public administration. Nor is it possible to guarantee access to the law and the rule of law.

The recommendations and examples of these first guidelines ask the drafters:

- to use modern and comprehensible vocabulary and modern forms;
- to avoid “the noun disease” and unusual prepositional phrases;
- to avoid long and complex sentences with embedded subordinate clauses;
- to avoid vagueness and unnecessary variation.

In 1979, a little supplement appeared, *More guidelines for the language of legislation*. This supplement offers principles on e.g. how to make the language gender-neutral, how to use headings and sub-headings and how to use lists for multiple conditions, requirements or rules. Bild

But, the most important thing here was that the Government declared that the drafters had to follow the guidelines, not only when drafting new Acts and Ordinances but also when drafting amendments. It prescribes that as soon as you make a substantial amendment, you must also modernise the language of the amended article, if necessary. In this way there is a constant modernisation going on in legislation, and the consolidated version of a law contains both old-fashioned style and contemporary, ordinary language.

When modernising the language, the drafter is required to be aware of the need for consistency in legislation. He or she should not change technical words, unless they are changed throughout the whole act and unless they have already been changed in superior legislation. The technical words in Swedish acts are not very frequent, though. We prefer to express the provisions in a straight-forward way in the vernacular, describing what you must do and may not do in certain circumstances.

If the substantial amendment is a minor one, like changing a few figures, the drafter may ignore the demand for changing the language also.

During the 1980s, we published more guidelines, for instance the so-called *Black list*, showing inflated, formal and difficult words and phrases alongside their more comprehensible alternatives.(bild) When the list was published in 1988, the alternatives had already been used in new and amended legislation and approved of by the directors-general for legal affairs in each ministry. So nobody could really argue against them and claim that the language experts were impoverishing the legal language, which can sometimes be heard from experts, when they feel that their jargon is criticized. (Such lists have

also been published by for instance the Tax Law Rewrite Project in Great Britain – OH)

Also the central authorities got their own handbook on how to draft regulations in the mid-1980s. This handbook is also used by drafters in the ministries, since it is still the most complete Swedish handbook of its kind.

There is also a handbook for the drafters in the ministries on the more constitutional and technical aspects on how to draft acts and ordinances. It is called the Green book. It contains for instance examples of

- short and clear titles of the laws, if possible one word only: Vallagen (The Elections Act), Skollagen (The School Act), Kommunallagen (The Local Government Act);
- how to formulate the preambles of new acts and of amended acts, depending on the kind of amendments done;
- how you mark the amendments with lines in the margin, when published in the Swedish Code of Statutes;
- how to print the whole act when amending it (recasting);
- which kinds of technical footnotes you must have, telling for instance the serial number of the government bill and the standing committees report where the act has been handled, the number of the EC Directive which has been transposed through this act.

### **A modern Swedish Act – how is it drafted?**

I will now show you some examples from Swedish acts, just to give you an idea of the techniques that are used to make them easy to read.

- short title,
- short introduction/preamble (*According to Parliament's decision the following is prescribed*),
- it is usually divided into chapters with chapter headings,
- the structure of the act depends on how it will be used and by whom, it must be logical and user friendly; the principle “from the general to the specific” is preferably used in the different parts of the act,
- definitions are usually grouped in one place, at the beginning of the act,
- the first article of the first chapter gives you a survey of the contents of the whole act,
- sometimes the first article includes a list of contents,
- sometimes there are full contents lists, but not included in the Act itself,
- the first article of every chapter has a short overview of what you can find in the following articles,

- informative subheadings, sometimes in the form of a question, guide you through the text – notice that the subheadings can cover not only one article, but several, which makes it easier for the drafter to group related points to each other, and still use short articles,
- there should be no more than three paragraphs in an article,
- vertical lists are often used for procedures, conditions and so forth,
- references to provisions in another act are formulated in such a way that the reader gets a fair picture of what the provision referred to is about,
- clear and simple language is used, if possible gender neutral language, according to the guidelines I referred to earlier:
  - (- normal sentence structure with the subject, verb and object placed as near to each other as possible,
  - the same word order as in ordinary Swedish (lawyers tend to use a word order which is quite different from the ordinary),
  - everyday words, forms and phrases,
  - use vigorous verbs instead of the “noun disease”,
  - favour the active voice,
  - do not gather several negatives together.)

By being members of law commissions and by writing guidelines and giving seminars we can inspire the commissions and the drafters to try something new. It is extremely important to develop new models, so that people can see the difference between the traditional way of drafting and the new way.

The next step in Sweden will be to include a summary of the act in the act itself. Both contents lists and summaries are needed, if legislation is to become as accessible as people want it to be when published on the Internet. You can't just publish the full text, you must help people to find what they are looking for by, for instance, giving them a short summary and contents list before they go further. And this should be taken care of by the drafters themselves, we believe. Otherwise such information might become misleading and incorrect. The director of our division is very interested in developing a prototype act with a summary included.

This kind of work – to use a better strategy for getting the message through in different documents and thus create new models that better meet the readers' need, has been the most creative and interesting part of my work as a language expert, I think. And also the most lasting one.

## **New models for bills, administrative decisions and Commissions' reports**

As a matter of fact, we have, during the years, developed new text models for some important texts drafted in the ministries, such as the explanatory part of the Government Bills, Government Committees' Reports, Committee Terms of reference and Government Administrative Decisions.

I would like to tell you briefly about the reform of the bills. This was the first important text reform carried out in the early 80's. It might serve as an example of a successful collaboration between language experts, lawyers and politicians. *And this collaboration is very important, as writing is governed by tradition and it is hard, or impossible, to change writing habits without convincing all parties concerned that a change is for the better.*

The major part of a Swedish government bill consists of explanatory comments on proposed legislation. The bill can be a volume of more than 1,000 pages, but usually consists of 30 to 150 pages. In the explanatory part the Government proposes solutions to certain problems, gives the arguments for and against the suggested solution and explains the possible consequences of the proposals. In the bill you also find the comments as to how the proposed legislation is meant to apply when enacted.

Before the reform, the explanatory comments were written like a long narrative story in a chronological order mounting to a climax at the end where you finally found the minister's proposals. That means that the text reflected and documented the entire legislative process and that the minister described all the problems and solutions that had been put forward during that process by different parties. It was really hard for the Members of Parliament (MP) to find the essentials, the reasons behind the Government's final proposals and the expected consequences. The structure did not meet the readers' needs. (OH)

Since the reform, the text focuses on the Government's proposals. The MPs and other readers find a box with a summary of the Government's proposal at the beginning of the section that deals with a certain problem and proposed reform. Just by reading the text in the boxes you will know what is being proposed.

Then follow summaries where you can compare the Government's proposed solution with the Commission's proposed solution and with the most important statements of

opinion on the commission's draft from, for instance, courts, government authorities, the civil society and law faculties.

After that follow the Government's reasons for its proposals and the expected consequences. Informative headings guide you through the text. (OH)

This structure and presentation make decision-making in Parliament easier, at least the MPs have a fair chance to quickly find out what they are to decide about and why.

It took us about three years, from 1981 to 1983 to carry out this reform.

We used the following "underground tactics":

- We sold the idea of a completely new structure and presentation of the bill to the Director-General for Legal Affairs in the Ministry of Justice and arranged seminars for open-minded drafters.
- These drafters used our new model for writing bills – we got a couple of prototypes.
- We argued in favour of the prototypes.
- The directors-general for legal affairs in all ministries found the new model interesting and agreed to use it.
- The Under-Secretaries of State as well as the Prime minister approved.
- We wrote a memorandum on how to write bills and we organised seminars for all bill-drafters.
- We helped the drafters, we revised the drafts.
- We evaluated and improved the model – and have been doing so ever since.

The same kind of models with the most important contents at the beginning (the result) is also being used in commissions' reports and government administrative decision. The same methods have been used for reforming those texts – prototypes, guidelines and training sessions. Even the parliament now uses this model in the reports on legislation from the standing committees. The language expert in the parliament had to work many years to convince the lawyers in standing committees to change their traditional way of writing their reports.

Such reforms take time, you need to have a strategy, to be patient, persuasive, diplomatic and persistent. As soon as drafters get accustomed to new models, though, they stop arguing against them. The readers' view is of course of utmost importance. In the case of Government bills, the MPs

really favoured the new model and that was our strongest argument for going on with the reform work.

### **The criticism of the drafting of EC legislation**

When the *Acquis Communautaire*, about 50,000 pages, was being translated into Swedish in the early 90's, Swedes were worried about the complicated language used in EU legislation.

The requirement of keeping the long and complicated sentences and not being able to split them up, was translator's nightmare.

There were also complaints about the long titles of the directives and the regulations, not to mention the preamble – the recitals –, often in the form of one single sentence of hundreds of words. Verbosity, frequent nominalizations with piled prepositional phrases, contracted sentences, long attributes, EU jargon, among other things, made EU legislation difficult or impossible to translate into modern Swedish.

Therefore, the language of the translations took us back several decades in respect of the developments to simplify and clarify legal language. Research being done proves that this is the case.

We know, of course, that there are several reasons why stylistic traditions are difficult to change. This is universal. In the EU institutions there is the principle of legal continuity and consistency, which means that drafters and revisers use the same wording in new legislation as in the existing one. There are the computer tools for drafters and translators, which make it easy for them to copy existing texts. The suggestions from Council working groups and the parliament to add or change parts of the text, often complicate the source text, as well. And the source text might be drafted by a Swede, not having English or French as his or her mother tongue ... Those are some of the problems, right?

At present there are lots of activities going on down here in Brussels. Sweden welcomes the many statements in favour of improved drafting quality which you can find in several recent documents, like the Interinstitutional agreement on common guidelines for the quality of drafting of Community legislation, the White book on Governance, the Action Plan for better Lawmaking and the Mandelkern Group Report on which the Action Plan in many respects is based.

### **Sweden's position so far on the Action Plan**

It says in the introduction to the Action Plan that "by being written in a less complicated style, the Community legislation should be easier to implement for the Member States and

operators concerned and easier for everyone to read and understand”. Those words, of course, are very encouraging, but they have to be put into practice.

The guidelines and the Joint Practical Guide for better drafting quality are a good start, but we think that there must be much more concrete measures and resources to see to it that they are applied by all those people involved in legislative drafting. I think you agree with me there.

In the Action Plan, there are lots of measures concerning systematic consultation and impact assessment and also a plan for simplifying and reducing the volume of Community law, but no explicit measures to guarantee that “simplification” also would include measures and resources so that the laws in question would be rewritten in a way that makes them “readily understandable by the public and economic operators” as it is stated in the interinstitutional agreement.

What is explicitly proposed is that the Commission would like to introduce a period during which lawyer-linguists could reread the Council’s and the Parliament’s last minute substantial amendments before the proposal is finally adopted. That is good, but not enough.

So during the last few months, Sweden has continued its work to influence the wording of the Council’s documents concerning better lawmaking. In a couple of days, the Council will decide on its conclusions regarding the Action Plan and in so doing “emphasize the importance of making EU rules, as well as national legislation, easier to understand and easier to apply to the benefit of EU citizens, consumers and businesses. To this end, it welcomes that the Commission will consider concrete measures to enhance the quality also in the preparatory phase of drafting of legislation”.

What concrete measures and what resources and competence will be needed internally is, of course for the institutions to think about and decide upon. There must be, though, strategic approaches, effective structures and adequate resources for improving the quality of drafting of legislation.

The Mandelkern Group points out that the topic of appropriate structures is absolutely crucial. This kind of reform work has to have

- political support and support from central administration, but also have a strategic as well as coherent horizontal approach.

The group proposes that the Commission should create a single, effective better regulation network in all regulatory DGs,

supported centrally by a special body, which should be in charge of

- developing methodologies and tools and seeing to it that they are used,
- providing guidance and support to integrate new techniques of better lawmaking into the daily activities of all departments, and to establish the necessary cultural change,
- monitoring and reporting common problems and the solutions found, and finally
- assuring co-ordination between all institutions and departments concerned.

For promoting a better culture of better regulation appropriately qualified staff is required both in the central body and in the relevant departments, it says in the report. This means that there should be a broad and thorough training of staff involved in legislative drafting.

As I have mentioned, the Swedish experience is that there is a lot to be gained if language experts and lawyers, as well as experts from other disciplines, cooperate in these matters. And that political support and support from central administration is crucial.

I do hope that you lawyers and a sufficient number of skilled language experts will be able to take part in the multi-disciplinary “regulatory management”, which is proposed in the Action Plan to be established in the institutions and between the institutions. Otherwise there might be a risk that better regulation work will not include enough action to ensure that the structure, presentation and language of the rules will be as clear as the citizens of the Union are hoping for. Impact assessment, consultation, consolidation, deregulation, good formal and legal quality and easy public access on the Internet are all important components in better regulation work, but they are not enough if legislation is to be understood and applied in the way it was intended.

### **Skilled plain language consultants**

As for skilled language experts we are rather fortunate in Sweden, as there is a special 2,5 years Swedish language consultancy program at the University of Stockholm, which provides the market with consultants with a solid knowledge of all aspects of the Swedish language and of communication. This program started in the late 70's. The programme includes theoretical and practical aspects. Courses are given in, for example, text linguistics, discourse analysis, semantics, pragmatics, Swedish grammar, rhetorics, psycho- and sociolinguistics and language technology. From the programme the students learn how to write clear, precise and straightforward

Swedish, tailored to the readers' needs. You can read more about the program in the Plain Swedish Bulletin.

### **Plain Swedish Group**

You can also read more about the Government's Plain Swedish Group, Klarspråkgruppen, in this Bulletin, a group that promotes clear language in all official documents and to this end encourages all Swedish Authorities and Agencies at central, regional and local levels to start and carry out their own plain language work. As I mentioned before, there is a legal requirement that the authorities must endeavour to express themselves in a way that is easy to understand, but legal requirements have to be fulfilled.

The campaigning work has been going on for 9 years and we are proud to say that it has been very successful. The secretariat of the group is placed in our division and I have been a member of the group since its inception. The chairman of the group is the director-general for legal affairs at the Prime Minister's Office.

#### The group

- supplies knowledge, ideas and experiences from various plain language projects in Sweden and abroad,
- arranges plain language conferences
- gives lectures on plain language to the authorities,
- edits the plain language bulletin,
- awards authorities the Plain Swedish Crystal,
- provides a lot of useful information and material at the language experts' and the group's joint web site:  
[www.justitie.regeringen.se/klarsprak](http://www.justitie.regeringen.se/klarsprak)

Last year, an evaluation of the comprehensibility in texts from public authorities was carried out.

The evaluation showed that archaic, difficult and obscure words as well as long and complicated sentences have almost disappeared from the bureaucratic language. Instead, there remains a lot to be done in other respects to make the documents more user-friendly.

The main comprehensibility problems lie in the lack of adaptation to the reader's need, in contents as well as in structuring and presentation of the contents. When it comes to content and structure, the reader's perspective is not taken into account and as to presentation, the texts often lack meta-comments to guide the readers through the text, such as summaries and subheadings.

**What we will do next: setting up a "EU language service" in the Government Offices**

The new challenge for me at the moment is the setting up of a special EU language service in our division. In Sweden, there has been a demand for several years now to give support to the Swedish delegates as well as to the translators and lawyer linguists in the institutions.

It wasn't decided until last year that our division should provide this EU language service, along with the Swedish language service we provide, for the purpose of improving EU texts, both the source texts and the Swedish versions.

Important tasks will be to draft guidelines, revise documents, give advice in EU language matters and to inform the Swedish delegates about the EU guidelines and the Joint Practical Guide.

In a month's time we will open a special web site for Swedish officials taking part in the legislative work in Council and Commission working groups and also for the Swedish translators, revisers and legal linguists in the institutions.

In order to reach all persons involved, I have asked all the ministries and a number of government authorities and agencies to appoint one or two contact persons in EU language matters. This network of contact persons, which is soon to be completed, will help us and the translators find the adequate experts, when needed, for instance in terminology matters. There is already a well functioning network with the coordinators and heads of units of the Swedish translators, the terminologists and the legal linguists in the institutions and we meet at a regular basis.

I believe that it would be very fruitful also to widen the networks, for instance to start an international EU language network with counterparts from all Member States as well as officials in the institutions, where one could share best practices in the field of clear legislation. I know that most Member States have accepted principles of drafting that are surprisingly similar to each other. Clarity, simplicity, precision, accuracy and plain language are common standards of good quality legislation both in the common law and civil law drafting styles.

The problem of good standards and recommendations not being known and therefore not applied by drafters is universal.

Someone has to see to it that such standards and recommendations don't become an empty gesture.

Moreover, it is very important that new models can be developed and tested. The criticism of existing drafting techniques should be considered in such pivotal work and best practice should be shared between all members of the European Union.

As for new drafting techniques in legislation, you might be interested to know what is happening in, for instance, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and Australia. Clarity is a worldwide organisation for lawyers and other interested in legal language with the aim of promoting good, clear language by the legal profession. Many of the legislative drafters using new techniques in these countries are members of this organisation and you may find interesting articles in the journal Clarity on this topic. The latest issue of the journal Clarity is dedicated, however, to what is being done in Europe: Germany, France, Italy and Sweden. I leave some copies here of my article on the Swedish work, published in this journal.

And so I would like to sum up my talk by quoting a Clarity member, a Canadian lawyer and experienced drafter, Mr David Elliot, who was involved in the New Zealand Tax Law Rewrite in the 90's, among other things. He says that simplifying complex legislation "means writing with the reader in mind. It also means being open to new ways of doing and expressing things. Ways which at first sight might seem odd and uncomfortable. It means being open to experts in communication and being open to a multi-disciplinary approach to drafting tasks. That is legislative drafting of the future."

Thank you very much for listening. I would appreciate it very much if we could keep in touch and share ideas and, as a start, I would like to invite you to contribute to our new EU language website (to be opened in November) by sending us the latest news, articles, discussions and research concerning EU legislation. The address will be [www.justitie.regeringen.se/EU-sprak](http://www.justitie.regeringen.se/EU-sprak).