

["Spaak 2" final report — What has to be done by June Summit?' from Europe \(22 March 1983\)](#)

Caption: In his editorial of 22 March 1983, Emanuele Gazzo, Director of Agence Europe, calls for the accelerated implementation of the proposals set out in the report by the Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Affairs.

Source: Europe. Dir. of publ. Riccardi, Lodovico ; REditor Riccardi, Ferdinando. 22.03.1985, No 4054. Brussels.

Copyright: (c) Agence Europe S.A.

URL:

[http://www.cvce.eu/obj/"spaak_2"_final_report_what_has_to_be_done_by_june_summit_from_europe_22_march_1983-en-ef6e5dfe-c488-4a00-97b8-4a1c48a35355.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/)

Publication date: 17/09/2012

“Spaak 2” final report — What is to be done by June Summit?

Our readers, who are receiving attached to today’s Bulletin the complete text of the Final Report submitted by the Committee to the European Council, will realise, after having read it, that — whatever the position of each Head of State or government on the various conclusions reached by the Committee — that the most important thing now is to determine how each is going to make up its mind about the formal proposal, contained in the last chapter (see yesterday’s P.D.) for convening a conference of the Member States in the near future.

It is generally established that a decision on this subject would not be taken at the European Council meeting next week, as in Dublin the Heads of State and government had already decided that the “big debate” on this question as a whole would have taken place at the European Council in Milan at the end of June. But there is nothing to stop the Heads of government partially modifying their Dublin decision, and speeding up the process, by for instance taking the decision in principle of convening the Conference.

Why should the process be speeded up? Firstly, because this is made necessary by the political situation and the forthcoming elections. Secondly: the positions of each are now known and the available elements largely inadequate for a decision “in principle”. Thirdly, because the debate initiated on certain sensitive issues has created a political tension to which a swift solution should be found. Fourthly, because the aim of making the Community work more satisfactorily, accepted by everyone, is urgent and the Commission has already announced that in the event of matters getting bogged down, it would assume its responsibilities. One could not, therefore, avoid the debate on the said subjects.

If this decision of principle were taken, the problem, for next week’s European Council, would be to ensure that the next three months be given over to the organisation of the Conference, and more particularly the definition of the mandate which the June European Council will have to give it. Remember that when Jacques Delors told the Parliament: “It is desirable that political impetus be given in March already and that the weeks between the two European Councils under Italian presidency allow the widest consensus on the definition of this mandate be reached”.

It would therefore seem in all likelihood that the responsibility for making progress, according to a specific goal, now lies with the Italian presidency. The latter will doubtless avoid making the big mistake of entrusting this task to the mechanics of traditional diplomacy and less than ever to the institutions whose transformation is the prime object of the Union initiative: the latter would quite naturally strive to prevent or minimise any genuine reform.

Mr James Dooge, when recently meeting the Italian Prime Minister Craxi had suggested to him keeping alive, in an appropriate form, the Committee of which he was chairman, and entrusting to him the organisation of the transition and preparation of the decisions to be taken in June. After what happened in the final phase of drafting the Report, and Mr Dooge’s false leap on the question of “vital interest”, it does not seem that the chairman is the person best qualified to conduct this delicate operation.

According to qualified observers, twofold action is needed at this stage: 1 — At the highest political level, the political decision to be taken in June can only be the fruit of personal contacts between the Heads of State or government, the only ones who can decide. In particular, there must be no shadow of a doubt about the determination of Paris and Bonn to forge ahead on the basis of the Committee conclusions, until the conclusion of a treaty-constitution for European Union. This will be the test means of getting all, or almost all, the Member States to attend the Conference. 2 — At technical level, the President of the European Council would designate a Working Party made up of jurists, equipped with a political mandate, responsible for introducing into the E.P. draft Treaty on Union, the amendments, integrations and other alterations which might seem appropriate on the basis of the Committee’s discussions. This would facilitate the Milan summit’s decision and would enable the intergovernmental Conference working in close cooperation with the E.P. to very quickly conclude its proceedings. None of this is easy, but it is all possible, with a little willpower.

Emanuele Gazzo