

## 'Andriessen and the "dialogue" between institutions' from Europe (14 October 1981)

**Source:** Europe. Dir. of publ. RICCARDI, Lodovico ; Editor GAZZO, Emanuele. 14.10.1981, n° 3227. Brussels.

**Copyright:** (c) Agence Europe S.A.

**URL:** [http://www.cvce.eu/obj/andriessen\\_and\\_the\\_"dialogue"\\_between\\_institutions\\_from\\_europe\\_14\\_october\\_1981-en-d6c866cc-e8b4-4961-a50d-e7634189d835.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/andriessen_and_the_)

**Publication date:** 16/09/2012

## Andriessen and the "dialogue" between institutions

Tomorrow, Mr Thorn will be going before the EP to explain in detail the aims and scope of what is currently known as 'The Andriessen Report' after the Commissioner in charge of drafting. The report deals with the relations between the institutions. EUROPE has already reported on the general lines of the paper which we shall be shortly publishing in full. The report follows five motions on institutional reform approved in Strasbourg on 9 July (and published by EUROPE/documents no.1166/67). It is against this background that our readers should examine and interpret the Commission's report.

It should be interesting to hear Mr Thorn's account of which parts of the original text have been deleted or amended and why (we do not believe that it is always the worst parts that have been deleted), especially in view of the fact that Mr Andriessen is bound by the College discipline.

We have no intention of analyzing the document in detail here or even of looking at the major question arising from it. Today we shall confine ourselves to a few comments. The chief merit of this paper lies in its general intentions and, to a certain extent, in the relevance of the analysis it contains. The Commission is quite right to outline its own view of the problem since it plays an active part in the dialogue between the institutions and because it justifiably claims that building up Europe is initially and exclusively a political idea. It is pleasant to hear echoes all round of theories which only a short while ago were regarded as heresy or a resurgence of fastidious Utopias.

What is not very clear is whether the Commission's top priority is to return to a situation which existed before (it says that the institutions must regain their decision-making powers and that the institutional balance sought by the authors of the Treaty should be restored as far as possible) or whether the EEC should go still further: the institutions will have to be strengthened to allow for new internal development.

In saying that at all costs changes should be made in the present situation (by building anew or rebuilding what has been demolished) the Commission is telling us nothing new. However, it does recall that others have said, for example, in the Vedel Report, reports on European union and the Three Wise Men Report. Several years on the misdeeds of badly managed power are more than ever evident and it is clear that nothing has been done to remedy the situation. Let us single out one case, the vote by majority. Unfortunately, the formulas which are periodically proposed - and the Andriessen report does not overlook this - are only contortions without any relation with reality and which the authors know will never be applied, as experience has proved. The only serious thing to do is also the most simple, namely, the return to the letter and to the spirit of the law. When this return is conditioned by an "if" or a "but", everything will be as it was before.

The report stresses that the reestablishment of "mutual confidence" is essential. Exactly. Let us suggest that, at the same time, the proof and the means of this reestablishment, be a formal declaration by a government member to pledge, as far as the vote in Council is concerned, the articles of the Treaties. You may be sure that it will never happen that the vital interests of a country will be in danger, which is what happens every time the Council is prevented from discussing an issue.

The part of the report which appears to be the weakest and the least clear (one should expect this) concerns the institutional dialogue, or "trialogue" rather. Let us see things as they are: if we want to move towards a European form of government we should have responsible institutions, whose mutual relations, based on compliance to the appropriate rules, can only be inspired by a steel-hard dialectic and not by hypocritical forms of "consultation". Any other form of government would appear soft and diluted, without "guts". As so many prolix reports have shown us. We would remind our readers of the brevity of some of the reports which have changed the face of society: the Moise Tables, the Philadelphia Constitution, and the Declaration of Human Rights. These documents were written in a language which people understand and remember,

Emanuele Gazzo