

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Churchill.

Mr. CHURCHILL (*United Kingdom*). — I am sure we can all agree with the Committee of Ministers that definite progress has been made in the last year in building up the European conception represented by this Assembly. There are, however, several important points which lie open between us.

We regret that these should have been somewhat inconsiderately set aside by the Committee of Ministers until October. I think the Assembly should press its points and its opinion on the questions at issue. There really is, for instance, no reason why a Resolution passed here by a two-thirds majority should not be formally made known to and laid before our respective Parliaments, it being, of course, obvious that nothing can prevent either the Government or the Parliament concerned from taking its own decision upon the questions raised after whatever debate they may think desirable.

It is important to the future of this Assembly that it should be brought continually into closer contact not only with the executive Governments but with all the representative institutions upon which, in all true democracies, executive Governments can alone be founded. For Great Britain I can, however, guarantee that all Resolutions of the Assembly will be brought before the House of Commons for discussion on their merits, whether we agree with them or not. For this purpose we shall use the facilities at the disposal of the British official Opposition, and I do not doubt that the House of Lords will take corresponding action. I suggest to my colleagues of other countries here that they use the liberties of procedure which their own Parliaments possess in abundance for the same purpose, and that this become our general practice unless or until the obstructive influences on the Committee of Ministers have been overcome or have disappeared.

There are other points of difference which may well be re-adjusted as a result of our discussions. I have always thought that the process of build-

ing up a European Parliament must be gradual, and that it should roll forward on a tide of facts, events and impulses rather than by elaborate constitution-making. Either we shall prove our worth and weight and value to Europe or we shall fail.

We are not making a machine. We are growing a living plant. It certainly is a forward step that Mr. MacBride, the representative of the Committee of Ministers, should be here among us to express their collective mind—if they have one,—directly to the Assembly, and to deal by word of mouth with matters which we may raise. Indeed, when we look back over the past twelve months—and not only over the past twelve months but to the Hague two years ago—it is marvellous to see how great is the progress which has been made in this time. From an unofficial gathering of enthusiasts, pleading the cause of reconciliation and revival of this shattered Continent, we have reached the scene to-day when we sit as a body, with ever-growing influence and respect, in our own House of Europe, under the flags of fifteen historic States and nations.

In all that we do and say here, we must not belie the hopes and faith of millions and scores of millions of men and women not only in the free countries of Europe but in those which still lie in bondage.

The Message which we have received from the "composite throne", if such I may term it, has directed our attention to the Schuman Plan of associating in an effective manner the basic industries of the Western nations, and invited us to express our opinion upon it. Sir, we as an Assembly are very ready to do so and it may well be that it is in our power to smooth away some of the misunderstandings which have arisen or the prejudices which have been stirred. We may handle this large and hopeful scheme in a manner which will be favourable to the general principles which it embodies.

Some of my British colleagues have offered a constructive contribution on this subject to the Debates of the Assembly, and I trust their views will receive careful and friendly consid-

Mr. Churchill (cont.)

ration not only from other Governments and Parliaments but from their own. It will be a memorable achievement if this Assembly is able to offer practical guidance to uncertain Governments and competing parties in regard to a scheme which seeks to build around the tomb of Franco-German wars and quarrels the structure of a more productive, a more stable industrial life for the vast numbers of our peoples who are concerned. We express our thanks to M. Schuman for his bold initiative and also for his courtesy in coming here to tell us all about it.

But, Sir, the Message we have received from the Committee of Ministers directs our attention in its final paragraphs to the gravest matters which now impend upon world affairs. We are invited to approve the action of the United Nations in Korea and to proclaim our "complete solidarity" with the resistance to aggression the burden of which is now being borne by the United States, but which involves us all. No one can doubt what our answer will be or that the European Assembly will do its utmost to sustain the cause of freedom and the rule of law in the face of a most grievous and violent challenge. But what is our position here in these smiling lands and war-scarred cities, their peoples so rich in tradition, virtue and glory, striving to rise again from the consequences of the tragedies of the past?

Sir, the Committee of Ministers has, by its Message, virtually invited us to consider in their broader aspects the military aspects of our position. Certainly it would be futile and absurd to attempt to discuss the future of Europe and its relation to world affairs and to the United Nations Organization if this dominating military aspect were arbitrarily excluded. Nearly all the speakers who have addressed us, including our two British Socialist colleagues, have trespassed upon this hitherto forbidden territory, and its effective occupation by the Assembly has now become a "*fait accompli*".

I am very glad that the Germans, amid their

own problems, have come here to share our perils and augment our strength. They ought to have been here a year ago. A year has been wasted, but still it is not too late. There is no revival of Europe, no safety of freedom for any of us, except in standing together, united and unflinching. I ask this Assembly to assure our German friends that, if they throw in their lot with us, we shall hold their safety and freedom as sacred as our own.

I have heard it said that if any Germans—I think the argument was raised yesterday—except Communists were to be armed, this might be the pretext for a preventive war by Russia. Believe me, Mr. President, the long calculated designs of the Soviet Government will not be timed or deflected by events of this order. There is no doubt that we are all of us in great danger. The freedom and civilization of Western Europe lie under the shadow of Russian Communist aggression, supported by enormous armaments. The Soviet forces in Europe, measured in active divisions, in Air Force and in armoured vehicles, outnumber the forces of Western Union by at least six or seven to one. These are terrible facts, and it is a wonder that we are sitting here in our new House of Europe, calmly discussing our plans for the future happiness and concord of our peoples and their moral and cultural ideals. It is a wonder, but at least it is better than getting into a panic. The danger is, of course, not new. It was inherent in the fact that the free democracies of the West disarmed and dissolved their forces after the war, while the dictatorship in the Kremlin maintained gigantic armies and laboured tirelessly by every means to re-equip them.

Two years ago, the Western Union Pact was signed and a number of Committees were set up which, as M. Reynaud and others say, have been talking ever since. Imposing conferences have been held between military chiefs and experts, assisted by statesmen, and the pretentious façade of a Western front has been displayed by the Governments responsible for our safety.

Mr. Churchill (cont.)

In fact, however, apart from the establishment of the American bomber base in England, nothing has been done to give any effective protection to our peoples from being subjugated or destroyed by the Russian Communist armies with their masses of armour and aircraft. I and others have given what warnings we could, but, as in the past, they fell on unheeding ears or were used to sustain the false accusation of "warmongering."

Now, however, suddenly the lightning-flash in Korea, and the spreading conflagration which has followed it, has roused the whole of the free world to a keen and vehement realization of its dangers, and many measures are now proposed which, if they had been taken two years ago, would at least have yielded fruit by now. Indeed, what is now proposed and on the move, if inaugurated two years ago, might well have gone half-way to meet our needs.

I do not doubt that, as the realization of our mortal danger deepens, it will awaken that sense of self-preservation which is the foundation of human existence, and this process is now going forward. Our British Socialist colleague, Mr. Edelman, reminded us of the immense superiority in steel, in oil, in aluminium and other materials on which the defence potential of the free nations rests. But much of this might be the prize of the aggressors if we were struck down.

M. André Philip said on Tuesday that France did not wish to be liberated again. After a period of Russian Communist occupation there would not, as M. Reynaud pointed out, be much to liberate. The systematic liquidation of all elements hostile to Communism would leave little which could be recognised by the rescuers of the survivors.

We in this Assembly have no responsibility or executive power, but we are bound to give our warning and our counsel. There must be created, and in the shortest possible time, a real defensive front in Europe. Great Britain and the United States must send large forces to the Continent. France must again revive

her famous Army. We welcome our Italian comrades. All—Greece, Turkey, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Scandinavian States—must bear their share and do their best.

Courage and unity must inspire us and direct the mighty energies at the disposal of our Governments to solid and adequate measures of defence. Those who serve supreme causes must not consider what they can get but what they can give. Let that be our rivalry in these years that lie before us.

The question which challenges us is: shall we have the time? No one can answer that question for certain, but to assume that we were too late would be the very madness of despair. We are still under the shield of the atomic bomb, possessed in formidable quantities by the United States alone.

The use of this weapon would shake the foundations of the Soviet regime throughout the vast areas of Russia, and the breakdown of all communications and centralized control might well enable the brave Russian peoples to free themselves from a tyranny far worse than that of the Czars. It seems very likely that such possibilities will constitute an effective deterrent upon Soviet aggression, at least until they have by a lengthy process built up an adequate supply of atomic bombs of their own.

There is another reason why the general armed assault by Communism against the Western democracies may be delayed. The Soviet dictators have no reason to be discontented with the way things have gone so far, and are going. Since the world war stopped in 1945, they have obtained control of half Europe and of all China without losing a single Russian soldier, thus adding upwards of 500 million people to their own immense population.

They have a wealth of opportunities for creating trouble and tempting us to disperse our forces unduly through the action of their satellites. It seems that Tibet is to be the next victim. Engaged in these diversions they are able to preach peace while planning aggressive war and improving their atomic stockpile.

But in my judgment, which I present with all diffidence, we have a breathing space, and

Mr. Churchill (cont.)

if we use this wisely and well, and do not waste it as we have already wasted so much, we may still greatly increase the deterrents against a major Russian Communist aggression. It is by closing the yawning gap in the defences of the Western Powers in Europe that we shall find the surest means, not only of saving our lives and liberties, but of preventing a third world war.

If in the next two years or so we can create a trustworthy system of defence against Communist invasion, we shall at least have removed the most obvious temptation to those who seek to impose their will by force upon the free democracies. This system of defence in the West will alone give the best chance of a final settlement by negotiation with the Soviets on the basis of our strength and not of our weakness. But there is not a day to be lost nor a scrap of available strength to be denied.

As I have already said, this Assembly has no power to act, nor do we seek to relieve the responsible executive Governments of their duties. We ought, however, to make our united convictions known. We should now send a message of confidence and courage from the House of Europe to the whole world. Not only should we reaffirm, as we have been asked to do, our allegiance to the United Nations, but we should make a gesture of practical and constructive guidance by declaring ourselves in favour of the immediate creation of a European Army under a unified command, and in which we should all bear a worthy and honourable part.

Therefore, Mr. President, I propose to you a Motion which, after some previous consultation in various quarters, I have ventured to place upon the Order Paper.

I trust that this Motion will, by an open and formal vote, receive the overwhelming, if not indeed the unanimous, support of this Assembly. This would be the greatest contribution that it is in our power to make to the safety and peace of the world. We can thus go forward together sure at least that we have done our duty. I beg to move that :

"The Assembly, in order to express its

devotion to the maintenance of peace and its resolve to sustain the action of the Security Council of the United Nations in defence of peaceful peoples against aggression, calls for the immediate creation of a unified European Army subject to proper European democratic control and acting in full co-operation with the United States and Canada."

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Mitchison.

Mr MITCHISON (*United Kingdom*). — On a point of order. I desire at some proper opportunity, Mr. President, to raise the question whether the Motion which has just been proposed is in order, having regard to the terms of our Statute. I do not know when to raise it, and I should be glad of your guidance.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation) — We shall raise this matter again at the end of the debate. I call M. Jacini.

M. JACINI (*Italy*) (Translation). — Mr. President, speaking for myself, and on behalf of a very large group of my compatriots, I have the honour to make the following declaration :

In conformity with the views expressed in this Assembly by some of the Representatives, the Italian Representatives have submitted on their own account, or in concert with their colleagues of other nations, Motions and Proposals for the setting up of effective central European organisms in the social, economic and structural field.

But having regard to the extreme urgency of the situation, we now declare ourselves in favour of any formula which may be recognised as most effective for ensuring immediate unity of action for the military defence of Europe.

We are satisfied that the speech by Mr. Churchill, which we have just heard, and the Motion that he proposed are in keeping with the spirit of the declaration itself; I therefore declare that I, personally, am in entire agreement with them.

THE PRESIDENT. — I call M. Korthals.

M. KORTHALS (*Netherlands*). — We had hoped to get, in the Report of the Committee of Ministers, information about acts, but we

*M. Korthals (cont.)*

find only words. There is, however, one exception; there was one good act which was done in the past year, namely the admission of Western Germany into the Council of Europe as an Associate Member. I hope that Western Germany will soon be a Member of this Council. Germany is now part of the Western community, and I hope that she will soon have not only all rights but all duties as well. Germany belongs to Western Europe and I hope that she will soon make a contribution towards our common defence.

We all know that our military defence is very important now. We also know, on the other hand, that we do not want a community which has only military aspirations. We all want a community in which there is the possibility of a good standard of subsistence for the people; we all want peace, justice and freedom; we do not want war. But we know that there is an aggressor who is seeking to extend his influence in all parts of the world and who is a danger to us all in Western Europe. That being so we must give the utmost attention to our military preparations.

In my opinion we must say three things to the Committee of Ministers. First, we do not want only committees and generals; we need soldiers, too.

Second, we know that our defence expenditure must now come first, but we also know that the defence of Western Europe can be carried through only with the aid of America and that the question of expenses in the several countries is one of great importance. If we have a system of Western European defence, then that defence is not solely a question for England, Belgium or the Netherlands, and so on, but for Western Europe as a whole. And then, Sir, we cannot accept that one nation should pay 25 per cent. of its national income towards defence and another nation 10 per cent. A solution must be found to this problem.

Third, it is impossible to bring Western European defence to its highest possible level without the military assistance of Western Germany. We need all forces in the defence against the aggressor. I know that we are not supposed to discuss defence here, but to speak in an international Assembly of this kind without referring to defence is impossible to-day.

The Committee of Ministers have seen the truth of this because in their Report they refer to the Korean question. I agree with the proposal of the Committee of Ministers on this point, but in my opinion it is the second point in their Report which is the really important one. The Ministers have forgotten to say, however, that the question of defence should no longer be a question of committees, ministers and generals. We have to discuss this question in this Assembly, and as the Committee of Ministers has forgotten to say anything about it we must say something now.

The Committee of Ministers has also forgotten something else. In a most dangerous period a year has passed and nothing has been done by that Committee to strengthen the Council of Europe. In my opinion, too little has been done to put into practice what the Consultative Assembly proposed last year. Even on the question of a European passport, which was referred to the respective Governments for study and research, we must be content with the Committee's observation :

"The Committee of Ministers will not fail to inform the Assembly of the results of this examination as soon as all the relevant data have been collected."

It is a year since we spoke about this question and other important questions. We have no time for discussion; we must demand action.

So it is with our relations with other organizations. It is a very good thing that the Secretary-General of the Council of Europe should write letters to his colleague in O. E. E. C., but this is not the main problem. It is necessary that the different organizations should be brought within the framework of the Council of Europe. How? We must discuss this, and in this matter the Council of Europe has a real task to perform; and, Sir, if the Schuman Plan comes into force, the Council of Europe must be connected up with it.

I appreciate the difficulties of the Committee of Ministers. It is a heavy task to bring unity to Europe. I am Dutch and I know the difficulties which have arisen in putting the concept of Benelux into practice. We shall be faced with more difficulties when we try to solve the European question. But the Committee of Ministers has not shown that it wants to take

*M. Korthals (cont.)*

every opportunity to strengthen the Council of Europe.

Europe has a task in this world. Europe needs close collaboration between the Ministers and the Parliamentarians here. It is my opinion that the Committee of Ministers has not used all its forces in the same direction as the Assembly. The Assembly tried to go forward. When we came here last year, nothing had been prepared. Committees have been formed, but the Committee of Ministers expressed the opinion that, with the exception of three Committees, they should meet not more than once between Sessions. After discussing the question, the Committee of Ministers withdrew its objections, but to me this is an example which suggests that the Committee of Ministers does not appreciate the necessity of making this Assembly and its Committees as strong and as workable as possible. The Assembly has won the battle on the question of Committees.

It is necessary, too, that the Assembly should meet, not once a year, but at least twice. It seems to me that it would be better to meet three times a year. At all times there are important matters to be discussed. Moreover, the people of Europe would have more interest in the Council of Europe if they saw that the Assembly was at work often.

Our Council of Europe is not complete. We need a European political authority with limited functions but real powers. We can discuss that matter later. I wish to say now that, for me, it is the only way to achieve real unity. It is very difficult for each country to transfer a part of its sovereignty. We all know that. But the development of the international structure is forcing us to transfer part of our sovereignty. No one can say, for example, that we all have our own sovereignty in military affairs now. We have now transferred sovereignty to generals and to committees of generals.

Then we must create new political institutions to deal with the new relations between the countries of Europe. There are European tasks which we must solve from a European point of view, and for that we need European institutions. The Schuman Plan is a first step. It is a good example of statesmanship. The great Powers of Western Europe will come nearer to each other when it is brought into

practice. It offers possibilities in the economic field which we shall discuss next week. Within the Plan is foreseen the creation of a supra-national Authority and a « common Assembly ».

In this General Debate, I want to express the view that the Council of Europe must be given the task of controlling the High Authority. Here is an opportunity to give a real task to our Assembly. The Schuman Plan is a first, and very important, step. There have been other important steps in the past year — in the political field, the admission of Germany; in the economic field, the further liberalization of trade and the European Payments Union.

We know that there are several other plans. For example, there is the Stikker Plan, to which the French Government gives full support, as M. Schuman said yesterday.

I know that great progress has been made in the last year, but we must appreciate that we have little time and, therefore, we must make more progress, because Europe is in danger.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call M. de La Vallée-Poussin.

M. DE LA VALLÉE-POUSSIN (*Belgium*) (Translation). — The Assembly has read the Message from the Committee of Ministers without the slightest enthusiasm, and many of us in this hall have said what we think of its disappointing character. We must recognize the fact, however, that it contains some phrases that have slipped in here and there, the writer being an honest man, which show that in spite of everything, the Committee of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly share the same anxiety when they find a virtually disarmed Europe face to face with what may be imminent perils.

All the hopes of social and economic progress with which we lulled ourselves last year run the risk of being set at nought by threats of war. And while we wish to safeguard and to preserve peace, we are faced with the fact that, not only can no adequate military force be put into the field, but that in every sphere in which for a year we have been trying to co-ordinate European action we have met with but little success, because we have always come up against the same difficulty: the absence of an adequate political authority. We have built up armies of technicians and submitted the politicians one and all to an intensive regimen

*M. de La Vallée-Poussin (cont.)*

of committee after committee, but as in every case we have scrupulously respected the principle of national sovereignty and the rule of unanimity, we have nowhere contrived to establish an effective authority or achieve a coherent purpose.

Today, we are short of time, and we are no longer entitled to grope about in the face of the threat of aggression that is perhaps close at hand. The Committee of Ministers warned us. Through us, European public opinion, which we all represent, has found its voice and has replied that it expects from the responsible authorities the creation of defence machinery such as at present is so conspicuously lacking in Europe.

The kind of body that is required cannot be a collection of technicians; we want to have to deal with responsible men, men whom we can call to account, because we shall have given them in the first place the means of action.

Our honourable colleague, M. Schmid, in the course of his most interesting speech, seemed to suggest, or to fear, that we were in quest of a general. We are not in search of a general; we are in search of a statesman or a well-balanced team of statesmen.

These men, or this High Commissioner for European Defence—as he has been called here—will not only be called upon to appoint a general as effective commander-in-chief of the armies, but also a director of armaments and a director of industrial mobilization. They will have to organize a staff, a kind of S. H. A. E. F., capable of making the best possible use of resources in man-power, in material and in money entrusted to them to ensure the protection of our homes.

We must indeed realize that only men endowed by us with personal powers and personal responsibility will be able to elaborate a plan of defence, work out what it will cost and choose the best technical methods for putting it into effect. Only a qualified statesman will be able to propose to these fifteen nations of ours a draft agreement laying down the contribution to be made by each of them for the common enterprise.

Only a statesman vested with the powers given to him by all the European Governments, will be able to carry on the necessary negotiations with the United States with a view to resolving the problems of Atlantic defence.

Only a statesman will be able to control the high command and army organization while assuming, before a democratic assembly such as ours, the political responsibility for the great work that military technicians and industrialists are to undertake under his direction.

What I am describing to you here is, in short, the application, from the European defence point of view, of what you yourselves called for when you asked for the setting up of an authority with limited functions and real powers. It is the indispensable instrument for the maintenance of peace or, at any rate, the warding off of aggression. The time for irresponsible committees has passed. We can no longer do without the effective will of a chief, effectively controlled.

Is it beyond the power of this Assembly of ours to draw up the Statute and the working rules of such a new body, to decide who shall appoint it, who shall control it, what shall be its powers and attributes?

If, before the end of the present Session, we could pass up to the Committee of Ministers a clear and practical scheme, European public opinion would greet initiative on our part with relief and probably with enthusiasm. And the Committee of Ministers would be assuming fearful responsibilities with regard to our peoples, were it not to get down at once to giving practical effect to our proposal.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call M. Smitt-Ingebretsen.

M. SMITT-INGEBRETSEN (*Norway*). — While listening with deep interest and admiration to the eloquent speakers in this Assembly, I admit that my thought has not been that regretful and saddening thought of our sins,—not even of the sins of our Ministers—but I have had to face again and again the unanswered question: What is the Council of Europe? What is the meaning of it?

Outstanding personalities in this Assembly have spoken as though it should be our task to prepare for a new war that is threatening us in the near future. If that be the truth, we shall all perish. One cannot expect adequate measures for warfare to come from an Assembly which cannot decide anything, but can only make Recommendations to the Committee of Ministers, which, in turn, can do nothing except ask for the consent of fifteen Governments. It is not in that way that we can bring together the forces of the free world

*M. Smitt-Ingebretsen (cont.)*

to fight the fear of a new war and to build up a defence which can prevent war from breaking out.

I do not think that it should be the task of the Council of Europe to prepare to meet war. It is not constructed for such a purpose. First of all, our Statute forbids us to discuss military questions, and in the civil field we have no authority to resolve anything. We can only plan and discuss and indicate ways in which it might be advisable to endeavour to solve the problems of Europe. Even the actual drawing up, from a technical point of view, of plans concerning economic, social and cultural questions, is in the hands of other bodies.

It is not for a body constituted as the Council of Europe to prepare for war. If the Council of Europe is to have a sound meaning, it must be something else — and I think that it has a sound meaning. It has the wonderful meaning of preparing Europe for peace. It has been constructed to create between the peoples that atmosphere of goodwill and understanding which is necessary to obviate thoughts of war. It has been constructed to give us a meeting place where we can build step by step the machinery for a peaceful Europe.

We shall have to be patient. It is not only in wartime that "it's a long way to Tipperary!" These is always a long way to go in order to gain something worth-while for mankind. It is, however, worth travelling along that road. We shall do all that we can to enable the Council of Europe to bring into being a Europe which is beyond the threat of war; but we shall always have in mind that we are builders of the future.

It is not for this Assembly to meet the crisis of the present day. If that is our objective, then we have the wrong remedy. The present crisis requires a body which can act immediately, which can take decisions and implement them, both in the military and in the economic field. The Council of Europe is not to-day the body to do this; but it is natural that the Council should tell the Governments of Europe that it thinks it necessary at the present time to meet the dreadful threat of war, and that

adequate steps should be taken to deal with this situation.

I think that the organisations formed under the Atlantic Pact and Marshall Aid are capable of co-ordinating the forces of Europe and America for the benefit of our security, and surely they are busy doing this work. Perhaps they are not effective enough and we shall have to strengthen them. It is, however, vital to all of us that they should fulfil the tasks for which they were created.

It should be obvious to all who have tried to face the problems before us that it is through collaboration between the national States that we shall have to meet any war which is forced upon us. Whatever may be the future organization of Europe, to-day it is impossible to create a federated Europe. I admire the faith and activity of the federalists, and I think it is right that they should have the opportunity of discussing their plans in the Assembly; but I do not think that the policy which they are putting forward is a realistic one. It is fascinating to listen to eloquent declarations of faith, but it is always useful to feel the earth under one's feet.

The Committee of Ministers has been severely criticized, and I agree that it could have shown more activity on different matters; but I do not think that the failure of the Ministers is at the root of the criticism. There are different views of the system under which we are working. The responsible Ministers act upon the constitution which we have drawn up through agreement between the national States. The critics base their attack upon a constitution which they would have liked to see.

There is only one way in which to solve this problem and that is to go to the fifteen national Parliaments and ask them whether they will agree to a new constitution giving this Assembly legislative and decisive power. We are all of us members of one or other of the Parliaments.

I do not think we have asked — and I am sure the time is not ripe for asking — the Parliaments to vote a new constitution of that sort. It is a pity. I should think it a glorious day if we were to see a united Europe, and I hope that day will come. I hope we shall never lose sight of that aim. But it is our fate



M. Smitt-Ingebretsen (cont.)

to have to stick to the realities of life. The peoples to whom we are responsible will not to-day yield up their sovereignties to make a federated Europe. If anyone is in doubt, let him ask them. It is the answer of the peoples that decides: that is the way of democracy.

The task of the Council of Europe is to make the peoples accustomed to collaboration. We must concentrate on the problems which it is possible to solve without a federated Europe. We must try to co-ordinate every effort that is being made, and every organization that is working on common problems in Europe. We must direct the rivers of collaboration into one mighty stream that will bring the peoples into the harbour of the United States of Europe.

I believe in a united Europe, but we shall have to work for it. We are not magicians. Every time we blame one another because things are not being done, we create doubt and dismay. Every time we help one another to do things, we create faith and confidence. Let us go on doing things—not miracles but practical things—so that, step by step, goodwill may be made to prevail among men. In that way we shall build up our peoples and Europe. Trust in the small things glorifies not the single man but opens heaven. We are called upon to construct the future of democracy in Europe, basing it upon the man in the street. Do not let us tire in our efforts.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call M. Braun.

M. BRAUN (*Saar*) (Translation). — Mr. President, first let me thank you most sincerely, in the name of the Representatives of the Saar, for your friendly words of welcome. We also wish warmly to thank the whole Council of Europe for having consented to receiving us in its midst.

Mr. President, we shall show our gratitude by our active collaboration for the attainment of the noble aim that the Council of Europe has set itself the task of achieving. We are among those who are supremely conscious that Providence is allowing us precious little time now for the achievement of a united Europe. More than ninety per cent of the population of my little country are eagerly awaiting the

day when the bells ring out for the birth of this Europe for which we all yearn.

It can quite easily be understood that we are among those who most desire that European States should manage as quickly as possible to conclude a federal pact instituting a European Parliament, elected on democratic principles, and a European Government which should be responsible to this Parliament. We do not wish to butt in on the discussions of the Great Powers. It matter little to us whether this Europe is, in the beginning, to operate on a purely constitutional basis or on a functional basis. The essential thing for us is that it should come into being speedily. This, however, can only be effected by the setting up of a supra-national authority, which alone can provide a solution for the political, economic and social problems in our respective countries.

Mr. President, we are grateful to our British and Swedish friends for pointing out to us, continental Europeans, the road that leads towards a federalist Europe. By so doing, they seek, even though less closely bound up with this group of nations, to join with us in defending European culture.

We, the Representatives of the Saar, are happy to note that a common European spirit has brought nearer the two great countries on our borders—France and Germany—and that they have met here, united in an identical desire to work for the achievement of a united Europe.

We most particularly rejoice in the fact that these two peoples between whom the existence of a sincere and friendly understanding alone will enable Europe to be saved, should now have found by their collaboration in the Schuman Plan a firm basis of understanding and lasting friendship.

Mr. President, the fact that in the course of its first year of existence, the Council of Europe should have proved a disappointment to many European peoples can be explained in many ways. But at the present juncture when the stars are favourable, but when we are at the same time faced by so grave a political situation, a further setback would be inexcusable. So it is our duty, with all the energy at our command, to go on following the road that will lead us as speedily as possible towards the goal which we have set before ourselves.