

The President (continued)

Does anyone demand a roll-call?...

The Assembly will therefore vote by a show of hands...

The draft Resolution is adopted unanimously.

It will be published as No. 40.

6. Supplementary Report to the Fourth Report of the Committee of Ministers

*(Debate on the Reports
from the competent Committees)*

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next item in the Orders of the Day is the debate on the draft Reply of the Assembly to the Supplementary Report to the Fourth Report of the Committee of Ministers.

Since, however, the Reports of the Committees have not yet been distributed, this debate will be held either at the close of this afternoon's Sitting or to-morrow morning.

7. Choice of an emblem for the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe

*(Debate on the Report of the Committee on Rules
of Procedure and Privileges, Doc. 198)*

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — As M. van der Goes van Naters, Rapporteur on the question of the future status of the Saar, is not yet present, I am sure the Assembly would like to pass to the next item in the Orders of the Day, which is : the choice of an emblem for the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. (Report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges, Doc. 198.)

I call M. Bichet, Rapporteur.

M. BICHET (*France*) (Translation). — Most European peoples instinctively feel that Europe will perish if it remains divided into small units, whereas unity will make it powerful and prosperous, and guarantee a peace based on the respect of liberty and justice. But these peoples need to see the idea of a united Europe embodied in the tangible form of an emblem.

The necessity of such an emblem became evident immediately upon the creation of the Council of Europe, in 1949. The champions of the European ideal used the flag with a green E on a white ground which was introduced by the European Movement at The Hague Congress. This improvised symbol was very popular, despite its lack of aesthetic appeal. In every country throughout Europe campaigns were organised, and various United Europe emblems were displayed side by side with the national colours on a number of public occasions, and even during national celebrations. Such campaigns probably did more than any number of meetings, more even than our own endeavours, to propagate the European idea among the general public. This vogue proved the need for such a symbol, for it is essential for an ideal to find expression in imagery, and the lack of an emblem for the Council of Europe has made itself keenly felt.

It was doubtless desirable for the European Movement to retain the emblem with which it had come into existence; but it was no less desirable for other European institutions, as and when established, to have their own emblems with which to demonstrate the reality of their existence. The Council's lack of a symbol has obliged it since 1949 to display the flags of all Member States, arranged as usual in English alphabetical order.

Not a week has passed since 1949 without the Secretariat-General of the Council receiving enquiries from organisations anxious to show their devotion to the ideas which it represents by displaying its flag; nor has a week passed without various individuals submitting more or less felicitous suggestions for such an emblem.

Early in 1950, the European Parliamentary Union suggested the adoption of its own flag—a golden sun with a cross gules on a field azure.

When, soon after our first Session, the Committee on General Affairs asked the Secretariat-General to draw up a report on practical steps to make public opinion more directly aware of the reality of European union, the first step suggested was the adoption of a symbol.

On 18th August, 1950, this proposal was submitted to the Assembly, which decided to refer it to its appropriate Committees, and so the question of the emblem was first referred to the Committee on Rules of Procedure and

M. Bichet (continued)

privileges. The Committee considers that the time has now come to request the Assembly to take a final decision.

Not only are the symbols of certain private associations frequently mistaken, at present, for the official emblem of the Council of Europe, but the establishment of a number of European institutions threatens to give rise to a variety of symbols, which will complicate the eventual choice of a single symbol.

We are well aware of the delicate nature of some of the necessary decisions. In the first place, it will be necessary to break away from the semi-official emblems of private movements which, whatever their merits, must give place to the official emblem of the foremost of European political institutions—that which it is the declared intention of the various Governments to adopt as the general political framework of Europe. Moreover, care must be taken to avoid regrettable manifestations of particularism, which might produce a crop of rival symbols. For instance, we have been informed that the Interim Committee of the Conference for the organisation of the European Defence Community is already considering the question of its emblem. Approaches have been made with a view to avoiding the risk of any such development.

When the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges first tackled this problem, it was struck by the number of proposals that had already been made. The Secretariat-General had received over a hundred unsolicited designs from private individuals, had had the official suggestion from the European Parliamentary Union, and had itself, with the assistance of certain experts on heraldry, investigated the question of an emblem which would be satisfactory from the aesthetic, symbolic and heraldic points of view.

The designs submitted being so numerous, the Committee asked the Secretariat-General to make a preliminary selection of ten or a dozen, on which the Members of the Assembly would be asked to give an initial verdict. The Assembly was therefore consulted in December, 1951, but only one-third of its Members replied to the questionnaire. Moreover, this investigation, led to two completely contradictory results.

Among those who had expressed an opinion, there was very nearly a majority in favour of

the emblem of the European Parliamentary Union, advocated by that great European pioneer, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi. But our Turkish colleagues were definitely opposed to the appearance of a cross in the emblem of the Council, and several other colleagues raised the same objection. The latter view made it impossible to adopt the flag of the Parliamentary Union and also ruled out the design prepared by the Secretariat-General—a cross vert on a field argent.

Don Salvador de Madariaga, President of the European Cultural Centre, then suggested to the Secretariat-General the adoption of a flag with a blue ground, representing the sky, and with small stars, so placed as to indicate each of our European capitals, and a larger star marking the position of Strasbourg. In practice, however, this emblem, instead of giving a clear impression of Europe, simply looked like a star-studded sky without apparent meaning.

However, the idea of stars shining in a blue firmament being acceptable the Secretariat-General finally proposed a flag having a circle of stars or on a field azure, and this was adopted by your Committee. The unbroken circle symbolises unity, whereas the stars shining in the firmament symbolise the hope of our nations.

An appropriate symbol could later be inserted in the centre of the flag of each of the European institutions. For instance, the Strasbourg Assembly could be denoted in this space by the arms of the City of Strasbourg, the European Cultural Centre by a book, and so on. These are only suggestions which should be studied in further detail. The main consideration was that agreement should be reached upon an emblem for the Consultative Assembly, which might be adopted for the Council of Europe as a whole and might also serve as a common denominator for existing or future European institutions. By preserving the general characteristics of this emblem and varying the details, these different institutions could even adopt the same basic emblem with a different central symbol representing its own particular functions, as in the examples given for the Council of Europe or the Cultural Centre.

It may be imagined that if such emblems, based on a single concept and closely related in subject, were adopted by all the countries of free Europe, they could be a very effective means of fostering the rapid and wide dissem-

M. Bichet (continued)

ination of the European idea, without which there is now no hope for our civilisation.

In view of the fact that members of the Committee have now agreed upon an emblem, it was considered unwise to embark upon a lengthy procedure before the emblem could be put into effective use. Thus, this report concludes with a Resolution and a Recommendation, of which the former must perforce be submitted to the vote before the latter. By this Resolution, the Consultative Assembly would freely decide, within the limits of its competence, to adopt as its emblem a blue flag with a circle of fifteen gold stars, which would be put into commission whenever the Assembly was in Session. The Recommendation, based on this decision of the Assembly, invites the Committee of Ministers to adopt this emblem for the Council as a whole and to take all steps to ensure that it is used widely and with appropriate dignity.

In accordance with the unanimous decision of your Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges, I therefore ask the Assembly to adopt the draft texts now submitted, if possible with the same unanimity.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does anyone else wish to speak?

M. ERLER (*German Federal Republic*) (Translation). — I do, Mr. President.

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

M. ERLER (Translation). — I have followed with sympathy the report of our Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges presented by M. Bichet. I am glad that a formula has been reached whereby the Council of Europe may evolve a symbol common to us all.

From the heraldic and aesthetic points of view and, considering the impression it is likely to make upon our peoples, I regard this as a good solution, but there is one matter which deserves further reflection.

The Committee proposes that we should begin by adopting this symbol for the Consult-

ative Assembly and then recommend it to the other branch of the Council of Europe, namely the Committee of Ministers. Not only is it essential that we should both have the same emblem, but I think we should also consider the political implications of this choice. The question on my mind is not without importance. True enough, the Consultative Assembly comprises delegations from fifteen Parliaments, but I recall a certain article which, while giving us all great amusement, went somewhat deeper than that by discharging the existence of a certain political situation. This article, which discussed the arithmetics of Europe, appeared, I think, a few months ago in the Strasbourg publication, "*Revue de l'Europe*". It demonstrated the difficulty of talking about a Europe of the Six at the same time as a Europe of the Fifteen. If one adds up the non-Member countries of the Community of the Six, one finds that there are only eight. But eight and six do not make fifteen. So we come to our problem: what about the fifteenth star?

We have always maintained that the Saar is not at the moment a State—in fact the next item in our Orders of the Day deals with just this problem—and I do not think that we can prejudice future discussions by adopting an emblem with fifteen stars, in that way recognising a hitherto non-existent State.

The idea behind the emblem is a good one, and I should like to see it accepted, but I should first like the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges to consult the Committee on General Affairs on this question. We could thus find the means of establishing an emblem valid not only for the Consultative Assembly but for the whole of the Council of Europe.

I fear that political considerations well known to us all will prevent the Committee of Ministers from approving a decision of this kind by the Assembly. What we need is a common symbol for our whole institution, not only for a part of it, though our Assembly may be the more important part.

Thus, Mr. President, while assuring you of our full support for the outward appearance of our common symbol, which seems to me excel-

M. Erler (*continued*)

lent, I would ask you to refer this particular point back to the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges, so that it may seek the opinion of the Committee on General Affairs on the political implications of this debate.

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

M. BRAUN (*Saar*) (Translation). — Mr. President, I hope that this statement by M. Erler is not a foretaste of our next debate. One has only to walk out of this building and count the flags outside in order to realise that the number is fifteen. No one has yet demanded the removal of one of these flags, and I see no reason for altering the emblem. If, however, you insist on doing something, I suggest the insertion of a dot with a star above it, but a somewhat dim star which would not gleam like the others (*Laughter*). Seriously, however, there must be fifteen stars, and the fifteenth should be allowed to gleam, for it does not imply recognition of the Saar as a State : our flag is not a legal argument.

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

M. BICHET (*France*) (Translation). — Mr. President, I would recall that the texts submitted include a draft Resolution and a Recommendation, and that this very distinction may enable our colleague to gain full satisfaction.

How so? Nobody, not even he, would deny, I think, that there are fifteen of us here and that the flag of the Council of Europe should therefore have fifteen stars. As M. Braun pointed out just now, a visit to the entrance of the House of Europe will show that there are fifteen flags flying, and nobody has ever objected to them.

We are making a recommendation to the Committee of Ministers, and it is a matter for this body alone to amend our proposals, although their decision will make no difference to the nature of our emblem, based as it is on the principle of a fixed field and a variable number of stars. Soon, we hope, the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Defence Community will be adopting a smaller number of stars. It is for us to make a recommen-

dation and for the Committee of Ministers to size it up, interpret it and make a final decision.

Thus, at this stage, I see no difficulty so far as the Assembly is concerned. We are all agreed upon this aspect. As for the other, we are making a recommendation which we think will be adopted by the Committee of Ministers, but the latter is better qualified to weigh up the political implications of its decision.

I therefore request the Assembly to record its vote without further delay.

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

M. ERLER (*German Federal Republic*) (Translation). — In that case, Mr. President, I greatly fear that we shall only have an emblem for the Assembly, which I do not regard as an advantage. What we need is an emblem for the Council of Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does anyone else wish to speak?...

It has been moved that the question be referred back to the Committee. I now put this motion to the vote.

I would recall that, in accordance with Article 32, paragraph 4 of the Rules of Procedure, the vote on procedural motions must be taken by sitting and standing.

I shall now ask the Assembly to vote on the motion to refer this question back to the Committee...

The motion is rejected.

I shall now ask the Assembly to vote by roll-call on the draft Resolution proposed by the Committee, which I shall now read out :

“ The Consultative Assembly.

1. Resolves to take as its emblem an azure flag bearing a circle of fifteen stars or (on an azure ground a circle of five-pointed stars or, none of which are touching).

2. This flag shall be flown outside the buildings of the Council of Europe whenever the Assembly is in Session.

3. Its use on other occasions shall be determined later by the Bureau of the Consultative Assembly. ”

The roll-call will begin with the name of M. Müller.

Voting is open.

(A vote by roll-call was taken.)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does anyone else wish to vote?...
Voting is closed.

The result of the vote is as follows :

Number of votes cast . . .	73
Ayes	49
Noes	17
Abstentions	7

The draft Resolution is adopted.

It will be adopted as No. 41.

(The list of those voting is given in Appendix II.)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Committee further proposes a draft Recommendation, which I shall now read out :

“ The Consultative Assembly,

Having adopted as its emblem an azure flag bearing a circle of fifteen stars or,

Recommends that the Committee of Ministers

(a) adopt the same emblem as the symbol of the Council of Europe as a whole;

(b) instruct the Secretary-General to enter into negotiations with the other European institutions to ensure that the emblems adopted by them shall have features similar to that adopted by the Council of Europe. ”

I shall now ask the Assembly to vote on the draft Recommendation by roll-call. In the case of a draft Recommendation, it is laid down in the Rules of Procedure that the required majority is two-thirds of the votes cast by at least one-third of the Representatives.

The roll-call will begin with the name of M. Müller.

Voting is open.

(A vote by roll-call was taken.)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does anyone else wish to vote?...

Voting is closed.

The result of the vote is as follows :

Number of votes cast . . .	78
Ayes	54
Noes	17
Abstentions	7

The required two-thirds majority has therefore been secured.

The draft Recommendation is adopted.

It will be published as No. 56.

(The list of those voting is given in Appendix III.)

M. KIESINGER (German Federal Republic) (Translation). — May I have leave to speak?

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

M. KIESINGER. — May I draw the attention of the Assembly to the Appendix and to the item “Symbol”? It states

“Against the sky-blue ground, the stars stand for the nations represented in the Consultative Assembly...”

I do not think that we can stick to the expression “nations”. I think that it would be better to change the text of the Appendix to conform with the text which we have accepted, and change the word “nations” to “members”.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Appendix to Doc. 198, which has been distributed, is purely an information document to complete the files of Representatives. It should be understood that the only officially valid text is the draft Resolution adopted by the Assembly.

M. KIESINGER. — I should like to point out that we really cannot use the expression “nation” for the people of the Saar. There is no Saar nation in any case.

8. The future position of the Saar

(Debate on the Interim Report of the Committee on General Affairs, Doc. 186)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next item in the Orders of the Day is the debate on the future position of the Saar (Debate on the Interim Report of the Committee on General Affairs, Doc. 186).

I call M. van der Goes van Naters, Rapporteur of the Committee on General Affairs.

M. VAN DER GOES VAN NATERS (Netherlands) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the debate on the Saar follows a short politico-aesthetic debate which bears some relation to the present question, although it, naturally, settles nothing about the future status of the Saar. It also follows upon a big debate on general policy, which is only logical —since our whole future, the restoration and strengthening of Europe, the progress of the European Defence Community and Political