

Gaetano MARTINO

Ten years in the European Parliament (1957-1967)

A scientist at the service of Europe

***Parliamentary Speeches given
during various periods of office***

**Political Series
POLI 118 EN**

This publication is available in the following languages:
IT (original), DA, DE, EL, EN, ES, FR, NL, PT, FI, SV (translations)

European Parliament, Luxembourg
Editor : Massimo Silvestro

Manuscript completed in January 2001
ISBN
Catalogue No: AX

© European Communities, 2001

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorized, provided the source is acknowledged and the publisher is given notice and sent a copy.

Printed in Luxembourg.

Gaetano MARTINO

Born on 25 November 1900 in Messina.

Professor of human physiology at the University of Rome.

President of the Italian Society for Scientific Progress

Member of the XL Italian Academy and other Italian and foreign academies. Dean of the University of Messina from 1943 to 1957.

Dean of the University of Rome from 1966 until his death.

Member of the Constituent Assembly (1946).

Vice-President of the Italian Chamber of Deputies from 1948 to 1954.

President of the National Education Committee from 1954 to 1957.

President of the Italian Delegation to the XV and XVI Sessions of the United Nations. Head of the Italian Delegation to the International Commission on Disarmament.

Member of Parliament from 1946 to 1967.

President of the Italian Liberal Party.

Minister of National Education (1954).

Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1954 to 1957.

Driving force behind the Messina Intergovernmental Conference for European revival: 1-2 June 1955.

Signatory of the Treaties of Rome (E.E.C. and Euratom) in his capacity as Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs: 25 March 1957.

Member of the NATO Committee

Member of the Common Assembly from 1957 to 1958 and of the European Parliament from 1958 to 1967.

President of the European Parliament from 1962 to 1964.

Author of scientific treatises on human physiology and of political works.

PREFACE

Gaetano Martino, the centenary of whose birth was commemorated by the European Parliament on 29 November 2000, was unquestionably one of its most striking personalities, having twice been its President at the beginning of the 1960s. The speeches he made in Strasbourg between 1958 and 1967 reveal a high level of moral consent and very acute political awareness.

Gaetano Martino, who was an internationally renowned Professor of Human Physiology and Dean of the University of Rome, devoted a significant part of his European work to the issue of university education. In particular, he led a courageous battle in favour of founding the European University in Florence, which he planned as a tool to be used to encourage the teaching and dissemination of a European awareness. This European Union pioneer saw culture as an irreplaceable lever to drive and accelerate the unification process.

Another principal aspect of his parliamentary work was focussed upon the development of European scientific research. In many ways, he was a precursor of the framework programme for technological research and development, through his insistent requests to the governments to devote the necessary resources to research in order to curb the brain drain which afflicted our continent during the 1960s.

There is no doubt that his masterpiece was the organisation of the Messina Conference on 1 and 2 June 1955, as a result of which the European process was revived and the Common Market became a reality. It should be pointed out that the Messina revival took place less than a year after the failure of the European Defence Community. Without this revival, the Union would not have achieved the progress we see today: from the European area without frontiers to the Charter of Fundamental Rights, from European Parliament elections by universal suffrage to the advent of the euro.

Gaetano Martino's speeches reveal his dual fidelity: fidelity to the traditions of all countries and fidelity to the principles of a common civilisation. The Common Market should not be conceived as a collection of mixed interests but as a means of attaining a higher aim: the unity of free peoples. Within this wide European vision, political, economic and defence agreements are obviously important, but they should form part of a general framework which will encourage the full unfolding of individual freedoms, democracy, the rule of law and civil society.

His far-sightedness led to his realisation that the original core of the European Community was destined gradually to extend its borders to take in the whole of Europe. This same vision must lead us, as the joint decision-makers for future enlargement of the European Union, to carry this historic task through to a successful conclusion, providing its institutions with the resources to function correctly and to reach effective decisions.

*Nicole FONTAINE
President of the European Parliament*

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
- <i>European Unification</i>	
- <i>The European University</i>	
- <i>Election of the European Parliament by Universal Suffrage</i>	
- <i>Election as President of the European Parliament</i>	
- <i>The Europe of Hope</i>	
- <i>The Community's Internal Functioning</i>	
- <i>The European Parliament and the National Parliaments</i>	
- <i>Re-election as President of the European Parliament</i>	
- <i>A tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy</i>	
- <i>Community and Democracy</i>	
- <i>The Messina Conference and European Political Union</i>	
- <i>The Community and the powers of the European Parliament</i>	
- <i>The European Parliament's Budgetary Powers</i>	
- <i>Overcoming the Community Crisis</i>	
- <i>European Scientific Research</i>	

Bibliography

European Unification

Speech given on 19 March 1958

The nations of this small area of Europe are now entering a new era. For the first time in the continent's history, a history which has until recently been more marked by war than by peace, we are seeing European economic unification. The outlines are emerging of a great Community, encompassing nations with different languages, customs and beliefs, leading to a more secure future. Our Assembly is one of the constitutional organs of this Community.

I would like to recall, if only briefly, the opposition, lack of belief and scepticism which had to be overcome in order to begin, pursue and achieve this so-called work of 'European Revival', which was finally completed in Messina early in June 1955 and which happily led, some two years later, to the establishment of the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. This recollection, which gives us some idea of the enormous progress we have managed to make towards European unity, also warns us of the dangers and obstacles we must face in bringing the present initiative to a successful conclusion.

The Community institutions are preparing to see their real strength put to the test. During this sensitive transition from theoretical planning to practical reality, it is up to us – the Assembly, the Ministers, the executive Commissions – to face and resolve all the issues relating to their functioning and balance.

The objectives and limits of the European Coal and Steel Community, the Economic Community and the Atomic Energy Community are clearly defined in the Treaties, but their establishment falls within the framework of a more general process, the process of European political integration itself. I believe that we shall apply and interpret the rules of the Treaties correctly if we keep our minds firmly fixed on European political integration. If we do not do this, or if by any chance we decide to restrict our powers and our options by looking back instead of forward, we shall betray the spirit of the Treaties and condemn the European Community to its end at the very moment it has begun.

The renewal of Europe called for by the diplomatic instruments of 25 March can only be achieved by strong and continued movement along the route of development and progress.

We shall only be able to claim to have attained the aspirations of those who, as representatives of the ideals of the European political class, contributed their ideas and initiatives to the creation of the three Communities, if we never forget that the final objective is total European unity.

Our era, which is an emotive one, reminds me of another historic period which formed the prelude to the first successful creation of a political community of peoples wanting to unite in order to cooperate in the work of civil progress.

This took place on the independent soil of America and we should remember it today, not only because it lay at the origin of one of the finest and most successful political structures of all time, but also because it was the first example of successful European unification, albeit in a far-off land.

The founders of American unity, in the same way as the modern founders of European unity, also went through successive periods of fear and hope, but the fear was finally overcome by the 'manly spirit' of those far-sighted and noble people and the hope was not long in becoming a reality. It is to this spirit that Madison referred in The Federalist Papers XIV, in the following words, which I believe are worth quoting at this august meeting: 'To this manly spirit', he wrote, 'posterity will be indebted for the possession, and the world for the example, of the numerous innovations displayed on the American theatre, in favour of private rights and public happiness. Had no important step been taken by the leaders of the Revolution for which a precedent could not be discovered, no government established of which an exact model did not present itself, the people of the United States might, at this moment, have been numbered among the melancholy victims of misguided councils Happily they pursued a new and more noble course. They reared the fabrics of governments which have no model on the face of the globe. They formed the design of a great Confederacy which it is incumbent on their successors to improve and perpetuate'.

Unlike those who constituted America, we now have precise models which we can follow, from the American model to that of Switzerland, which is so close and which is justly called 'the European microcosm of the American macrocosm'.

The greatest men in Europe, from De Gasperi to Schuman, from Adenauer to Churchill, from Sforza to Spaak, had moral and political faith in an ideal of European unification at a time when the decline of the old continent appeared to them to be the inevitable consequence of the serious crisis arising from the second world war. This faith was supported by carefully considered reflection, a highly realistic recognition of the position and needs of the historical cycle at a time when temporal power, in all its manifestations, had attained such a degree of development that it could no longer be sustained by the modest resources of the various European States. It is evident that our States, which appear small in size compared with the continentally based massive forces which have entered world history, can no longer solve their problems without uniting and resorting to forms of permanent cooperation. All the European countries, without exception, need this intrinsic unity if they wish to take part in the advancement of European civilisation.

This union would, however, be condemned to transience and decline if it were to be dictated only by practical necessity. Political, economic and military agreements are necessary, important and imperative, but they are not enough. The true basis of European unity is of a spiritual nature.

Europe is already united through its culture and civilisation. This is so obvious that we do not hesitate to refer to Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare and Pascal as European and we consider individual freedom, political democracy, the rule of law, all those values which Europe has accumulated over numerous centuries in its historic movement towards unity, to be our common heritage.

Simple awareness of a unity of culture and civilisation is, however, not enough. It still needs to be confirmed through positive action by the European people.

The long and difficult crisis which Europe suffered for over fifty years was due above all to the people's lack or inadequacy of 'active' faith in this civilisation and in its ideas, its principles and its values. A number of Europeans have believed and still believe that their irreplaceable and priceless spiritual heritage is a heritage which can be preserved passively, whereas in reality it is an asset which should be renewed from day to day, with perseverance and tenacity. Every time, somewhere in Europe, that human dignity is flouted, political freedom violated or the law trampled on, this is not a 'particularism', as Machiavelli would have put it. The entire civilisation of western Europe feels affronted.

It is now essential, for everyone's sake, that we get Europe out of the rut in which it has been so long stuck because we have not been able adequately to defend its spiritual essence. At present we really need Madison's 'manly spirit'. We need to drive out all ideas of fear and selfishness and also the last vestiges of the spirit of domination.

It is true to say that the attempt to integrate Europe is essentially an attempt to move beyond the stage of nationalism but without stifling the specific spirit of each of the nations of Europe.

History teaches us that in this beautiful European garden, the most noble and elevated expressions of art and thought have been the fruit of two forms of fidelity: fidelity to the traditions of each nation and fidelity to the principles of a common civilisation. When the nations of Europe demonstrate originality and creativity, they remain European in everyone's eyes but when, on the other hand, they decide to isolate themselves, feeling unequal to the task, they condemn themselves to irredeemable sterility and decadence.

We would like to move beyond the historical era of nationalism. Entry into this new era does not, however, involve the need to destroy the notion of nationality. All that is needed is for each nation to make a greater effort to restore the purity of this notion's original meaning and to free it from the malign aspects which turned this benign and potent structure of human society into a diabolical and destructive force. On a world level, nationalism has until now appeared to be an expression of freedom and dignity. It now needs the animation of a new spirit to lead it towards higher forms of freedom and dignity, towards full human integration.

In pluribus unum: Europe's political unity should be based upon multiplicity and diversity. Moral and civil progress will not be possible unless we animate and stimulate our nations' creative and constructive momentum.

We need to activate an organic process designed to follow internal rather than external routes. This is the major difficulty to be overcome. It will only happen, however, if our work is always guided by faith. This is what Goethe meant when he said that one should not only move forward with courage, but should also wait patiently for growth, action and results.

The European University

Speech given on 12 May 1959

The Liberal Group has honoured me by asking me to speak to the Assembly on its behalf and announce its unanimous support for the principle of founding a European University, as put forward in Mr. Geiger's excellent report. I also would like to congratulate him upon this report.

Before, however, touching upon the subject of the foundation of a European university – which I shall in fact do in just a few words – and explaining the Liberal Group's position in this respect, I would like express a few personal considerations of a legal nature. I have said 'personal' for two reasons. The first is because I am neither a jurist nor a lawyer, but a doctor, and I would not wish to commit the Liberal Group by statements I may make which may not be wholly accurate even from a scientific point of view. The second is that with regard to the legal interpretation of the texts referring to the six countries' obligation to found an institution of university status, the Liberal Group has not reached unanimous agreement, as demonstrated by Mr. Peyrefitte's interesting speech.

The text of Article 9.2. of the Euratom Treaty states: 'An institution of university status shall be established; the way in which it will function shall be determined by the Council, acting by a qualified majority etc'.

There has been a great deal of discussion, and I imagine this will continue, on the question of whether this second paragraph of Article 9 of the Treaty establishing Euratom is mandatory or whether it simply forms an example of a programme. I believe that there should be no further doubt in this respect, given the decision by the Council of Ministers of the Community on 20 May 1958 which began as follows: 'It is planned that a European University shall be founded as an independent and permanent institution ...'.

It is therefore evident that the six governments signing the Treaty establishing Euratom considered the second paragraph of Article 9 to be a mandatory provision, rather than simply constituting an aspect of the programme to be carried out in this sphere. We have the duty to establish this institution of university status. What this institution should essentially comprise remains to be seen.

It is said that it should be – and it appears that some of those present share this viewpoint – a centre for specialist nuclear research. Such a centre would not, however, be – I apologise to those used to university matters for such a mundane explanation – an institution of university status in the strict sense of the term. What is, in fact meant by an institution of university status? Why does the Treaty speak of an institution of university status, rather than of a university? This is another question which has been, and will continue to be, widely debated.

An institution of university status is a body which, like a university, issues its students with diplomas enabling them to exercise a given profession. No institution of university status exists which does not have this fundamental institutional duty. A specialist research centre could, however, depending upon the circumstances, be either a post-graduate centre or a research centre without being an institution of university status.

But why does the Treaty say 'institution of university status' rather than 'university'?

In some of our countries, particularly France and Italy, education is organised in such a way that it includes on the one hand universities of the traditional kind, divided into a number of faculties, and on the other institutions which, although having the same fundamental tasks as the universities and issuing their students with diplomas enabling them to exercise a given profession, do not form part of the university world as such but have an independent status for one reason or another. An example is the French Teacher Training College (*Ecole Normale Française*), which was mentioned a few moments ago, and a number of Italian institutions which I shall mention to demonstrate how extensive this structural system is in my country.

In Italy, there are institutions of university status which are not connected with national or independent universities, but which have the same legal status as such universities. There is the 'Politecnico' in Milan which is not part of the University of Milan, the 'Politecnico' in Turin, the 'Istituto di economia e commercio' in Milan, the 'Istituto di economia e commercio di lingue e letteratura straniere' in Venice (which is interesting because it has two faculties rather than just one and because its structure is more like that of a traditional university), the 'Istituto superiore di architettura' in Venice, the 'Istituto superiore orientale' and 'Istituto superiore navale' in Naples, the Advanced Teacher Training College in Pisa, the 'Istituto di alta matematica' in Rome, the 'Istituto superiore di magistero' in Catania, the 'Istituto superiore di magistero' and the Acquila 'Istituto superiore di magistero' in Genoa, the 'Istituto superiore di magistero femminile' in Naples, the 'Istituto superiore di magistero femminile' in Rome and the 'Istituto superiore di magistero' in Salerno.

Some fifteen university institutions issue diplomas, just like the universities, without, however, being amongst the twenty-two universities established in Italy. Perhaps the term 'institution of university status' has been used because there was a desire to leave open the question of such an institution's structure and possible division into various faculties, in order that it could be settled by the relevant authorities after signature and ratification of the Treaty. It does not imply that this institution should act not as a traditional university, but rather as an advanced nuclear research centre or an institution of university status comprising a single faculty, such as physics and mathematics.

Article 9 of the Treaty establishing Eurotom is divided into two paragraphs. The first paragraph states: 'After obtaining the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee the Commission may, within the framework of the Joint Nuclear Research Centre' - a centre whose formation is mandatory - 'set up schools for the training of specialists, particularly in the fields of prospecting for minerals, the production of high purity nuclear materials, the processing of irradiated fuels, nuclear engineering, health and safety and the production and use of radioisotopes'. If there had been a desire to establish a cultural centre of this kind, there would have been so separation, which there is, between the first and second paragraphs nor, above all, the use of the more mandatory wording: 'An institution of university status shall be established; the way in which it will function shall be determined by the Council, acting by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission'.

There is no connection between the two paragraphs. They relate to two different things. The first gives the executive Commission of Euratom the option of creating specialist schools within the framework of the Joint Nuclear Research Centre; the second governs the question of the institution of university status, or, if you like, the European University.

In this respect, it is worth looking back at what happened at the time. I am, although not a jurist, well aware that while laws state their subject matter, precedent is also important, and when doubt arises as to the meaning of a statutory provision, it is customary to look for precedents. I lived at the time of these precedents. I was one of the six Foreign Ministers who were fortunate enough to follow the slow, arduous and long drawn-out process of drafting the Treaties establishing the Common Market and Euratom, from the beginning in Messina until the end in Rome. I well remember the words used by Mr. Hallstein, who we are privileged to have with us today in his capacity of President of the Executive Commission of the European Economic Community when, on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany, he advocated the foundation of a European university.

In so doing, Mr. Hallstein expressed his wish for a full university and gave his reasons. The term 'full university' meant, to his mind, a university oriented not only towards the sciences but also the humanities. He also made particular reference, do please correct me if I am wrong, to the science in which he is an eminent specialist: the law.

I did not get the impression that Mr. Peyrefitte was particularly well informed when he said that the six governments had dropped Mr. Hallstein's proposal and had only given their agreement in principle as a result of 'diplomatic courtesy'.

Personally, I am quite sure that I remember that there was unanimous agreement on this point and that the matter was not debated because everyone had immediately accepted that Mr. Hallstein was right when he said that we could never attain European economic and political integration without genuine European awareness. If we want European political integration, it is our responsibility to ensure that such European awareness is developed and spread.

I think I should make the following point. When we met in Messina on 1 and 2 June 1955, to conduct what is known as the 'European revival' – a rather inelegant term – our objective was not strictly economic, but was basically political. We met in Messina because the French National Assembly had rejected the Treaty establishing the European Defence Community, with the result that the potential political integration of Europe which this Treaty appeared to offer had vanished into thin air. The Common Market and Euratom were, to our minds, simply the means and tools for attaining political integration. We thought that it would be appropriate to set out on the longer, more tortuous and more difficult route of economic integration to attain the political integration which was the final aim of the European Defence Community, having lost the possibility of direct political integration as a result of the French National Assembly's vote. Our final goal was not the Common Market, our final goal was the political unity of Europe, in other words the Federation of the United States of Europe.

These facts need to be borne in mind in interpreting correctly the spirit and letter of the Treaties.

But why was this Article concerning the European university contained in the Treaty establishing Euratom and not in the Treaty establishing the Common Market? Some factors have been raised whose origins are obscure, factors which have been called banal. I agree with Mr. De. Smet in considering these factors banal, but there are others which are quite the opposite of banal and should very clearly reveal why the Treaty establishing Euratom was chosen rather than the Treaty establishing the Common Market.

There is no doubt that with regard to research, science and culture, the Treaty establishing Euratom is of far greater significance than the Treaty establishing the Common Market. What would you have said if the second paragraph of Article 9, instead of appearing in the Treaty establishing Euratom had instead appeared in that establishing the Common Market? Would you have said that the Treaty's authors intention was simply to establish a faculty of economic and commercial science and not a faculty of physical and nuclear science?

But why, one may ask, is this rule not contained in both Treaties? There are, admittedly, provisions which are contained in both Treaties, particularly provisions of an institutional nature. On the other hand, there are provisions which are not contained in both, but which could be contained in either, since they are of general significance. I can cite, for example, the provision relating to the equivalence of educational qualifications which is not contained within the Euratom Treaty and which only appears in Article 57 of the Treaty establishing the Common Market. Would you then maintain that this provision does not include diplomas and qualifications relating to physical or nuclear science? Would you maintain that the equivalence applied only to diplomas from the economic and commercial faculties? Obviously not, since these are provisions which have a value in themselves rather than as a result of the place they occupy and rather, furthermore, than as a result of the Treaty in which they are contained.

The primary objective of the establishment of a European university (or of an institution with university status) was clearly indicated by Mr. Hallstein in Messina and was not disputed by anyone during the long negotiations leading to the Treaties establishing the Common Market and Eurotom. This primary objective was to develop the European awareness that is essential to European political integration, which is, we must remember, the Treaties' final objective.

Such political integration requires active and conscious popular participation. Without the presence of popular awareness on the extremely difficult road to political unification, the final objective will never be attained. It will never be possible to form the Federation of the United States of Europe. Additionally, is it really the aim of the second paragraph of Article 9 to ensure coordination between the cultures of the various Member States, as Mr. Peyrefitte too modestly imagined, coordination which would undoubtedly also be very useful? The true aim, the supreme objective is to encourage the development and spread of a genuine European awareness.

It is for this reason that the University should be a university of the traditional type, divided into faculties, and should not be confined exclusively to technical and scientific objectives. It is for this reason that the European University must also include the humanities, particularly certain fields.

To accept the principle, as Mr. Peyrefitte has (he himself also appears in favour of the idea of founding a European university), to accept the principle, I repeat, that it is necessary to negotiate a new Treaty and have it ratified by the six countries concerned would appear to reveal the desire not to found the University. Mr. Peyrefitte is a distinguished diplomat and it is for this reason that he has a taste for treaties and ratification. But all those amongst us who do not share this taste, because we do not follow the same profession, must be aware that there is no need whatsoever to sign a new treaty and submit it to new ratification by the six countries. There already exists (and it seems to me that it is too easy to forget this) an authentic interpretation of the second paragraph of Article 9 of the Treaty establishing Euratom.

On 20 May 1958, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the six countries met and drafted the second paragraph of Article 9 as follows: 'It is planned that a European University shall be founded as an independent and permanent institution for teaching and research, whose professors and students will come in the main from the Community countries'.

The six governments which signed this Treaty therefore interpreted the second paragraph of Article 9 in this way. Can it be imagined that this is not an authentic interpretation? Is it really believed to be necessary for those of us who are more versed in legal science to interpret this paragraph to find out what the six governments intended to say and do when they signed the second paragraph of Article 9?

It is, therefore, not true to say, as Mr. Peyrefitte has, that the six governments had not wished to accept the proposal put to them by Mr. Hallstein in Messina. They in fact interpreted this provision as I have indicated; in other words, very explicitly and clearly.

Putting personal considerations now to one side, I would like to come to the position taken in this respect by the Liberal Group, to which I have the honour to belong.

The Liberal Group is unanimous in recognising that the idea of founding a university as an instrument for developing and spreading European awareness should be very favourably received by our Assembly.

The spiritual roots of the notion of a united Europe go back to the distant past. The search for these roots has recently led to numerous and very interesting historical studies. It also attracted the attention of illustrious thinkers even during the last century. It is sufficient to mention the great Leopold Ranke. All these thinkers consider the notion of uniting Europe and its cultural progress to be a fundamental factor, able to form an efficient instrument to encourage and accelerate the movement towards European unification. It is vital that culture is used to develop and spread European awareness.

It is, however, true that until recently, European thinkers worked more towards division than unity, were noted for a propensity for fragmentation rather than union and for venerating the individual above the general. This arises from the fact that European philosophical thought has held that the local traditions so dear to its heart, have formed the basis for the progress made in local culture during the last two centuries.

European thinkers have always feared that the process of European unity would involve the loss of local traditions and local political structures. This perhaps explains some of the opposition and resistance which is still expressed here and there. The previous speaker had, it appeared, questioned certain Dutch, Belgian and German university rectors, who had shown hostility towards the notion of a European university.

I have moved in university circles for over thirty years. I was Rector of the University of Messina for fourteen years. I am at present a Professor at the University of Rome, and in this capacity I very often have the opportunity to meet eminent representatives of the world of science and academics. I have to say that amongst European thinkers, those opposed to the foundation of a European university are absolutely not the majority. They represent at most a

tiny minority. Obviously I have not carried out a survey, but I have the impression that only a few fear the formation of a European university, some for the reasons I have given – the fear that a European university might in some way or other harm local traditions – others through fear of competition between a new higher education institution and the higher education institutions to which they are most closely linked. This is not, however, true of the vast majority, who are well aware that local traditions have nothing to fear, that on the contrary their value will be increased in a united Europe. They also know that the creation of a new higher education institution could never harm the development of other European cultural institutions and national universities. On the contrary, it would be to their benefit, just as in past centuries the creation of new cultural institutions has always helped and never harmed the progress of those already in existence.

European academics are well aware of this. This is why I think we need not worry. There is no doubt that the formation of a European university, far from arousing strong opposition, will instead receive a high level of support from the university world. I am also convinced that it would be senseless to consider forming a European university which is unconnected and thus totally excluded from the current European cultural world.

The existing national universities would need to cooperate in founding and developing the European university. Such cooperation would form the principal factor of the European University's development. It would also smooth the way for the awakening and development of European awareness. Through such cooperation, the European University could become a kind of inspirational model for the national universities, a kind of guiding institution to lead the national universities in the enormous common task of developing and spreading European awareness.

I have said that the first proposal for the establishment of this European university was made in Messina, but unless I am mistaken, the idea had already been born in London in January 1942.

The European Movement Congress proposed the creation of a European University in London. This proposal was then renewed in Strasbourg, in April 1959, by the Federalist Union and other concrete proposals followed successively from the Council of Europe, the European Coal and Steel Community and the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation. These precedents may have inspired Mr. Hallstein in Messina, when, with the authority invested in him as the representative of a great country, itself a shining example of culture, and these precedents before him, he so strongly and fervently advocated the foundation of a European University. These precedents would also explain why, from Messina to Rome, no-one ever opposed the idea.

This forms additional proof that the European University issue goes beyond the now emerging Europe, that it exceeds the scope of our Community and reaches beyond the borders of the six Messina Conference countries.

The European University affects all the countries of western Europe, all those countries which share the same civilisation and the same culture. I would even go so far as to say that the advantage of the university is that it could combine the efforts of the six countries of our Community with those of all countries with a common culture and civilisation .

At Messina and since Messina, we have always left the door of our Community open to new members and the same applies to the Treaties signed in Rome on 25 March 1957. Our hopes were and are particularly focussed upon England, and also upon the Scandinavian countries and all other European countries with a common culture and civilisation.

This issue remains open.

On 12 February last, the House of Commons examined the Liberal proposal relating to Great Britain's simple membership of the European Common Market, which involved the relinquishment of its project for a free-trade area. At this time, Mr. Maudling made some interesting comments. He gave the three main reasons why the British government did not consider, at least for the time being, that it could form part of the European Common Market.

The reasons given were the following:

- 1° Accession to Common Market would mean following a common commercial policy.
- 2° It would mean relinquishing the policy of 'free entry' into the Commonwealth.
- 3° According to Mr. Maudling, the true aim of the six countries was not economic integration but political integration. Consequently accession to the Common Market would mean membership of the Federation of the United States of Europe.

Despite this, however, the question of England's potential membership of the Common Market was not closed on 12 February 1959. Just a few weeks later, 'The Economist', a liberal and authoritative publication, mentioned that discussions were continuing on this strictly political level, the issue being whether England should or should not agree to join the European Common Market, in other words whether, having taken Mr. Maudling's political considerations into account, the country should accept remaining outside a system of European unification which would have not only economic but also political implications.

It has been said that England is inconceivable without Europe. I would add that Europe is inconceivable without England. The great ambition of all those who aspire to effective European unification is precisely this: that England will take part in our efforts and will share our destiny. Yet, not only England, not only the Scandinavian countries, not only the European countries which form part of the Atlantic Alliance and therefore share our fundamental political reasons for the political unification of Europe – a desire for security and thus our countries' independence – but all European countries who share our western culture and civilisation. Our hope is that one day they may all form part of our common structure.

Our Europe, united today on an economic level, tomorrow on a political level, will and must form the initial nucleus of a far more wide-ranging partnership, encompassing all countries with a common culture and a common civilisation.

In the opinion of the Liberal Group, this should now form a subject for common reflection.

The Liberal Group considers that the foundation of a European university is of fundamental importance, given that this institution will not and cannot be solely confined to the six countries of emerging Europe. It will be and must be the essential model for all universities, the spiritual guide for all European countries with a common civilisation and culture.

Election of the European Parliament by Universal Suffrage

Speech given on 17 May 1960

Before beginning the debate upon the amendments, the Liberal Group considers it would be useful to set out its general position on the Commission's report, since the main share of the Liberal Group's vote on the proposed amendments will be determined by this general position.

The Liberal Group was represented by several of its most eminent members in the Working Party. In addition, its representatives on the Commission of Political Affairs supported a number of amendments which were generally adopted. The Liberal Group considers that very detailed work went into the Commission's Report and that this Report has successfully reconciled an attitude passionately in favour of European institutional progress with a realistic awareness of the psychological and political possibilities.

For this reason, the Liberal Group is almost unanimously in favour of the Commission's Report but has little inclination to adopt further amendments which may risk disturbing the delicate balance which has been achieved.

We would like to draw the attention of our colleagues, particularly those who signed the amendments, to the numerous risks facing the proposal under debate.

Firstly, it may be rejected by the Ministers. They could – and this has perhaps not been sufficiently emphasised – reject it for two reasons, either because they do not approve the provisions or because they consider the time is not right.

There is also the risk that the proposal, once accepted by the Council of Ministers, may not be ratified by one or other of the six countries' parliaments.

Finally, there is the even more serious risk that though approved by the Council of Ministers and ratified by the parliaments, the proposal will not receive popular support, in other words that elections to the Assembly may be met with popular indifference.

As far as the Liberal Group is concerned, it is prepared to accept these risks and use all its influence in each of our six countries to avoid them. It considers, however, that the risks would be even greater if certain amendments – or motions for resolutions, such as those relating to the future Assembly's powers and responsibilities – were to be adopted. We do not oppose the hopes expressed in the amendments. We simply consider them to be premature at this stage. And having assessed the risk, we would like the Commission's President or one of its rapporteurs, to clarify the way in which this proposal will be submitted to the Council of Ministers.

Will the proposal be accompanied by a letter from the President of the Commission or the President of the Assembly? Will this letter contain any kind of statement on the reasons for the proposal? Will the Working Party's President and rapporteurs request the Council of Ministers give them a hearing so that they can clarify and comment on the Commission's cautious approach to this work.

There is another point worth mentioning. In the event of the Council of Ministers contemplating extensive amendments to the draft agreement, will the working party or the Commission request the Council of Ministers to submit these amendments before they are adopted by the Council? This is so that those of our colleagues who have devoted nearly two years to this work may give their opinion before the text resulting from our deliberations is drastically changed.

We know that the text of the agreement forms a compromise on numerous issues, such as incompatibility or the number of members of parliament. As far as we are concerned, this is a reason for supporting it, because when we have to uphold it within the national Parliaments, this compromise will have a greater chance of being ratified than any other. We would ask you not to lose sight of the fact that this draft will have to overcome numerous obstacles before its acceptance.

The Working Party and the Commission of Political Affairs have long and carefully weighed the pros and cons of the resolutions they are proposing. The Liberal Group will request its members to be wary of sessional changes and improvisations and to stand firmly behind the Commission's text.

Many of us have noticed a certain relationship between the acceleration of the Common Market and the election of the Assembly by universal suffrage. There are still many unknown factors, such as the number of abstentions, which are totally unforeseeable at present. But surely popular support for Europe is an unknown factor which will depend upon our own present moderation and farsightedness.

The problem is popular support. As Maurice Faure has pointed out, this is the greatest risk.

There is also the enormous problem of overseas representation, which will have repercussions not only for the Eurafrican countries, but for the planet as a whole.

Other economic and even structural problems will arise in the coming months. It would, therefore, be better not to complicate the issue by petty quibbles over trivialities.

We must be reasonable, above all we must place the urgency of the construction of Europe ahead of any fleeting personal preference. We must remember that election by direct suffrage will be the latest stage in a development which we have no right to delay.

We have been the Common Assembly. It has been worthy of Europe. If we want this Assembly to continue to be worthy of Europe, it is our duty to accelerate its development in an era when history is accelerating everywhere.

We must act in such a way that the present Parliamentary Assembly will not be criticised in the future for having held back the true European Assembly, elected by true European universal suffrage.

Given Mr. Dehousse's words, I can now end my speech. I would, however, like to add a further argument to his, an argument of a constitutional nature, which is important and which I hope will persuade Mr. Vendroux to withdraw his proposal, given the practical problems it raises.

I would firstly like to say that I have a lot of sympathy for his aim, in other words for a popular referendum on Europe, even though at present limited to the European election issue.

This could be a way of enabling popular awareness to play a direct part in the creative European process. This is the principal requirement for progress along this difficult route.

I have to say, however, that a referendum on the adoption of the European election agreement would simply result in delaying considerably the procedure for such elections.

What is more, the referendum would not remove the need for ratification of the agreement by the six parliaments and it would not basically add to the popular sanction at present carried out by representatives of our six countries. In addition, just as there are constitutional obstacles in Belgium, there are very serious ones in Italy. The constitution of the Italian Republic only makes provision for two forms of popular referendum on State legislation. Firstly a referendum for the repeal of already existing laws, secondly a referendum for the approval of constitutional laws which were not approved by the required quorum in the two parliamentary chambers. It is, therefore, not possible to submit a law such as this to referendum, since there is no provision for this under the constitution. There is another thing, as well. The Italian constitution is explicitly opposed to the ratification of international agreements being made subject to popular referendum. It accepts no referendum for laws on taxation or the budget, amnesty or reduced penalties or authorisation to ratify international treaties.

The constitution of the Italian Republic would therefore have to be amended in order to conduct Mr. Vendroux's referendum. Our constitution is, however, very rigid and the amendment procedure is difficult and protracted. This method would in practice torpedo elections by direct universal suffrage and it is quite obvious that this is not what Mr. Vendroux's wants. Mr. Vendroux wants, on the contrary, is exactly what I want, which is the direct and valid approval of our idea by popular awareness.

This is why I am insistent that Mr. Vendroux should withdraw his proposal. It could be sent to the Committee for Political Affairs for examination and report to the Assembly. This is by far the best way of initiating the procedure which Mr. Vendroux wants but surely does not want at any price. If, on the other hand, his recommendation should in fact result in acceptance by the Assembly of the referendum proposal, it would cause a potentially fatal delay to the procedure for European elections by direct universal suffrage.

Election as President of the European Parliament

Speech given on 27 March 1962

Above all, I feel the need to express my feeling of gratitude for your decision to appoint me as President of this Assembly. I would also like to express my thanks, as well as yours, to our longest serving member, M. Burgbacher, Member for Berlin, for his excellent opening speech, in which he anticipated my own thoughts.

I have always considered myself fortunate to have had the opportunity, during my public life, of making some contribution to the cause of European unity. For me, therefore, your choice is a great honour and a great pleasure.

The Treaties of Rome, whose signature in the Capitol will be formally commemorated here the day after tomorrow on our fifth anniversary, were formulated in Messina, my birthplace, during a Conference which I had the honour of attending as my country's Minister of Foreign Affairs. From Messina to Rome, during nearly two years of arduous negotiations, I had the privilege of helping to draft the final agreements, along with other eminent colleagues who are also here today: Mr. Hallstein, President of the Executive of the Common Market and Mr. Maurice Faure, a highly competent member of our Assembly and of my own political Group, also Mr. Mario Scelba, who was President of the Italian Council of Ministers at the time of the Messina Conference.

This is why your choice is so meaningful for me. It increases my sense of achievement and give rise to a sense of intense pleasure.

I would also like to express my particular thanks to my eminent Liberal and Allies Group colleagues who have several times placed their confidence in me by proposing my candidature and supporting it with zeal and tenacity. The consideration they have shown towards me personally has caused me some agitation and confusion in that I definitely do not feel worthy of such allegiance.

I cannot hide from myself and you cannot hide from yourselves, the reason for my doubt and concern. Simply think of those of my predecessors with far greater names than mine. The names Robert Schuman and Hans Furler now form part of the annals of history, alongside other great names, as the true founders of Europe. They designed and began the construction of a new Europe, conceived as a single political and economic entity which would protect the freedom of the citizens of Europe and secure their moral and civic progress.

I am sure that I express the unanimous feeling of this Assembly in extending them our heartfelt thanks, our deepest gratitude for the admirable work they carried out in confirming and developing the ideal of European unity, both within this Assembly and in the outside world.

In awareness of the limits of my strength and the difficulties of the task which lies ahead, I appeal to your understanding and unstinting cooperation as I take up the mandate which you have so generously conferred upon me.

Four years have now passed since the Treaties of Rome came into force. No objective observer could underestimate the remarkable progress which has been made towards economic unity in such a short period of time, progress which has been the result, above all, of the wisdom, skill and spirit of the members of the Commissions of the Economic and Atomic Energy Communities and the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community. The Communities born of the Treaties very quickly threw off the criticism and scepticism which had surrounded their preparation and creation. They revealed the level of their dynamism and vitality. They also revealed that in many ways they were even more resolute and enterprising than their creators had dared dream.

The member countries have fulfilled their obligations and have even moved ahead of some of the planned timetables. The decision by the British Prime Minister, in July of last year, that Great Britain should apply for full membership of the European Communities and the negotiations which followed during November, are further aspects of European progress which open up new prospects for the long held desire to extend Europe's boundaries. Denmark and Ireland have followed the British government's example and Greece's application for association was followed by applications from Austria, Switzerland, Sweden and other countries.

Movement to the second stage of the Common Market's transition period provides yet another stimulus for the movement towards unity. The decision taken on 14 January this year by the Community's Council of Ministers was not adopted without difficulty, but at the end of the day, hesitation and reservation gave way to a determined will to move forward.

A few days before 14 January, an event took place which it would not be wrong to describe as exceptionally important for European unity. I am speaking of the declarations made by President Kennedy in his State of the Union Speech in 1962. The President of the United States of America declared that the growth of the Common Market was the 'greatest challenge of all' at the present time. He added that 'the Common Market is growing' and 'assuming the accession of the United Kingdom, there will arise across the Atlantic a trading partner behind a single external tariff similar to ours with an economy which nearly equals our own. Will we in this country adapt our thinking to these new prospects and patterns - or will we wait until events have passed us by'.

As a result, the Common Market has not only and will not only continue to form a magnet attraction throughout Europe, but has also, through its success, its constant strengthening, its prospects for subsequent development, already given rise to the issue of the relationship between this unified area and the economic area of North America, in terms which I would even go so far as to describe as pressing. Similar common market projects will also be suggested in central and southern America. As a result, we are on the brink of new links between the two sides of the Atlantic, links which will undoubtedly help to consolidate the web of solidarity throughout the free world.

This is not all. Within the economically integrated area, a tight network of agreements in the private sector has strengthened the foundations of the Common Market. In the industrial sector, cooperation between enterprises, patent exchanges and reciprocal financial participating interests have formed links which it would now be difficult to break. We can obviously take pleasure in this. The results obtained by the Common Market in slightly over forty [*sic*] years have justified the hopes and expectations of the those who instigated the Conference of Messina and drafted the Treaties of Rome. We can take pleasure, I would say, but not be satisfied, for the great and

undeniable progress made on the route to economic unity has not been equalled on the route to political unity. In this latter sphere, there has been no progress worth noting.

Personally, I consider that we should not underestimate the political side effects of the advance of economic unity. The transition to the second stage of the Common Market will have undoubted political implications. At that stage the rule of the qualified majority must be applied in numerous cases, common directives will be implemented in the six countries' economic policies as a result of periodic exchanges of views and there is also the imminent accession of Great Britain and other European countries. It also seems to me unquestionable that only effective and clear decisions of a specifically political nature will activate the course of European unity by resolutely driving it towards its final goal.

Prospects of political unity lay at the origin of the work of forging a new image of Europe from the ruins and hostilities of the war. The European Defence Community and the European Political Community were the two main stalwarts in terms of projects for forming a common European authority which would operate on a higher level than its members and take decisions on their behalf in the last resort. Their failure did not discourage the spirit and will of those who were working for effective European unity. Historical events made it necessary to find other routes to a united Europe.

The route chosen in Messina at the beginning of June 1955 was that of economic unity, the only route which would open the nationalist fortresses to subsequent political unity. It would, therefore, not be true to claim that Messina treated the unification process on an exclusively economic level. The economic prospects only had value as a means of attaining political integration. The European union ideal was to remain unchanged. The Messina draft provided the same notion as that conceived by the Monnets, Schumans, Sforzas, De Gasperis and Adenauers of this world, in other words genuine European political unity. If we analyse the historical, legal and political data, it is possible to identify within it the embryo of a federal type structure, able to grow and develop autonomously through the functioning of its institutional machinery.

It is this autonomous effort towards progress and development within the Community which has unfortunately missed the target. The fundamental issues raised over a period of four years are still not resolved. No concrete measure has been taken to unify the executives of the Communities, to adopt the procedure for electing the members of our Assembly by direct universal suffrage, to found the European University, to provide the Community institutions with a single headquarters. Proposal after proposal has been drafted, with the only result being an increase in the archives.

Admittedly, some have maintained and are still maintaining that it would be preferable to refrain from pressing the political accelerator in order not to run the risk of losing everything as a result of asking for too much. With the spectre of the failed European Defence Community always in mind, they would like to use the basis of sound economic unity, considering this the natural way of providing the right conditions for political unity. In other words, they would like to gather the ripe fruit of political unity from the tree of economic unity. I do not believe, however, that I can share this view. It means in effect forgetting that the present national situation, with its old and new crises, its numerous still-open wounds, calls for immediate reinforcement of the political foundations of European unity.

Unless we achieve political unity, not only shall we be in a position where we cannot effectively ward off the dangers which threaten peace in Europe and the world, we also run the constant risk of losing, in a split second, all that we have painfully achieved during two years of hard work.

The discussions and polemics which have resulted from the Common Market's move to the second stage of the transition period are a warning of this. The prospect of effective unity, achieved in a relatively short space of time, is the only thing which can protect us from unpleasant shocks. We should also not forget that by halting on the route to political unity we have given its opponents renewed strength and courage. City gods have reappeared in a blaze of light to close the way to universal gods in European history. Sadly, it now seems that what Luigi Einaudi called 'the myth of sovereignty' will regain strength. And, as the great statesman, now departed, was in the habit of saying, as long as this myth reigns, Europe will be incapable of unity.

One of the great indisputable merits of our Assembly is that political unity has always been its principal aim. The European Parliamentary Assembly, in so far as its limited powers have allowed, has always led the way in promoting and encouraging initiatives favouring this unity. It has made its voice heard, on several occasions, warning against the dangers of the status quo and a routine approach and calling for more impetus to be given to the political and spiritual aspects of the unification process. The Assembly has vigorously stressed on numerous occasions that the battle for European unity will not be won solely on an economic level, but also on a political and spiritual level. European unity will not take root until it has become rooted in individual awareness. If the popular will is not given the means to participate directly in governing the new Europe, if the idea of unity is not planted in the mind and encouraged to grow, the European Community will have no certain future.

The drafts and resolutions which have been prepared in our Assembly for electing the future members of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage or for encouraging the creation of the European University or for promoting relationships for association and productive cooperation with the people of the former colonial territories are proof of action aimed at strengthening the political and spiritual aspects of the unification process. I think that we should intensify such action, this being all the more essential given that other forms of political cooperation based on schemes and concessions which we believed had gone for ever appear to be regaining vigour and substance.

At our time in history, there is no room for doubt. It is a time for decisions. It brings to mind another time in history which was the prelude to the first experience of a political community of peoples wishing to unite in order to cooperate in their desire for peace and progress. This took place on the vast and independent territory of America and it is worth remembering, not only because it gave rise to one of the most perfect and permanent structures of all time, but because it was the first time that Europeans had achieved unification, even though on different territory far from their own.

As we are today, the founders of American unity were then divided between fear and hope. But then these fears were banished by the 'manly spirit' of these far-sighted and noble people and their hope was not long in becoming a certainty. It is to this spirit that Madison referred in The Federalist Papers XIV, in the following words, which I believe it is worth quoting:

‘To this courageous spirit’, wrote Madison, ‘posterity will be indebted for the possession, and the world for the example, of the numerous innovations displayed on the American theatre, in favour of private rights and public happiness. Had no important step been taken by the leaders of the Revolution for which a precedent could not be discovered, no government established of which an exact model did not present itself, the people of the United States might, at this moment, have been numbered among the melancholy victims of misguided councils Happily they pursued a new and more noble course. They reared the fabrics of governments which have no model on the face of the globe. They formed the design of a great Confederacy which it is incumbent on their successors to improve and perpetuate’.

We must, in turn, choose between the old and the new era. The old era attracts us through the strength of its traditions, habits, prejudices and the compromises they allowed. The new era calls for courage, sacrifice and hardship, for the initial benefit of our children and grandchildren.

What will Europe choose? Must we think that after thousands of years of having been the spiritual cradle of humanity and the ‘world memory’, Europe will refuse to opt for the new era? Must we think that Europe, wisdom's model, will close its eyes to the present state of world politics, where only the great continental systems have prospects of life and growth?

We have faith in Europe's choice. It is precisely because we have this faith, however, that we should intensify our efforts to inspire Europeans and further develop Madison's ‘manly spirit’, the spirit upon which, in the final analysis, the future of united Europe depends. This is why our Assembly has fought and will, I am sure, continue to fight the battle to establish the European University with great tenacity, seeing this correctly as one of the principal tools which will help to enrich Europe's spiritual heritage.

This idea inspires the masterpiece that we have awaited for years, the formation of Europe as a common spiritual heritage, an ethical ideal rather than a community structure, capable of increasing the potential for physical defence and survival and raising the living standards of all European citizens. The protection and enrichment of the noblest values and the most striking aspects of the European spirit is, for ourselves and our descendants, the essential condition for the political and economic unity of our continent.

In the final analysis, preservation of the European spirit will form the basis of any initiative to create a new unified European structure. It is a difficult task, when we consider that we ourselves, rather than others, have rejected Europe's specific values so many times in the past, leading to a history punctuated by sad outbreaks of obscurantism and aberration. This threat, which is still latent and still imminent in Europe and as such particularly insidious, calls for sustained will. There is no such thing as a Europe based on natural law, any more than there is a nation based on natural law. One becomes European in the same way as one becomes German, French or Italian, by consciously feeling European.

To take the famous words of Renan, it can be said that Europe, like the nation, is a daily plebiscite. It is a plebiscite that arose from rediscovering the sources of the European spirit, the sources which made Europe *anima et ratio mundi*, the Greek thought which recognised in man ‘the measure of all things’ ; the Latin thought which laid down the fundamental rules of human

society in the concise terms *honeste vivere, neminem laedere, suum cuique tribuere*; the Christian thought which elevated man to the dignity of the divine by calling him 'the son of God'. These thoughts formed the basis for the modern age - religious tolerance, political freedom and democratic government being the three supreme values which represent our civilisation's greatest achievements.

I have referred to the 'European spirit', but in actual fact it is obvious that this spirit is not solely European, but also universal. It is called upon to fulfil a universal mission, to spread its wings everywhere on earth where humanity lives in accordance with the ideals, principles and values accumulated by Europe during its three thousand year history. The European spirit is the very spirit of the free world, even though its principal seat is still Europe. Europe's central position in the spiritual sphere is all the more evident and transparent today as a result of the fact that the old continent is no longer playing its former immense role on the world political stage. Jaspers said that the millennia existence of Europe at present offers the potential for extension to new concepts and that the spirit which created science and technology must surely contain the means of restoring world order.

These noble thoughts express our most ardent wish: that Europeans may find, within their millennia culture, the necessary strength and faith to advance more courageously and morerapidly towards unity. This is the ultimate aim, the final end of their turbulent path.

The Europe of Hope

Speech given on 17 September 1962 at the European Parliament –
Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe

As a result of the great kindness of Mr. Federspiel, the eminent President of the Council of Europe, I have the honour of chairing the first part of this joint meeting of our two Assemblies. I have also been offered the possibility, but I shall use it with care, of saying a few words by way of introduction to the political debate, based upon the excellent report presented by Mr. Eduardo Martino on behalf of the European Parliament.

Several times in the past and under similar circumstances, including when I was a Rapporteur in the year 1959, we were able to highlight the undeniable significance of a debate which forms the expression of the open and liberal spirit which inspires the European Community. Today, this debate will give us an opportunity of contemplating the remarkable progress made by the Community and the further prospects which appear to be opening before it both at present and in the more distant future. Significant progress has been made in economic solidarity and new events have occurred which confirm that the process of European unification is likely to involve further developments. It is for this reason that Mr. Eduardo Martino's report calls more than ever for an effort towards further conscious reflection, on our part as well as on the part of all those who are patiently working to construct the new Europe.

Community action has gradually consolidated the basis of construction initiated by the Treaties of Rome and has also added an essential component through the achievement of a level of equilibrium which now enables us to maintain peace, even though such peace is uncertain in our time, and to envisage a more stable and more secure future.

Our satisfaction at the increasing success of economic integration should not, however, tempt us to pause on our long and difficult path. On the contrary, we must draw increased strength from this success for other achievements. It would be a serious mistake to rest on our laurels and slow down our work after having achieved so much, forgetting that the aim is to create wider and more complete forms of association between the countries of Europe.

The ideal which has constantly stimulated and inspired the work of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and the European Parliament will only be realised if the present European Community intends gradually to extend its borders to cover European territory on a much larger scale. The Common Market concept was not an end in itself, but was a means of attaining a far higher aim: the political unity of the free nations of Europe. It was conceived in Messina and formed by the Treaties of Rome as an open, not closed, Community, a Community able to go on growing and multiplying. If we ask why it has exceeded our wildest hopes and has so rapidly become such an influential model, such a magnetic attraction both inside and outside Europe, the only explanation is the internal dynamism and the capacity for extension inherent in the European Common Market. To confine it within its present limits would be to clip its wings, jeopardise the success already achieved and condemn it to inevitable decline.

We are living in a fast-changing world and we are aware that change is the only way forward. We cannot therefore aspire to a fixed position. What we should want and what we do want is this change to be marked by progress and not by a halt or a backwards step on the road leading to European unity.

Those who have tenaciously and passionately held on to the ideal of European unification are following the on-going negotiations for Great Britain's accession to the Common Market with a mixture of hope and anxiety. They are receiving with pleasure the first contacts from other European countries requesting association. Naturally no-one is underestimating the complexity and seriousness of the issues which must be resolved in order to achieve the transition from this small area of Europe to a far wider Europe. It is not easy, for example, to reconcile the United Kingdom's specific requirements with the crucial requirement of avoiding any weakening of the Community's institutional structures, structures which contain the initial nucleus of European federation. We must find the right way of adapting the Community machinery to the new situation whilst simultaneously maintaining full and uncompromising loyalty to the principles and ideas which inspired the Treaties of Rome. It would not be in anyone's interest and would be disastrous for all if the price of the negotiation were to be the adulteration or abandonment of Europe's essential features.

The Common Market has brought great benefits to the countries which formed it. It has been the inspiration for their rapidly increasing energy and, even more important, has channelled them in the direction of organised development. These benefits must increase as the area of unity extends. As the Common Market grows, it will be in a greater and better position to follow the rhythm of modern Europe's productive expansion. But economic considerations are not the only ones. There are higher political considerations which can commit and encourage, and even ease and accelerate, the process of European unification.

Although the European unification process and its scale in the immediate future will unquestionably have political repercussions, acceleration of the process of political unification will always be strictly subject to full use and perfect functioning of the institutions established by the Rome Treaties. This leads to the question of whether it would be useful to find new instruments for political unity instead of using and improving those we already have. The dynamic features of federalism already exist in the present Community. We must make them more active and forceful if we wish to give greater impetus to political unity.

We must be fully aware that the establishment of a genuine and effective common political structure is our essential first task at this stage on our road towards European unity. There are storm clouds on the horizon and the only way of removing the threat is by increasing Europe's political weight.

From across the Atlantic, the United States of America, is now increasingly pressing us to accelerate our unification effort. Post-war history is also the history of gradual convergence and increasing cooperation between America and Europe. This convergence and cooperation is becoming increasingly intensified as Europe transforms its dedication to unity into reality. The creation and implementation of the Common Market have given rise to the concrete issue of interdependence between the two great forces on the opposite sides of the Atlantic. Formerly, it was the Atlantic Pact that formed the platform for a common defence policy.

These two processes, European unification and the Atlantic alliance, have never appeared as alternatives but rather as complementary arrangements. They have a tendency to be based on one and the same process and this should lead to Atlantic unity.

In his speech in Philadelphia in July, the President of the United States again took up a theme which he had explored extensively in his speech to Congress on the State of the Union, declaring that the final aim of the cooperation between America and Europe – even though perhaps still in the future – was lasting association between the people of both continents.

‘It is only by this association,’ he declared in the text, ‘that we can assist the developing nations to throw off the yoke of poverty. It is only by this that we can hope to achieve a world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion’.

But he issued a reminder that it was up to Europe to take the first step.

‘They must go forward in forming the perfect union which is the only thing which will allow this association with America’.

Many people see President Kennedy's vision as unconventional and idealistic, but many others have observed that it would correspond with the West's logical destiny. I am amongst the latter.

I believe that the common spiritual process is nearing a level of maturity which includes awareness of the common values and ideals which define our respective American and European lives, values and ideals without which neither America or Europe would have a certain future.

The American people have, through the voice of their most eminent representative, already demonstrated this awareness. It is impossible to deny a profound significance to the fact that the Philadelphia declarations coincided with the event which marked the separation between the old and new worlds. Almost two hundred years after this historic date America has declared its will to become once again permanently united with Europe. It is neither arbitrary nor illusory to consider that a new cycle may be about to begin in the history of humanity.

A response to the appeal launched from across the Atlantic would involve Europe in taking a faster and more definite route to full political unity, through an awareness that this unity will be required to cement the association between the two continents, in other words the total union of the West. It is only through such association on a higher and more perfect level, that we can protect our common civilisation.

Europe will devote itself to the creation of its ‘perfect union’, all the more determinedly and speedily if it is determined to overcome all remaining national self-interest and to set aside old and outdated ideas which, as Thomas Mann saw it, ‘pollute the air and paralyse life’.

‘The Europe of Hope’, it has been called, this new Europe which is slowly emerging and which is showing promise of more rapid and more harmonious progress than the Europe of yesterday. We are justified in believing that this new Europe will not disappoint the hopes of the majority of free people, who wish to preserve and increase freedom, who wish to ensure that they and their children can live in a less anguished world than the present, in a world which, as President Kennedy hoped, may be free from the spectre of tyranny and war.

The Community's Internal Functioning

Speech given on 21 November 1962

At the end of this latest colloquy between the Council of Ministers of the Communities and the European Parliament, I would like to express, on behalf also of my colleagues, my most sincere and profound thanks to the Council members and to their President Mr. Piccioni, who has once again expressed his unwavering faith in the European ideal. I would also like to thank all those – Ministers, Presidents or Members of Executive Committees, Members of Parliament – who took part in and contributed their thoughts to the debate, thus making the discussions which have just ended more constructive and fruitful than ever.

Your Assembly has good reason to congratulate itself, in that the Community's governing institutions now realise that acceleration of the European Community's political impetus is closely linked with the consolidation and improvement of its institutional machinery. The Parliamentary Assembly has supported such consolidation and improvement consistently and vigorously since the very beginning of the Economic Community and the Atomic Community. By so doing, the Assembly has complied with the letter and the spirit of the Treaties. The Treaties themselves symbolise the will, even though at present indirect, of our six nations. It has been still further expressed, historically speaking, through practical application, revealing the awareness and driving force behind the Community's political development. This is what the European Parliament is, it is the awareness and driving force behind European political unity. This is why it has and must put the future before the present. It has sought to prepare for this future with all its available resources, either by using the institutions the Treaties provided for this purpose or by trying to improve them, or by trying new ways of achieving a new and more favourable balance between the Communities' administrative structures without departing from the Treaties' institutional framework.

As a result of these initiatives, the European Parliament has sometimes given the impression of wishing to force the pace of progress too fast. It has also happened that in the heat of the controversy surrounding such and such an attitude by the national governments to the movement towards European political unity, intentions have been detected which were not really correct. Be that as it may, it seems to me that by placing the institutional issue at the forefront and discussing it constantly, the Parliament has prevented factors of involution gaining ground, on either a national and community level, which, through a moment of uncertainty, may halt or deflect the process of European unification. It has also created the conditions for actual political development within the Community, development which, though slow, still represents considerable progress. This is shown, for example, in the new and interesting position gradually being taken by the Council of Ministers within the Communities' administrative machinery and by the short but very full history of these colloquies between the Parliament and the Councils.

The purpose of these colloquies is precisely that just described, a search for further institutional balance to encourage parallelism, if I can put it this way, where possible between the two routes to economic and political unity. It has responded and is continuing to respond to the requirement for exchanges of preliminary ideas between the parliamentary structure and the executive structures on essential issues concerning Europe's life and future. Initially an experiment, this initiative has become a genuine tradition which now forms an integral part of the institutional procedure for implementing the required cooperation between the Communities'

governing structures. I am happy to say that the credit for this tradition's introduction and consolidation is due in the main to the Councils of Ministers. They accepted the Parliament's position immediately and have made an enormous contribution to our meetings. I am, however, above all pleased to say that this dialogue has now moved from the technical to the specifically political level and has attained broad dimensions, as clearly revealed by the two subjects under discussion this year.

On this occasion, we have had an opportunity of examining and discussing in depth not only community action in a given sector, but community action in general in the new stage we have just entered, which is so decisive for the future of the European Community. It is, in fact, in this stage – as has already been said – that the rule of a majority decision on various subjects is to replace the rule of unanimous decisions. In addition, the principles have been defined for a common agricultural policy. This represents radical innovation in the sphere of cooperation between the nations. I think it may be true to say that European integration is now showing signs of the first fruit of the federalist seed sown by the Treaties of Rome.

The fact that the two themes are closely linked is obviously no coincidence. It is evident that any forward movement by the Community along the political route will reopen the institutional issue immediately and urgently. I would say that this is the fundamental issue and that its solution has always been considered as the prior and imperative condition for any accelerated movement towards the final goal of political unity and permanence of the Community. It seems to me that our animated debate led to the formation of a common opinion, which the Councils will take into account, on the need not to delay any action to improve, strengthen and, if necessary, amend the present institutional structures.

I would like to take this opportunity to emphasise once again that there really should be no further delay in ensuring that the European Parliament is elected by direct universal suffrage. It will require the application of a specific rule of the Treaty, a rule which should not be left inoperative for much longer. If the Parliament is to be the pivot of the Community's political development, it must reflect, at the highest possible level, the spirit of democracy amongst the people. We cannot shape the Communities' political development without the democratic spirit, any more than we can construct political Europe without direct popular participation.

At the same time, it is impossible not to anticipate an extension of Parliament's political powers, now that the Common Market has entered its second stage, given the consequences which this will involve, which I have just mentioned, and now that we are expecting its borders to be extended by the accession of new countries. The Parliament must become constantly less technical and more political. It must consequently be given effective powers to exercise parliamentary control. This expansion of political power can be only be good, given that its aim is to separate clearly the supervisory functions and the executive functions, thus consequently increasing the functioning capability and vitality of the structures concerned.

Any modification to the institutional structures can obviously not be limited to the Parliament, but must be extended to the Communities' other governing bodies. If we wish to achieve a new and more rational balance between the institutional structures, by placing them on a level other than that provided by the Treaties of Rome, we will need to act simultaneously upon all aspects of the institutional machinery. This is why, before entering the third stage, we must solve the

problem of constituting a single European Community executive, replacing the three separate executives, and a single Council. In other words, one Parliament, one Council of Ministers, one Court of Justice, one Commission. There is no need to stress the fact that it will have to be accepted that a single executive would unquestionably be a stronger executive. The presence of a 'strong and dynamic' executive in the European Community would accord perfectly with democratic principles. As Lippman said, democracy does not consist of preventing the government from acting, it consists of the ability to change the government. The executive must be able to act strongly at the right time.

Those who still oppose these essential structural reforms which are in many cases nothing other than rigorous application or faithful interpretation of the spirit of the Treaties, appear not to take sufficient account of the Community's new rhythm, or its present prospects for development, or even of the specific historic era in which we live. If we are genuinely concerned about the future of the Community, which means the future of Europe itself, we shall have to intensify our efforts to renew the community institutions. In this respect, I would like to recall a few of Jean Monnet's words which seem to me to be particularly enlightening.

The establishment of institutions which obey new and common rules, he said, is more important for the future of the European people than technical progress and the development of material resources contributed by market enlargement or by individual action. Only the institutions can gain wisdom through their accumulation of collective experience and as a result of this experience and wisdom, people who are subject to the same rules will gradually change their behaviour, if not their nature. It is the institutions which control the relationships between people and form the structural support for civilisation.

All of us here are conscious of having done our best during the colloquy to find the best and smoothest means of ensuring that the community institutions gain this wisdom. But we are also conscious that most of the work is still waiting and must be carried out as soon as possible. To the initial valid reasons, other even more valid reasons are added, not simply as suggestions but as requirements for firmly pressing the political accelerator.

International events during the last few weeks have once again demonstrated, more clearly than ever, that world peace hangs on an extremely tenuous thread. Once again, the fear of war has been stronger than the hope of peace. Fortunately the worst has been avoided, but the not improbable possibility that new clouds will gather as harbingers of storm is a signal for all responsible politicians to find the right conditions for a situation more conducive to peace. Everyone is in agreement that effective European unity is one of these conditions. A Europe united not only economically but also politically would form a fundamental, I would even go so far as to say a decisive factor for world peace. For this reason, it is now time to jettison doubt, hesitation, self interest and selfishness to make way for dynamic action to encourage European political unity.

In expressing the wish that this action be taken as soon as possible, I would like to extend my warmest thanks to you all. I hope that future meetings, like this one, will still further strengthen and intensify a level of cooperation which is proving both desirable and productive.

The European Parliament and the National Parliaments

Speech given on 4 February 1963

On 11 January, in Rome, a Conference was held between the Presidents of the Parliamentary Assemblies of the Member States of the European Community and the President of the European Parliament. I believe that it is appropriate as well as my duty to give you an account of this Conference before opening the work of the session.

I would firstly like to express once again my gratitude to the Presidents of the legislative assemblies of the six countries for their courtesy in responding to my invitation and taking part in this conference. I suggested this during my official visits to the governments of the six member countries after entering office as President of the European Parliament. As I shall later explain in more detail, there had been a need for some time to hold a direct colloquy on subjects of general interest. The great success of this initiative was actually due less to my tenacity than to the fact that it was impossible to delay this need any longer. It was just that I had the good fortune to gather, if I can put it this way, fruit which had already ripened on the tree. This obviously in no way diminishes my satisfaction at this meeting. Its significance, as I need not tell you, will be felt by the general public as well as by all those who are particularly attached to the ideal of European unity.

This was the first time, in the Community's still short but very full history since the Treaties of Rome in March 1957, that the Presidents of the national legislative assemblies and the President of the European Parliament had met to discuss the relationship between the national assemblies and our parliament with regard to European affairs. This is an issue which is as complex as it is sensitive and its solution will affect the Community significantly, both now and in the future. For this initial meeting, we simply suggested a wide-ranging exchange of views in order to compare and assess our various viewpoints. I think this was a wise decision. A specific agenda would have been too restrictive. It was, nevertheless, understood that the exchange of views would be based on coordination between the work of the European Parliament and the national parliaments and on ways of publicising the work of the European Parliament in the Community countries.

The very day after the Community was established, all those who were understandably concerned to achieve as high as possible a level of harmonisation between the various legislatures turned their attention to the issue of cooperation between the national parliaments and the European Parliament. It was obvious that Community's correct functioning and gradual political development would depend upon this. However, since the Community was established, and for reasons which are too well known to need mentioning here, the acceleration of economic union has not been accompanied by a comparable acceleration of political union. Those who are involved in the life of the Community and those who follow its ups and downs from outside are becoming increasingly aware that there is a lack of balance between economic and political union, a lack of balance which could have serious consequences for the future of the unification process.

Many people have said, time and again, that we are at a decisive stage of the historic process initiated by the Treaties of Rome and that the countries of this small area of Europe must either increase their efforts to establish closer political union or risk choking the very structure of economic union. This is in no way an imaginary danger. All the positive, almost miraculous, achievements of the Economic Community so far in its role as a driving force, an inspiration for dynamism in all spheres of European society, an example, a guide and a magnetic attraction not only in Europe but throughout the entire world, cannot and must not allow us to forget that it will only survive and provide new and still richer rewards if it can be transformed into a genuine political Community. The current view, that 'the European Community cannot remain a simple economic union' contains an undeniable truth. Without political and governing unity, a common economic policy is impractical in the long run. The effort required to find a commonly accepted formula on the issue of common agricultural policy formed a serious warning at the beginning of last year. Its preparation took no fewer than forty-five working sessions by the Council of Ministers of the European Economic Community. It is true that once agreement was reached, the French Minister of Agriculture declared that the Ministers 'were ordered to succeed', but the following comment, from Britain appeared no less true: 'It remains to be seen whether some of those who were ordered to succeed will end up rebelling at some stage, considering that their agricultural policy represents their greatest national interest'.

The agricultural policy is only one example. There are others which illustrate the permanent fragility of the very foundations of the European Economic Community. Unless the appropriate public measures are adopted dynamically and quickly, there is a risk that other weak points may cause real cracks in the framework of a community structure which was so patiently constructed amidst so many problems.

Thus, the 11 January Conference formed a specific opportunity for looking at the basis of general action to promote European political union as vigorously as possible. It is not difficult to realise immediately the reasons for wider and closer cooperation between the national parliaments and the European parliament and the political objectives to be attained by such cooperation. Until the European Parliament is elected by direct universal suffrage, the national parliaments will continue to form the most immediate and closest link between national spirit and awareness and the European community institutions. It would be illusory even to try to create European political union without appeal to the widest, most active and most conscious level of popular awareness. Unfortunately, such awareness is not sufficiently widespread at the present time. What is more, we lack the mechanisms to strengthen and spread such awareness. The vast majority of our six countries' citizens are not in a position to follow the work and functioning of the Community closely. As a result, they could not possibly make a conscious choice from a genuinely European perspective when called upon to vote. At the present time, our people exercise their right to choose their representatives solely from a national viewpoint. The European Communities appear to have become far more 'a matter for the six governments' rather than 'a matter for the six peoples'.

There is another fundamental reason for more active and conscious participation by the European people in the life of the Community and this is the need to strengthen democracy in Europe. It has been very justly said that 'European integration without democratic control would lead to a gradual decline in democracy throughout the European area'. Within the Community we are therefore witnessing a phenomenon which needs watching closely, which is to the tendency of the executive structures to disregard the opinion of the European Parliament. This is not all. In some spheres, even highly important spheres such as the common agricultural policy or the free

movement of workers, Council decisions can be adopted without any effective involvement by the Parliament or any monitoring by the national parliaments.

It is quite obvious that a fundamental rule of democracy is not being fully acknowledged, even though only in some limited spheres of Community life. Such a serious juridical-political, above all political, shortcoming must be quickly eliminated by joint action between the European Parliament and the national parliaments. If not, we could well see the consolidation of certain interventionist and separatist trends within the Community which, when combined with the centrifugal trends which are unfortunately still alive and active in national circles, could cause a split between the European community and the national governments. Such a split would have very disastrous consequences, not only for the development of political unity but also for the strength of European democratic institutions. I believe that we should remember that the great democratic route is the only route to European union.

Furthermore, I am personally convinced that when the European Parliament is elected by direct universal suffrage, the 'European' function of the national parliaments will not be in any way diminished. The problem which now exists and which will increasingly arise during the desired political development of the Community, is the problem of establishing a balance between a European federal government and the national governments. This will be far easier to solve if the conditions needed for total cooperation between the National Parliaments and the European Parliament have already been considered and finally established.

I think these few pointers are sufficient to emphasise the significance and political importance of the Rome meeting.

The Presidents of all the European parliamentary assemblies were present. Three of them were represented by their Vice-Presidents for reasons of illness. The only absentee was the representative of the French National Assembly, who was detained by the important debate on the State budget. President Chaban-Delmas did, however, confirm that he was in favour of my initiative and requested to be informed of the results of the meeting.

These are summarised in the final Communiqué and in the review by the Secretaries-General, which were adopted by the Presidents' Conference with a few amendments and additions and have now been circulated to you all.

I believe that the Conference's most significant outcome was the unanimous and formal reassertion of a common faith in Europe and the unanimously expressed intention of continued cooperation between the national parliaments and the European Parliament, as a contribution to the unification process.

The Presidents are convinced, states the Final Communiqué, that if the Member States are more aware of the work of the European Parliament and the issues it is called upon to discuss, this will help to form the European awareness which is essential to the political construction of Europe.

And further on : There is no doubt that cooperation between the National Parliaments and the European Parliament will form a massive contribution to the progress of European construction.

The Presidents are therefore proposing, within the limits of their own powers, that this cooperation is carried out on the widest possible basis.

With regard to the technical methods of spreading wider knowledge of the work of the European Parliament and the issues it is called upon to discuss, some proposals have been drawn up with the aim of adopting measures which comply with, or are not contrary to, national statutory procedures and can therefore be immediately or easily applied. Thus there was a suggestion for the creation of a 'Committee' or a 'Sub-Committee' with special responsibility for European matters, for holding one or more annual debates on the state of European integration, debates which may possibly give rise to a subsequent government report on the subject. It was also proposed that particularly important resolutions adopted by the European Parliament should be sent to the national parliaments for information and that improvements should be made to the methods used by the national parliaments to obtain information on the work of the European Parliament.

Approximately six years ago, the Treaties establishing the two European Economic and Atomic Communities were signed in Rome. These two Communities were united with the already existing European Coal and Steel Community by means of a single institutional mechanism to form what we now know as the 'European Community'.

I have had the honour both of talking to you and of taking part in the preparatory work and drafting of the Treaties of Rome and I well remember the scepticism which surrounded the establishment of the two Communities. At the time, most people thought that this establishment would not be ratified by all the national parliaments and that it would not stand up to the test of time. Fortunately the clouds of scepticism soon cleared and the European Community was quick to prove that it possessed a dynamism which its founders themselves had not suspected. More than once, it has been said that it has formed the most revolutionary action since the war and perhaps the most remarkable event since the fall of the Roman Empire. Such a flattering opinion is doubtless partly true, as long as we do not forget that no political structure, no matter how phenomenal, can last for long unless it is inspired by human will and awareness.

Such praise, when either heard or read, almost seems to imply that the common market is now a permanent part of the patrimony of our era and that it is consequently in a position to function and develop autonomously on a separate, even opposite level from that of national politics. I believe this to be profoundly wrong. The European Community expressed the will of the European people at a given moment in history. In the future it will express the will of the European people at another moment in history. By that, I mean that its destiny is entirely in the hands of the citizens of Europe and is not at the mercy of impersonal and elusive history. History is written hour by hour and day by day through human action and there is no choice other than to accept that at the present time the European people are unfortunately taking insufficient account of the European Community's impact upon their individual and collective lives.

Despite everything, hopes for the Community's political and economic future at present far outweigh the fear of failure and decline. This based on the not unjustified supposition that the European people will in a short time become increasingly aware of the new spirit of the modern West and will attempt to act in accordance with this spirit. This is the spirit of moral, economic and political union and its historical impetus lies in the western nations' desire for unity.

This is within the order of things in a world which sees distances shorten and moves daringly towards the conquest of space on the one hand, and on the other remains profoundly divided between two opposing and irreconcilable conceptions of life. The forces which serve the same ideal tend to unite on the same level. The tendency towards union has been marked by several events in the West: the establishment of N.A.T.O., the O.E.E.C., the Council of Europe, the E.C.S.C., the W.E.U., the Common Market, Eurotom. I shall also not forget President Kennedy's appeal for more adventurous and closer forms of partnership between the free democratic nations on both sides of the Atlantic. Amongst these forms, we must include the enlargement of the Common Market as a result of the accession of Great Britain and other countries, an enlargement which we welcome with all our hearts. I would finally like to mention the event which seems to me to be the most significant of all, the creation of the Ecumenical Council which could, in the final analysis, be defined as the Council of the Union of Christian Nations.

In the face of the present dramatic dissension between the governments of the Community's member countries with regard to Great Britain's accession, I would like to take this opportunity of saying a few impartial words on this Assembly's aspirations, concerns and anxiety.

In its debates on this subject, the European Parliament has already unanimously expressed the hope that the Brussels negotiations are moving towards a favourable outcome. It has been observed that Great Britain meets the essential requirements for the accession of new members to the European Community in full. Our Parliament was in fact the first institution to point out that the accession of new members may not involve any amendment to the Treaties of Rome. It is precisely because it is convinced of the absolute need for total respect for the Treaties governing the Community's life and development that the Parliament has always insisted upon the application of certain essential political rules. Not all the governments appear so far to have accepted the application of these rules. There is in fact no doubt that the structure of the Treaties could be substantially – I would even say radically – amended, not through the adoption of new provisions but simply as a result of a *de facto* waiver of the existing ones.

We have, however, always considered that the Brussels negotiations should be used for this purpose. In other words they can be used to find a means, acceptable to all, of removing certain specific drawbacks *without the need to carry out any amendment to the existing Treaties*. I would like to express my wish, which I am sure you will echo, that a means may be found of resuming the suspended negotiations and bringing them to a successful conclusion.

Europe has again made the greatest contribution to the present impetus towards union. As a result of this task, which it has turned into a duty, it is once again in its place 'at the centre of the world'. The European Community institutions contain *in nuce* the future federal government of Europe and already symbolise it, even if only a very small part.

This unification process is, however, neither unstoppable nor irreversible, whether in the vaster area of the West or the smaller area of Europe. It is essential for the European people to move resolutely along the road to union. They will be able to do so if they can strengthen their faith in Europe and overcome any discouragement which arises from the inevitable problems involved in such elevated and noble work.

It should be obvious to all the people of Europe that union does not only mean freedom, democracy, civil progress, but also and above all peace. For eighteen years now, humanity has lived through the anguish of another potential tragedy, even more serious than the one it suffered not long ago. A few months ago, we were on the edge of the abyss. If Europe can succeed in reaching effective union on a political and not merely economic level, whilst remaining firmly anchored in the Atlantic Alliance, it would represent an immense force for the maintenance of world peace.

Although our initiative is limited in terms of scope and although it is only intended to influence a part of the general process of developing and strengthening the political aspects of the Community, the value of the cooperation between the European Parliament and the national parliaments initiated by the Rome Conference will be no less significant. I am also convinced that there will be no diminishment of any sense of duty and goodwill in carrying out this work, either on our part or on the part of the national parliaments.

Re-election as President of the European Parliament

Speech given on 25 March 1963

I would like to express my gratitude for the confidence you have once again shown in me by once again electing me as President of the European Parliament. I am particularly deeply grateful for the very kind and flattering comments made by the most senior member of our Assembly.

I am even more flattered to have been elected as a result of the fact that the Parliament is poised at an important and crucial point in its history, being seemingly on the brink of having a significant influence on the future of the European unification process. Over and above the written rules set out in the Treaties of Rome, it is obviously the Parliament's responsibility to promote the unification process and move it from the economic level, to which it has been confined so far, to the more specifically political level. No other Community institution has more competence to take on this task, in that it clearly – though only indirectly – appears that it is the Parliament and the Parliament alone which can express and represent the feelings and ideas of the Community's vital element, this vital element being our people.

The work carried out during the past year forms proof of the European Parliament's capacity and willingness to act as the driving force in the process of unification. This task has been eased by the effective cooperation, enthusiasm and unreserved dedication to the European cause shown by the Presidents of the Political Groups, the Members of the Executives and the High Authority. I would today, in this Chamber, like to extend my warmest thanks on behalf of all of you.

I have already said that the Parliament is the 'awareness and driving force of the unification process'. This was unquestionably how it appeared when it discussed the most important political issues for the immediate future with the representatives of the Councils and the Community executives in November of last year. The same applied when in a debate in the February session, a debate so elevated that it can be placed amongst the most noble and eminent parliamentary traditions of the countries of Europe, it serenely conducted – at one of the most critical moments of the Community's brief but already intense life – the discussion on the interrupted negotiations in Brussels on Great Britain's accession to the Common Market. It also applied when it requested and obtained the support and cooperation of the national parliaments of the Community Member States to encourage progress in European construction. Another specifically political manifestation of the European Parliament's activity is the publicity campaign designed to awaken and develop our peoples' awareness of unity, by organising visits by thousands of young people from the six countries to the Parliament and to the Community institutions, by carrying out preparatory work in all the Community countries and by adding widely to its own repertoire of information tools and arranging conferences and discussions on the issue of Europe.

As your spokesman, your President, I did not fail, during my formal visits to the six Community member countries of the Community, to stress the desire for application of the Treaty of Rome's remaining rules, these being rules of a political nature aimed at the transition of the unification process from the economic to the political level. It is senseless to consider that European construction can survive and progress whilst remaining exclusively economic, although many people appear to believe so at present. If it is limited to the economic sphere, European

construction will be inevitably doomed to failure. It is also senseless to consider that European political construction can be achieved without the active involvement of popular awareness and opinion. Cold reasoning by the governments will not be sufficient to form Europe; the passion of the people is indispensable. 'Passion', according to the philosopher's immortal work 'is the wind, reason is only the sail'. We therefore need the wind of popular passion to swell the governments' sail of reason. In other words, the Parliament's work must be based upon the firm and sincere support of the European people. This is why one of the political rules I have mentioned previously, requiring the election of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, is fundamentally important to the current process. We must never stop repeating our urgent wish, need, desire to see this rule of the Treaty of Rome applied without delay, since it is this rule alone which will enable our people to take an active part in the common effort to construct Europe.

We must, above all, persevere in times of crisis such as the one we are going through at present, when clouds amass on the horizon and we are worried about the threat of erosion and collapse of the still fragile structure built with so much patience, so much difficulty and so many disappointments.

We must not forget that on 20 January a gulf opened up between the Community member countries. The causes have already been discussed at length in this Assembly and will be discussed again during this March session. This gulf should have been closed quickly rather than deepened. But unfortunately it deepened following the decision taken by two Community member countries' governments to refuse or postpone the signature of third country association agreements which had already been initialled during December. The Parliament can only deplore this situation. As your spokesman and colleague, I would like to express the anguish of those who believed and still believe that only union can save Europe from ruin. I would like, on behalf of us all, to launch an urgent appeal to the Community member countries' governments and people to reject anything that can divide and accept everything that can unite, to overcome the present problems and leave the door open to future hope. 'The world is for the living'. This famous maxim of enlightenment shows exactly the direction we should take.

Divergent views and opposition should not allow us to lose sight of our common spiritual and cultural origins, of the fundamental identity of the values and ideals which have modelled the history of Europe for centuries. We must be aware that union between the European people is required not only for material needs, military defence and economic development, but for higher ideals of an ethical kind. These higher ethical ideals inspired those who drafted the Treaties of Rome far more than political or economic ends. By a happy coincidence today is the sixth anniversary of their signature at the Capitol. Our union is required above all because it is the only way we shall be able to remain faithful to these ideals and use them as an inspiration and model for our future lives.

In the final analysis, everything comes back to the immortal ideals which conferred so much nobility, civilisation and humanity upon our nations' history. We would like to see them adopted in support of our new work. It has been very justly observed that a realistic politician does not isolate action from human ideals but considers such ideals as the true reason for action. We must always remain faithful to our ideals if our work is to be genuinely useful and creative. According to ancient philosophy, no-one but God knows the future. But if we look around us, as far as the eye can see, there are many reasons for hope. I believe that the most important of all is the enthusiasm shown by millions of young people for the European cause and these ideals.

We should therefore work with confidence and new heart in playing our part to construct a common destiny for all European nations believing in God and freedom. On the road we are travelling, which is neither smooth nor safe, we can take as our guide the spirit of the great poet Dante Alighieri, who was Italian and yet also European and universal and who De Sanctis said saw beyond the city to the nation and beyond the nation to the confederation of nations. This vision formed history's guide.

Tribute to the Memory of John F. Kennedy

Speech given on 25 November 1963

One of the most enlightened, the most noble, the most generous men who has presided over American politics from Independence to the present day, one of the most brilliant, the most courageous, the most rich in creativity and energy who has ever been called to play a leading role on the world political stage, one of the most noble and exemplary spirits whose existence has honoured and ennobled the human race, John Kennedy, the young President of the United States of American, universally loved, is dead, tragically assassinated in his country whilst carrying out his presidential duties.

Today, his immense shadow lies over the entire civilised world and time can never reduce or remove it.

During his three years as President, his name was linked with critical events. He has already entered history as the President of the 'new frontier', in other words as spokesman for a political conception and governmental practice aimed at consolidating and defending liberty and democracy on American territory, through the enrichment and development of these principles and ideas and through an all-out and merciless fight against any threat to life and growth. These threats included misery, ignorance, illness, discrimination and social injustice. The 'new frontier' was a return and an appeal to the spirit of loyalty, courage, coherence and virility which had characterised the period of American expansion and provided it with the moral principles needed to ensure its development through liberty, equality and order.

This was the spirit which inspired President Kennedy's internal policy, a Christian and liberal policy in the highest sense of the word, a policy which knew nothing of hesitation, respite or internal compromise. President Kennedy was convinced that 'a man must always do his duty and this principle is the basis of all human morality'. Not only through his Civil Rights Bill, but also through his radical, academic, economic and social policy, he constantly sought to provide the liberal and democratic institutions with new and deeper values.

The spirit of the 'new frontier' did not only inspire internal policy, but also, even perhaps above all, American foreign policy during the last three years. It is for this reason that the tragic death of President Kennedy afflicts not only the soul of the American people, but also that of all the citizens of the free world and the whole of civilised humanity.

President Kennedy entered history as an intrepid champion of the freedom of the people of the West and a promoter of a massive task of détente and conciliation. During this task he had to work in a particularly difficult international political situation full of unknown quantities which, at the time of the Cuban Crisis, led him to stretch his determination to the utmost in his role as defender of the principles and vital needs of the free world. Before this, his critics had not spared him, accusing him of not knowing how correctly to assess the forces which stood against the free world and of not proving as determined as his predecessors in the face of the insidious and unscrupulous policies of the enemy. But when, thirteen months ago, the free world was faced with immediate threat, he did not hesitate to crush it, taking personal responsibility for the methods used. This demonstrated that there were limits to democratic tolerance, limits never to be overstepped without the risk of world war.

I do not know whether President Kennedy's attitude to the Cuban crisis led to his tragic end. It is, however, certain that it was this attitude which was the departure point for a new phase of international politics, a phase during which the moral force of the West blossomed and – as a result of the agreement, even partial, on nuclear testing – humanity has caught sight of a new glimmer of light, strengthening the common hope for a less uncertain and more enlightened future.

This is an aspect of President Kennedy's policy which I would like to mention more specifically. Those of us who live and work in this part of Europe, who are doing our best – regardless of all adversity – to consolidate and extend the degree of unity we have already attained, also remember President Kennedy as a man who promoted, with as much authority as tenacity, the ideal of European unity. This, far from being an end in itself, would be a tool to strengthen the solidarity of nations on both sides of the Atlantic and a departure point for total union of the free world, invigorated by a peace 'in which people live together with mutual respect and work together with mutual consideration'.

In his historic speech in Philadelphia on 4 July 1962, President Kennedy asked for a closer relationship between America and Europe, a first step towards achieving the magnanimous ideal of a great association of Atlantic nations. Using strong and noble words, he urged the Europeans 'to construct their new house with creativity and resolution'. At the same time, he urged the Americans to think no longer in continental terms but in intercontinental terms. 'It is only by becoming united', he declared 'that we can contribute to the achievement of a world based on law and free choice, banishing war and coercion'.

Not only America, but the entire free world and all human beings who want finally to drop anchor in a peaceful harbour have an interest – he said – in the constitution of a united Europe. This united Europe, connected with America by strong and indestructible links, would become an incalculable source of energy and progress.

The main ideas and concepts of the Philadelphia speech were taken up again and amplified in the speech, no less great and no less memorable, given by President Kennedy at the Paulskirche in Frankfurt on 25 June. He once again pointed out, over and above the profound common interest of the free world, the historic need to create a permanently united Europe which would form a permanent part of an Atlantic association composed of independent States, equally sharing responsibility and decision and equally united in the duty of defence and the art of peace.

This is not a vain dream. This association could be realised he said 'by making concrete efforts to resolve the problems we are all facing: military, economic and political. Association is not an attitude but a process. It is a continuing process which becomes confirmed from year to year, as we resolve our common problems'.

Whilst reaffirming the absolute necessity of solidarity between the United States and Europe, President Kennedy was no less in favour of an extended dialogue with the Soviet world. But he expressly said 'We are asking those who consider themselves our enemies to understand that in our relationships with them, we will not exchange the interests of one nation for those of another and that our fervour for the cause of freedom is common to all'. Far from underestimating them, he sincerely recognised that 'the obstacles to hope are great and threatening'. And he concluded with these words 'The objective of peace in the world must, both today and tomorrow, lie within

our decisions and inspire our intentions..... We are all idealists, we are all dreamers. Let it not be said of this Atlantic generation that it left ideals and dreams to its elders and strength of thought and decision-making to its enemies’.

During my recent official visit to the United States, in my capacity as President of this Parliament, I saw direct and precious evidence of President Kennedy's desire to help us form a united Europe, to join in our fight against the reversals and prevarication of a sterile and disunited past, his desire to join us in finding the most suitable tools to overcome our dissension, which he hoped would be temporary and of little importance. He asked to be kept informed of all the most urgent and serious problems faced by the Community and he expressly confirmed, during our meeting, his full solidarity with the work of the European Parliament.

With the death of President Kennedy, the European cause has lost a great friend and ally. In paying our last emotive respects to his memory, at a time when the American people are paying their last homage to their President, I believe that we must commit ourselves to guarding his message closely. We must continue along the road he helped to open up and which he several times referred to as the only way to protect human freedom and dignity, the only ideals worthy of life, for ourselves and our children.

Community and Democracy

Speech given on 21 October 1964

I shall only say a few words in response to the statements just made by Mr. de Lipkowski, in the hope of bringing a note of tranquillity into the debate which followed the reading of the French government's communiqué. Although, like Mr. Pleven and Mr. Dehousse, I am not pleased at the idea that Europe should resort to an *ultimatum* in order to ensure respect for the Treaties, Mr. de Lipkowski is right in saying that the agricultural policy is one of the instruments which was planned in Messina (and subsequently included in Treaties of Rome) in view of European economic construction. I would go further. It is one of the instruments which in the long term will help attain the true objective of the Rome Treaties and the aim of all our efforts. I am speaking of European political unification. But I must add that this is not only true of the common agricultural policy, but also, without exception, of all the other chapters of the Treaties of Rome. These Treaties form a coherent whole and are the result of a long period of study, which was precisely aimed at ensuring that they would one day lead to the political and economic unification of Europe.

I do not agree with Mr. M. Spaak – who was himself one of the authors, even the principal author of the Treaties of Rome (we should remember that Mr. Spaak was the President of the Committee of Experts which sat so long in Val Duchesse) – when he says that the authors of the Treaties of Rome made the mistake of trusting in ‘historical fatalism’ to move the unification process from the economic to the political level. This is not so. It is true that we considered European economic unification to be a means of attaining genuine European political union in the long term, not by relying on historical fatalism but by relying upon respect for and full application of the Treaties of Rome. Some of the exclusively political provisions were included specifically to ease the transition of the unification process from the economic to the political level.

I would cite, for example, Article 9 of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community which relates to the European University. This would be the essential method of awakening and spreading the European awareness which is so essential to a federal Europe, a Europe united on a political level.

It is senseless to believe that Europe can be constructed solely through the will of governments or leading figures. It must be constructed through the will of the people. If the people do not participate, European political unification will always remain a pipe dream, a utopia. With regard to Article 138 of the Treaty establishing the E.E.C. – which was targeted by Mr. de Lipkowski yesterday, an Article which made provision for the election of the parliamentary assembly by direct universal suffrage, the reason for its inclusion was not a concern for ‘perfectionism’, as Mr. de Lipkowski has said, but as an instrument designed to ensure that the people participated directly in the process of European construction.

How could a politically unified Europe be constructed without the accord of the peoples' awareness? This is why election by direct universal suffrage forms one of the main instruments for the construction of European political unification.

What about the other provisions on the choice of a single headquarters for the Communities, symbolising the capital of the future single European State, or the Communities' financial and budgetary independence? What about all the provisions which have still not been applied for the simple reason that the governments do not wish to apply them?

I have no intention of accusing one or other of the governments of the Community member countries. I am simply wondering whether they should examine their consciences as to whether their country's government has any responsibility for the non-application of any of the provisions of the Treaties of Rome.

Mr. President, I believe that we must all specifically stress this point. When I had the honour of being President of this high assembly, I always stated, at meetings I attended in that capacity with the political leaders and governments of the Community member countries, that they should accept all possible and imaginable measures for establishing political cooperation between them, this being a precious instrument for European construction. The old Fouchet plan, the new Spaak plan and many other projects for European political union are all aimed at this essential cooperation. There is, however, one condition. This is that they do not confine the unification process, at the stage of integration, to cooperation between sovereign states, that they do not, as the President of the High Authority has just said, step back from the present unification process.

For us, this is a source of permanent concern. We fear that such hesitation which – as Mr. de Lipkowski said yesterday – should not influence the application of the Treaties of Rome, does in fact exist amongst those in power. We fear that this is why certain provisions have not been applied and why some governments are obstinately refusing, under the Fouchet plan, to apply in full the provisions of the Treaties of Rome.

Perhaps, Mr. de Lipkowski, this hesitation is a precise expression of the intention to move from the integration unification process to one of cooperation between sovereign states.

Cooperation between sovereign states will, however, never constitute European unification.

European unity presupposes full and final renunciation of the myth of national sovereignty.

This is why I consider that, without taking offence at the French government's present declaration, the European Parliament should place itself above individual conflict and express a fully unanimous opinion, namely that all the provisions of the Treaties of Rome should be applied (and that it is the duty of all the governments to ensure that none of them is forgotten or omitted). This full application lies at the very origin of the effective construction of Europe.

It is our duty and the duty of all those who believe in the future of Europe and appeal for political and economic union, to call upon the governments of the various countries to accept this commitment.

The Messina Conference and European Political Union

Speech given on 19 January 1965

In anticipation of future European unification, I believe the time has come for us to look again at some of the fundamental and essential principles that lay behind its conception. I would like to talk of the Messina Conference agreements and the drafting of the Treaties of Rome.

I believe that this is essential, even though, as agreed, the so-called technical aspects will be reserved for the broader and deeper discussion which will be held during the March session.

At the time it seemed that the two new Communities planned during the Messina Conference should not be established on either a purely economic or a purely political level. In becoming economically united or attempting to become so as a result of these Treaties, Europe is in any event carrying out an eminently political action through cause and effect. It seemed obvious that this action would have to be judged in its historical context, in other words in relation to the results achieved so far by the search, immediately after the war, for unity by a given part of the continent. Although the attempt at political unification remained unproductive, economic cooperation, through the Coal and Steel Community, was constructive and fruitful. This is why Europe was overcome by scepticism and disappointment after the French government rejected the brave and liberal notion of a European Defence Community during the summer of 1954. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of our six countries, who met at the Messina Conference, realised that new unification instruments were needed to concentrate on enlarging economic unification which had had more beneficial results. This was, however, not sufficient reason for slowing or ceasing to continue our efforts towards the common aim, which was full European political and economic unity. We planned economic unity not as an end in itself, but as a means provided by the specific historic political context at the time to make progress in the dual political and economic process of European integration. Numerous provisions of an exclusively political nature were included in the Treaties of Rome in order to allow the Communities to develop politically as well as economically or to accelerate the transition from the economic to the political level.

Another essential principle of the Messina agreements related to the open nature of the new Communities. All those who discussed the general lines of the agreements for so long and then drafted the Treaties during two years of hard work, were agreed and firmly convinced that the new European Community, once an institutional reality, could not survive and progress if it were to remain isolated. In their opinion, the smaller area of Europe could not remain isolated, either from the wider area of Europe or the Atlantic Alliance, nor could it remain isolated from that part of Africa where it had instigated movement towards progress. This is why the Messina Conference's final communiqué contained a formal invitation to the British and a clear expression of the hope that they would accede to the Communities born of these Treaties and why provision was also made for the association of overseas countries and territories. There is no doubt that the two new Communities instituted by the Treaties of Rome would only be established as open Communities.

A third principle confirmed at Messina related to the actual nature of the two new Communities, named and defined simultaneously as the Common Market. I would like to stress the point that the Common Market was designed and conceived as a great act of faith in freedom as an ideal

and as a way of life. All in all, the aim of the Common Market was that it would form a responsible, courageous and farsighted structure, seeking to establish mechanisms for improved standards of living and increased well-being throughout the modern world.

These are the main principles which lay behind the Treaties signed at the Capitol in Rome on 25 March 1957.

Nearly eight years after this formal ceremony and just over seven years after the Treaties entered into force, this initiative, undertaken during one of the most dramatic and anguished periods of European post-war history, has become one of the most admired of Europe's achievements during its thousands of years of history. On an economic level, the Common Market has progressed at a powerful, surprising and miraculous rate, mainly as a result also of intelligent work by the executives. Seen from outside, the European Community represents what some would define as 'a top level world economic power' or even 'the world's leading economic structure'. The integration of the national economies of the six countries within a single market has acted as a 'multiplier' of the former economies and has given rise to a completely new and different structure which cannot be compared with the sum of its parts. Nowadays, the Common Market accounts for approximately a third of world trade, the same percentage as the United States of America. Its foreign trade growth rate is, however, higher than that of the United States.

The Common Market has therefore proved that it is in fact the innovative and revolutionary instrument planned by its authors and drafters. Despite all the delays, all the shortcomings, all the errors which have marked and are still marking the unification process, we owe to the Common Market the beginnings of the unity we have achieved after so many centuries of conflict and war. If our initiative had failed, the issue of our political unity would not now have arisen.

It must therefore be acknowledged that economic unity has not so far been without repercussions in the political sphere. The very existence of the Economic Community represents a political force. Neither should we underestimate certain political implications resulting from the adoption of some of the Treaties' provisions.

It must, however, be added that the indirect political results so far obtained are wholly inadequate. In the face of the Community's huge and continuous economic growth, the basis for political unity has become increasingly narrow, increasingly tenuous and increasingly fragile.

I have already said that economic unity was considered from the outcome as an instrument at the service of political unification. This is shown by the essentially political provisions contained in the Treaties, such as the provisions relating to the European Parliament, the European University, the single headquarters, Community budgetary and financial autonomy, the common commercial policy and the development of the institutional machinery.

Nothing should have prevented the acceleration of the economic unification process from being accompanied by a corresponding acceleration in the political unification process. Unfortunately this has not been so. On a purely political level, the Community has made very little progress.

The lack of proportion between its economic dimensions and its political dimensions is the cause of its present serious imbalance.

It is currently said that European economic unity is a fact which is now irreversible. We shall examine this idea.

The thought does in fact leave us perplexed. It is not true to say that the process of economic unification is safe from the risk of decline and collapse. We should remember what happened in January 1962 when the transition to the second stage of the Common Market transition period was marked by such serious and dramatic disputes that it was feared that its end was imminent. These disputes, as is known, were above all of a political nature. Then there was the experience of January of the following year, when the negotiations for Great Britain's entry into the Common Market broke down, again also for solely political reasons. This resulted in a crisis which affected the entire integration process and, despite appearances to the contrary, this crisis is in fact continuing to disrupt and disable Community life and policy. Lastly, we should remember the dramatic disputes which arose over the common agricultural policy, new instances of which took place a few weeks ago, before decisions could be reached on cereal prices alone.

Whilst defects remain in political unity, the integrated economy will remain subject to the direction and instruction of national policy. In the best possible hypothesis, the European Community will survive, or rather, as has already been predicted, get by with much difficulty, hanging on to the positions it has attained and taking care not to let go of the results it has achieved, without impetus, without vitality, without drive. Under these conditions, it would be disastrous if the dominance of those who hold the technical levers of the Common Market, the feared dominance of the technocrats, were to be strengthened and extended. It would also be disastrous if the national economic systems, self-sufficient and feudal, turned in upon themselves, without strength or spirit, were to be reproduced on a much larger scale and a far higher level

We can return here to the fundamental principle which I have just mentioned, which inspired the concept of the Common Market as the economic route to political unity. It is an illusion to believe that this objective can be left to the passive effect of events. On the contrary, it is absolutely essential to take political action, in the form of a linear, clear and decided will. All those who form part of the government of Europe are now agreed upon this point and the European Parliament has also clearly set out its position on this subject on several occasions.

Everyone has, on numerous occasions, agreed the need to form political Europe. But if we glimpse behind the veil of simple formal declarations, if we go deeply into the thought of the present eminent leaders of Europe, we realise that clearly divergent political situations and considerations exist with respect to the best method and timetable for reaching European political unification. On the one hand, there are those who want only an extrinsically unified Europe, leaving most of the power to the various countries which form it. There are those, on the other hand, who want an intrinsically united Europe, leaving the minimum level of power to the various countries.

I believe that even though we are delaying a deeper and more detailed discussion of these subjects until the March session, it is important to give an opinion now on certain fundamental principles underlying this dispute. A European Confederation or a Federation of the United States of Europe? Towards which of these two objectives should we be leaning? What is our proposed final objective?

This is not a marginal question. It relates to a fundamental difference, on both a legal and a political level. Jurists teach us that the difference between federation and confederation relates to the 'principle of sovereignty'. A federation is a unification of States upon which is superimposed a new State, arising from the transfer and merger of part of the powers of the various federated States but with autonomous sovereign power. Against this, a confederation is a simple gathering of States. It does not lead to the formation of a new power but to a juxtaposition of States, each of which retains its own sovereignty in full. History reveals that confederations have been neither dynamic nor productive and that they have never been able to withstand the shock of opposing forces, whether internal or external.

If we now examine confederation and federation from a political angle, we see that the first is the result of a 'contingent convergence of interests between independent and sovereign states amongst which a State or a group of States occupies a position of hegemony in connection with the others' and that it is only the second which achieves real equality between the States which comprise it and is in a position to pursue a policy which is on the one hand an expression of the policies of the various Member States and on the other an expression of the higher federal power. Consequently, whereas the federation is essentially democratic in terms of content and characteristics, the same cannot be said of a confederation.

Those in favour of confederation have often mentioned the current situation of the national States. They have commented that Europe's historical weft is at present still woven with national threads. This is to accept appearance rather than substance. It amounts to a refusal to look beyond the present limited horizon. The national States are all declining for the very reason that the historical function which lay behind their origin and their growth is gradually disappearing. Political and economic life can now no longer be restricted to the limited areas of national territories. It is increasingly requiring an extension to great continental areas.

This is not all. In upholding united Europe, we are above all upholding a Europe which is united, far more than politically but on a spiritual and ethical level, a Europe which is governed in full by liberal and democratic institutions, a Europe which is capable of gradually growing and extending, moving from its present borders to those of the whole of free Europe, as far as the extreme limits of the frontiers erected in defiance of the law by the opposing forces, a Europe which is always open to those to aspire to become part of it by accepting the principles upon which it is built. But our concept does not end there. This Europe, uniting all the free countries which form part of it, will, in conjunction with the United States of America, form the strongest links within the vast Community of the free West. The great free Europe which we have just outlined is destined to be the second pillar of this Community, alongside the United States of America, which is at present the sole pillar, sharing all the rights, all the obligations and all the responsibilities on a truly equal footing.

This is, therefore, our ideal political route. If we wish to subscribe to the idea of a confederation, the route will be cut off. Europe would be united only partially, fictitiously and incidentally. We would inevitably end with a Europe which would comprise, perhaps even against the intentions of some of those who are suggesting and desiring it, a group of dominant countries – the strongest and the richest – and a group of dominated countries – the weakest and poorest. This Europe would remain closed within its present borders and Great Britain, as well as other countries which are not yet members, would have little or no possibility of accession. In the final analysis, this would undoubtedly be a Europe which would close ranks against the United States of America.

In my opinion, this is the nub of the issue. Confederated Europe would become the third power, measured on a continental basis, in comparison with the two great powers which are confronting one another today and against which it would also stand opposed.

This is precisely why we are openly revealing our disagreement, because we consider that the present small Europe and the future great Europe, which is what we want, should not be considered to be ends in themselves, but as milestones along a unique process, whose final stage will be the appearance of a far vaster and more complete form of solidarity between the free and Christian nations of the West.

This is not a utopian vision, but a political project which corresponds in full with the broad guidelines of American politics.

The American ruling class has always been very sympathetic to the cause of European unity and has shown great interest. We should remember that the first inkling of European unity was formed around the Marshall Plan. We should remember the statements made by eminent people in American public life since the end of the war. The famous words of Dean Acheson, when he said that Europe attracted America by its unity but repulsed it by its divisions, is particularly revealing of the attitude held by American politics regarding the process of European unification. However, the creation and phenomenal development of the Common Market raised an urgent question for America concerning the definition of its relationship with Europe, which would no longer be the traditional relationship but would exist in the form of an intrinsic and permanent economic and political union.

The foundations of this new policy of interdependence between the United States of America and united Europe were laid in 1962 by the late President Kennedy. On the 4 July 1963, on the occasion of the 186th anniversary of the United States' Declaration of Independence, he gave the famous speech on independence, which is without any doubt one of the greatest, most noble and most courageous speeches on foreign policy in history. 'Building the Atlantic partnership', he declared in particular, 'will not be easily and cheaply finished. But I will say, here and now, on this Day of Independence, that the United States will be ready for a Declaration of Interdependence, that we will be prepared to discuss with a united Europe the ways and means of forming a concrete Atlantic partnership, a mutually beneficial partnership between the new union now emerging in Europe and the old American Union founded here 175 years ago'.

I believe that the primary, indomitable condition for achieving this great and high-principled project, which is based on spiritual and ethical rather than political considerations, is the creation of a concrete, solid European union, in other words the creation of a United States of Europe.

It is obvious that the notion of a confederated Europe which would become the world's third political force would go against this. If this should unfortunately happen, the 'Kennedy line' will fail, American isolationist forces would regain strength and Europe would remain alone, sustained only by its vain and futile prestige.

Although the concept of a confederated Europe must be rejected, there is no need to accept the thesis advanced by those who would prefer the European Community to take no action at all until the historical and political situation allows it to continue on its route towards greater and fuller unity. It is essential and urgent that something is done to initiate European political union, no matter how cautiously and hesitantly. We cannot wait any longer without jeopardising the current unification process and undermining all the effort which has so arduously been made so far. Even at the Paris Congress in 1900, the gradual construction of a United States of Europe was envisaged. Even at that time, there was a proposal for cooperation between the sovereign States so that the people could 'become accustomed to working together'. The forms of political cooperation contained in the various initiatives and proposals would seem to concur, but on one condition. The process of unification should not involve any regression from integration to cooperation and the political provisions of the Treaties should be applied in full. This is the thesis which I have championed for years and which I have stressed on every possible occasion, particularly since the crisis of January 1963 and particularly during the period when I was President of the European Parliament.

I cannot see why only the economic provisions of the Treaties should be applied, leaving the political provisions as a dead letter.

In my opinion, the failure to apply these provisions is the reason for the Community's political paralysis. The Community has developed in a way which is not in line with the plans and desires of those who drafted the Treaties of Rome. Its economic growth rate has exceeded expectations but on a political level it is still at the starting point. The result is a fragile structure which threatens to topple at any moment under the pressure of intermittent attacks of adversity. Against this, harmonious development on both an economic and political level would have guaranteed the stability and strength of the integration process. Above all, it would have encouraged its rapid movement towards the final aim.

This is why that I consider that it is essential, in order to prevent the unification process regressing from integration to simple cooperation between sovereign States, to apply correctly all the provisions of the existing Treaties, including those which are exclusively political.

What does 'apply the Treaties' eminent political provisions' mean exactly?

It first and even foremost means that it is time to merge the Community executives as a first step towards merging the Communities themselves.

Application of the Treaties' political provisions also means finally giving the Community a single headquarters and ensuring that there are no further delays in establishing the European University. These two aspects, the Community headquarters and the University, could appear to be secondary but this is not so. They are also of great political importance. Meetings of the Community institutions at one and the same place and the opening, after a long period of waiting, of the doors of the European University, would express the European people's concrete will for union and symbolise the convergence of all our efforts to attain the objectives of unification.

Precise application of the Treaties therefore above all means amending the present system of electing the European Parliament. I have said 'above all' because once we have won the battle for the Assembly, we shall have achieved a great step forward on the road to political unity. The European parliamentary assembly was planned in Messina as the driving force of political activity, as the very heart of the European Community. It should have inspired Community action through the direct will of the European people. I still feel honoured to have fought for the creation of a true European parliament with all my strength, modest as it is, during the agonising and exhausting stage of drafting the Treaties.

Since it was absolutely impossible to have the Parliament elected immediately by direct universal suffrage, I insistently proposed that a specific date should be set for the replacement of the system of indirect election by the more democratic system of direct election, which would be more responsive to the requirements of the Community's political development. My proposal went unheard. The compromise was the insertion of the paragraph providing the Assembly with the power to draft proposals for the election of its own members by the system of direct universal suffrage. But the proposal put forward in June 1960 by the European parliamentary assembly has still not even been considered by the Community institutions concerned.

The political aspects of the European Parliament do not, however, relate solely to the method of election, even though it is unquestionable that only direct universal suffrage, as furthermore noted by Mme. de Staël in her time, can link the European people closely with their Community institutions. There is no doubt that without direct popular participation the European Community would be deprived of its principal means of support. A second political aspect concerns the European Parliament's powers. As it stands, these are confined with such modest and narrow limits that it is unable to carry out the functions common to all true parliaments. Certain issues concerning the Community are at present beyond any political control, since the jurisdiction of the national parliaments has been lost without having been replaced by that of the European parliament. This has led to the appearance of uncontrollable and uncontrolled authorities which are incompatible with democratic and liberal institutions and with the rule of law and are constantly criticised both here and abroad.

Two years ago, speaking in my capacity as President of this Assembly, I deplored and condemned the fact that the executive institutions could take fundamental decisions on extremely important matters, such as the common agricultural policy for example, without any possibility of control and comment by the European Parliament or the national parliaments.

Personally, I am convinced that changes to the system for the electing members of the Assembly and their effective exercise of all the powers to which they are entitled, would form a significant

contribution to the process of political unification. I would certainly not underestimate the difficulties to be overcome in this respect. But the time has come to make a choice. We either reject and wipe out everything which has been achieved over the last seven years or accept the ideals and reasons for European political construction, with all the resulting consequences.

We are now faced with the need to take a final decision. We cannot evade or postpone it any longer. The governments of our six countries must make this historic choice, in the light of the threats facing us and in the interests of all those who live in this part of the continent.

I hope that the present view of Europe will help, stimulate and encourage them to carry out their duty. The governments are suffering from doubt and hesitation and are having difficulty reaching agreement on the road to concrete unity, but Europe is continuing to construct itself in various lesser or greater ways. There is a tightly knit canvas of common interests, which intermingle, which intersect, which merge, a multitude of initiatives on interesting subjects and issues, carried out not only by a particular country but by nearly all of Europe. There are cultural and tourist exchanges which find expression in the crowds of young people, many of whom visit and show wide interest in the work of our Assembly, who cross the land of this old continent in all directions and are gradually becoming conscious of its unity

In this way the message of European unity is transmitted by both visible and invisible routes, reaching out to and winning over an ever increasing number of people and increasing the number of those who believe in European unity, men and women who are so aptly called the citizens of Europe.

This can and must give our movement increasing momentum, raising faith and hope in our hearts in the dawn of the new united Europe, a Europe which will ensure the well-being and future of its children, a Europe capable of asserting its will amongst the world powers in the service of freedom, peace and justice.

The Community and the powers of the European Parliament

Speech given on 25 March 1965

Mister Chairman,

In your speech of last Monday, you pointed out that, by May, fifteen years will have elapsed since Mr. Robert Schuman issued the declaration which gave rise to the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community. I would like to point out that a few weeks later we will be celebrating another anniversary. It will be the tenth anniversary of the Messina Conference, during which agreement was reached and the foundations laid for the Treaties signed at the Capitol in Rome in 1957.

I have previously drawn this Assembly's attention and would like to do so again, to one of the fundamental principles of the Messina Conference, namely that economic construction was neither more nor less than the means and the instrument intended to lead Europe to political unification.

Taking this fact into account, I consider it utterly impossible to consider present development to be exclusively economic, as was unfortunately indicated in the otherwise remarkable speech by the President of the Council of Ministers this morning. 'It will be impossible later on to make progress with Europe's economic development without carrying out its political unification'. These words are not mine, but those of General de Gaulle, President of the French Republic. I think he is completely right and that Mr. Dehousse is wrong in considering that we have already passed what he calls 'the point of no return'. There is no point of no return in this sphere and nothing is irreversible.

To limit European construction solely to the economic sphere would be to condemn it to inevitable disintegration, like the idol with feet of clay. Up until December of last year we witnessed numerous examples of difficulties due to the absence of a of a centralised political authority, a Community political authority through which we could overcome the periodic crises which affect our Community.

It is for this reason that we are basing so much hope on the Conference to be held in Venice on 10 May. We very much regret that Mr. Couve de Murville, who stood aside from his capacity as French Minister of Foreign Affairs in order to speak only as President of the Council of Ministers, said nothing to raise our hopes and increase our confidence. Some days ago, we read in the French newspaper *Le Monde*, which is generally well informed, that the French government was the only one which had not yet specifically acceded to the Italian government's initiative in organising the May conference. We would have welcomed, with pleasure and gratitude, a word of comfort from the President of the Council of Ministers in his capacity as French Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In order to respect the limits set by our Parliament's President, I shall confine my speech to a few thoughts regarding the Parliament's powers.

Mr. Couve de Murville said this morning that certain proposals by the governments of the Community's member countries had already been adopted, whereas others had not been accepted as a result of lack of unanimity. In this respect, we would very much like to know which proposals were accepted and which items were accepted by the Council of Ministers from the proposals made by the Italian, Belgian, Dutch and German governments. This is particularly necessary in view of the fact that Mr. Luns, the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs, in a speech to the Council of Ministers on 1 December informed us that the Council of Ministers had so far not wished to accept the proposals put forward and had simply requested the Permanent Representatives Committee to study the issue. In this speech, which was widely distributed in the four languages, Mr. Luns criticised his colleagues for opposing an increase in the Parliament's powers on the pretext that it is not yet elected by direct universal suffrage, whilst at the same time also opposing its election by direct universal suffrage as a result of the fact that its powers are insufficient. Mr. Luns thus revealed the vicious circle surrounding us, which we must escape at any price.

Have things changed since 1 December? It appears not. Just a few days ago, after meeting General de Gaulle, our Parliament's President Duvieusart told the press that he had pleaded the European Parliament's cause in vain during his meetings with the President of the French Republic and French government ministers.

What worries me most is not so much the refusal to increase the Parliament's powers in accordance with the provisions of the Treaties of Rome but the proposal to reduce them. This cannot be wholly attributed – I agree with Mr. Vendroux on this point – to the French government, which does not deserve to be considered the only bad influence on the European Community. The governments of all the member countries – and we must have the courage to acknowledge this – have always been unanimously in favour of reducing the powers provided for the European Parliament by the Treaties of Rome. We need only remember, for example, that certain procedural issues do not require unanimity because the Treaties make provision for their acceptance by a simple majority. Yet we cannot manage to obtain a simple majority to satisfy the *desiderata* of the European Parliament.

As far as legislation is concerned, is it true that under the Treaties of Rome, the Parliament is a consultative body, as in the definition that the Council of Ministers insist upon giving it? Not at all. The Treaties of Rome conferred legislative power on a closely cooperating triumvirate. Firstly the Commission, with its right of initiative, secondly the Parliament with its right of consultation, and thirdly the Council with its right of decision. These three aspects are essential for any legislative activity. One only has to consider the composition of the Parliament and the public nature of its debates and its deliberations to realise that it cannot be considered to be a purely consultative body.

What happens in reality? This morning the President in Office listed the numerous regulations which had been adopted by the Council of Ministers. These are important regulations relating to very important matters of (competition rules, the free movement of workers, the price of cereals, etc.) They represent genuine laws which are immediately applicable in all the Community countries. As it stands, the Council of Ministers has often asked the Parliament's opinion before examining the Commission's proposal and has then negotiated directly with the Commission in view of amending the original text. As a result, in some of the cases I have just mentioned, the proposal finally adopted by the Council of Ministers has been completely different from the one previously submitted for the Parliament's opinion.

I am not saying that when secondary issues are involved, the Council cannot make amendments to a proposal already examined by the Parliament. But if this proposal is amended intensively, should it not be the Council's duty to ask the Assembly's opinion again? If not, surely the triumvirate I have just described would be deprived of one of its essential components? Has the Council of Ministers disagreed on this subject or should it be considered that the Ministers of the six member countries have always agreed upon the adoption of a procedure which undermines the Parliament's rights and which, in the final analysis, goes against the provisions of the Treaty of Rome itself?

Still more important is the issue relating to financial and budgetary control. I can understand the annoyance which must be felt by a President of the Council of Ministers if he has to listen to the same thing several times during a single day. I would, nevertheless, like to say that the statements made by the various speakers deserve to be taken seriously. It is impossible to envisage a democratic regime in which the executive's policy is not subject to financial control.

The truth is that the national parliaments have relinquished this control and it has not yet been taken over by the European Parliament. Mr. Couve de Murville has told us that when the Communities are merged, the issue of financial control will be examined, particularly with regard to financing the common agricultural policy. Mr President, it will now take almost three years to move from the merger of the executives to that of the Communities. In the meantime, is it possible to consider that the procedure can go on as at present?

Finally, there is the issue of the association of third countries, in other words the interpretation of Article 238. I shall not repeat the reasons, which seem to us to be clear and obvious, which justify the European Parliament's interpretation, an interpretation which is different from that of the Council. I shall however point out that in October 1963, when I was President of this Parliament, I wrote a letter to the President of the Community's Council of Ministers, requesting that direct negotiations be initiated on the interpretation of this provision of the Treaty of Rome and saying that if these negotiations do not lead to joint agreement, the interpretation should be referred to the Court of Justice of the Communities. The President of the Council of Ministers at the time came here, during the following November, and assured us that he had taken up the Parliament's cause before the Council of Ministers, adding that he had unfortunately not had time to study my letter. Many months have, however, now passed since October 1963 and I would have thought that the Council would have had time to read and reply to the letter from the President of the European Parliament.

I shall conclude now, because I have already far exceeded the time allowed. We obviously approve Mr. Couve de Murville's appeal to the national parliaments to ratify the Treaty amending the Treaties of Rome as soon as possible, particularly in view of the fact that we realise that this would be a good time to bring forward some rules to strengthen the Parliament's powers. We regret that it is not possible to do so on this occasion. We believe that the merger could represent a further step towards unity and we shall endeavour to carry it out as soon as possible.

In order, however, that we can consider the merger of the executives to represent progress rather than regression, despite the reduction in the European Parliament's powers which it would involve, the Council of Ministers should give us some form of assurance. This could be done by

means of a Protocol or, failing this, a Declaration of Intent attached to the Treaty amending the Treaties of Rome.

At the end of his speech, Mr. Couve de Murville told us this morning that the progress made during the past year should give us courage to face the future. I am convinced that there is no doubt of this. I also feel, however, that we should take advantage of the encouragement given by last year's progress by working to overcoming the numerous problems which lie ahead of us.

The European Parliament's Budgetary Powers

Speech made on 11 May 1965

Firstly, I would also like on behalf of the Liberal Group to compliment Mr. Vals on his excellent report and introductory speech.

Mr. Vals has laid emphasis – correctly, in my opinion – on the political aspect of the proposal by the Commission of the European Economic Community, an aspect to which the Assembly should pay special attention. The Assembly's Political Affairs Committee pointed this out when claiming the fundamental power to deal with the matter. Admittedly, it does not intend to raise objections or express disappointment regarding the Bureau's decisions, still less regarding the decision by its eminent President. It would simply like to examine the political nature of the issue before us since this is the reason it has automatically been referred to the Parliament's Political Affairs Committee.

We are in fact faced here with the application of one of the provisions of the Treaties of Rome, a provision which was drafted specifically to allow the unification process to move beyond the purely economic level to a more political level. We are probably looking at one of the most important of these provisions – which include, as you know, the establishment of the Community's single headquarters, the foundation of the European University, the election of our Assembly by direct universal suffrage, and so on – and we should therefore handle it very carefully. It is for this reason that we are wary of any attempt to adjourn any decision on this subject until it has undergone further study although it does in fact merit this. Having said that, we are faced with a political provision which requires the Assembly to take a political decision and political decisions cannot be adjourned. The Liberal Group is unanimous on this point. It considers that the Assembly should reach a clear and explicit decision on this issue by the end of this debate.

We all know that the Commission's initiative has given rise to criticism, reservation and protest. Even this morning, a French newspaper which carries some weight said that given the French government's official position – and I believe I am quoting the text of the passage – the Commission's decision appears provocative. I am obviously not, either personally or officially, pleading on behalf of the Commission. The Commission can perfectly well defend itself. I would, however, like to take this opportunity of making a few comments on this criticism, reservation and protest.

The Commission has been accused of having exceeded its mandate. During its meeting of 15 December 1964, the Council of Ministers requested it to make proposals for replacing the States' direct contributions to the financing of the common agricultural policy by the Community's own resources and, more specifically, similar financing for other sectors where the Common Market is now operative. The Commission therefore tackled the more general issue of replacing national contributions by the Community's own resources, or to put it another way, the issue of the Community's financial and budgetary autonomy as provided under Article 201 of the Treaty instituting the Common Market, as well as the question of the Parliament's powers.

In raising the issue, however, I would like to know why it is not evident that we must study the meaning of Article 201 of the Treaty instituting the European Economic Community? Could the Commission have avoided this? As far as the Commission's work is concerned, Article 201 is mandatory. Whereas Article 201 leaves it to the Council to decide upon the provisions it will recommend the Member States to adopt, in accordance with their respective constitutional rules, it stipulates that the Commission must study the terms and present proposals to the Council. The Council 'can', the Commission 'must'. These provisions are therefore binding upon the work of the Commission and cannot be avoided. From the moment that the Council requested the Commission to examine how the Member States' contributions could be replaced by Community resources, it was obvious that it would also have to present proposals on points which arise in a more general manner from Article 201. Some have objected that the Commission had presented these points prematurely and that all that was needed at present was to make proposals for sectors where the common market was already operative, leaving the others to be presented subsequently, when the common market was operative in these other sectors. In fact, this is exactly what the Commission has done. It has in no way proposed the immediate introduction of the new system in sectors where the common market is not yet operative, but instead its introduction on 1 July 1967, perhaps hoping, more optimistically than the Council, that by that date the common market would be operative in all sectors, in other words not only in those of the agricultural economy, but also in those of the industrial economy.

Another criticism of the Commission is that it studied the issue of the Parliament's powers and presented proposals on this subject. Surely, however, the question of the Parliament's powers must be linked with the application of Article 201 of the Treaty instituting the European Economic Community. Is it not part of any democratic philosophy that, once the Community is autonomous on a financial and budgetary basis, the Assembly should have the power to exert control? Could the Commission have avoided this? Could it have closed its eyes to reality? This issue arises not only from the philosophy behind the Treaty, but also from the philosophy underlying the factors we are examining. Could the Commission have avoided taking into account the decision recently adopted by the second chamber of the Dutch parliament? Should it have buried its head in the sand like an ostrich?

The Commission has divided its proposals into three parts. On behalf of the Liberal Group, I have to say that we consider these three parts to be inseparable. They form a single and unique proposal, even though they are divided into three sections in the Commission's text for reasons of clarity. It is a unique, totally indivisible whole, and the Liberal Group is opposed to any attempt to divide it. The financing of the common agricultural policy by the Community's own resources, the financing of all the Community's activities by its own resources, the powers of the Parliament – all these notions form a single and indissoluble whole. *Simul stabunt, simul cadent* : we cannot approve one part and reject or adjourn another.

Speaking now from a personal point of view, I would like to commend the caution shown by the Commission. It has demonstrated a high level of wisdom and restraint in making graded proposals to allow the new system to be introduced gradually. I have to say (stressing the fact that this is an entirely personal assessment) that the Liberal Group is not unanimous on this point. Some of its members are far more uncompromising than I am. However, I believe that moderation forms part of the Treaties of Rome recommendations. These Treaties in fact made provision for a progressive and slow evolution of the unification process. They laid down a transitional period of twelve years which could potentially be increased to fifteen years precisely to avoid sudden disruption to the Member States' economies and to ease the introduction of a

new system which would obviously disturb the existing system. It seems to me, therefore, that in these proposals, the Commission is responding to the philosophy behind the Treaties. It appears to me to be indisputable that the Parliament's powers – which form the subject we are really examining here (a subject which has already been dealt with by the previous speakers and will be dealt with again by those who follow me) – that the Parliament's present powers are inadequate for dealing with its new obligations under the proposals made by the Commission of the European Economic Community. I consider them to be inadequate, not only with respect to the letter of the Treaties of Rome but also with respect to their interpretation.

With regard to the Parliament's powers, the Community has not interpreted the letter of the Treaties as required. It must be clearly and unambiguously stated that the Council of Ministers has shown a manifestly negative attitude in this respect. Furthermore, in his speech to the Council of Ministers on 2 December, Mr. Luns, one of its most authoritative members, criticised this negative attitude, this wrongful interpretation of the Treaties of Rome, when he said : 'We must say, in all honesty, that it is true that the Assembly has been consulted on numerous occasions, but that the advice it had expressed was never taken into account'.

As a result of its tendency to disregard the Parliament's advice and to limit consultation to its solely formal aspect, the Council of Ministers has clearly revealed its negative attitude to the Parliament's legislative function, a function which is fundamental to the future of the Community and the process of unification.

The Council of Ministers' negative attitude was again revealed when the Treaty merging the executives of the Communities was signed in Brussels on 8 April. This was an excellent opportunity to raise the issue of the Parliament's powers, but in fact by signing this Treaty, the representatives of the governments were in fact sanctioning a reduction in the Parliament's powers compared with those conferred under the Treaties in force.

In fact, modest though it was, the Committee of Presidents given responsibility by the Treaty of Paris for approving the Community institutions' budget was also a structure through which the Parliament could give its opinion and, better still, take part in collective decisions on budgetary matters. This Committee was, however, disbanded following the merger of the executives. The Council of Ministers would have therefore been justified in replacing it with another structure to enable the Parliament to undertake one of its most important obligations, namely making decisions regarding the budget. During the meeting held by the Chamber of Deputies' Committee of Foreign Affairs in Rome on 31 March, Mr. Fanfani, Minister of Foreign Affairs, promised, at the Commission's request (a request upon my initiative), that during the meeting of 8 April he would put forward the thesis that it was essential that signature of the Treaty be accompanied by a reform of the Parliament's powers. According to information in the press, Mr. Fanfani did in fact express this point of view before the Council of Ministers. He did so in a very restrained manner, simply requesting the governments of the six countries to issue a declaration of intent. When one remembers how many times these governments have publicly undertaken to study in detail the serious question of the Parliament's powers, it is impossible to understand why there was no response to this very restrained suggestion by the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs.

There is an attempt to explain it at present by saying that the six governments have agreed to put back the examination and solution of this important issue until the merger of the Communities. In my opinion, this is profoundly wrong, in that during the necessarily long period before the Communities are merged, the European Parliament would lack effective powers to work efficiently, even in the principal sphere of activity common to all parliaments, namely preparation of the Community institutions' budgets.

It is therefore essential that the Parliament's powers be extended immediately so that the collective will can act in the preparation of the budget and the Community's financial administration.

This issue is entirely separate from the issue of the European Parliament's derivation. You all know that I have fought endlessly for direct universal suffrage. However, as Mr. Vals correctly remarked a few minutes ago, the question of powers is independent of that of the Parliament's derivation. In my opinion, the issue has been intentionally distorted by confusing the two concepts. It is said that it is not possible to elect the Parliament by direct universal suffrage because it does not have sufficient powers, but it is also said that it is not possible to give the Parliament further powers because it is not elected by direct universal suffrage. Therefore when I proposed at Val Duchesse – as Mr. Hallstein will confirm, since he was present – that the European Parliament should be elected immediately by direct universal suffrage and when I subsequently insisted that at least a date should be set for the beginning of election by direct universal suffrage, this was certainly not in order to increase its powers. At that time, the idea of linking these two issues never crossed our minds. I fervently maintained that it was necessary to elect the Parliament by direct universal suffrage simply because I saw this as the only way of achieving effective participation by the collective will – in other words the popular will – in the process of European construction. It is senseless to think that Europe could be constructed on a political level solely through the will of the governments and plain and cold and reasons of State. Two attempts had already failed – the European Political Community and the European Defence Community – through lack of the popular inspiration which is such a significant aspect of political construction.

This is why I believe that the European Parliament should be elected by direct universal suffrage. This is why I have constantly said that it is one of the most urgent requirements for European construction, particularly its political construction. But to move from there to refusing to grant greater powers to the Parliament while it is still not elected by direct universal suffrage is an idea which I find quite frankly incomprehensible. Regardless of the derivation of the Parliament, whether by direct universal suffrage or indirect suffrage, as is the case with the present Assembly, it is essential that it is based on democracy, in other words, the will of the people.

It is obviously therefore entitled to the same powers as any other Parliament which expresses the will of the people. I would add that it is odd that it is precisely those who fight at every opportunity with so much determination – and, I have to say, so much success – against the appearance and establishment of a European technocracy, who, by so obstinately opposing giving the Parliament the necessary powers, have given rise to the appearance of technocratic centres in Brussels which have no democratic basis and which reject the most fundamental principles of the primacy of the law.

Is it really necessary to revise the Treaties of Rome to achieve effective parliamentary control? Is it not sufficient for the Council of Ministers to lay down a rule of procedure defining – in accordance with Article 203 – the procedure to be followed for the adoption of budgets or for the

Parliament' essential involvement? I don't know, but what I do know is that the reason the Parliament is insisting that an amendment to the Treaties should provide a method for its final approval of budget decisions is because the Council of Ministers has not so far had the political will to recognise that parliamentary involvement in the budget adoption procedure is essential. It is for this reason that we are under the obligation to propose amendments to the Treaties of Rome, although we are well aware of the disadvantages of this.

I consider that the timing of the initiative taken by the Commission of the European Economic Community should also be commended. It appeared at the very moment that the attempt to 'restart' European political union had failed and when the conference in Venice proposed by the Italian government had fallen through. This failure made a profound impression on all firm believers in Europe, because it revealed the need for far more time for true European economic and political construction, even though we had all constantly pointed out – the President of the French Republic being the first – the need to form new instruments for political union to shore up the present economic construction. 'In truth, we cannot guarantee Europe's economic development without political union', said General de Gaulle at the time.

Why then the refusal to attempt to find, in Venice, a formula for achieving political union of the peoples of Europe? When – as you will remember – Mr. Couve de Murville, the President of the Council of Ministers gave his report to this Assembly in March on the work of the Council during the previous year, I asked him whether the French government intended to support the Italian initiative concerning the conference in Venice and he replied that he was leaving on the following day for Rome to discuss this question with the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs. I was naive enough to believe that this meant that Mr. Couve de Murville was assuring me that the French government was in favour of this initiative. I was, however, taken in by his reply and did not interpret it in terms of the diplomatic reservation which habitually veils statements made by Ministers of Foreign Affairs. I therefore searched in the parliamentary debates where I discovered, to my great surprise, that it appeared in the following form, isolated moreover from the explicit question which I had raised: 'I must in fact return to Paris this evening because I am leaving tomorrow for a visit to the capital of the country of which Mr. Martino is a distinguished representative'.

The failure of the Italian proposal to hold a conference in Venice aroused concern, in that it appeared to confirm a very clear trend towards restricting the process of unification solely to the economic sphere. Despite General de Gaulle's words, which I have just quoted, it seems to me that the French government still sees it this way.

This is a serious error in that the unification process will be unable to continue in the long term if it is exclusively limited to the economic sphere. Without the appropriate political structures, it will end in collapse. It also seems strange to me to be that in order to survive, we must renounce our reason for survival. The final aim of the present process of unification is European political unity. Economic unity has never been considered as an end in itself but as a means of attaining political unity. True European unity is essential in that the national States are not and cannot claim to be in a position to face alone the dramatic problems of the modern world. They will be even less able to deal with the more serious problems which could confront humanity tomorrow.

Human awareness lies behind the fact that the entire world now aspires to unity. Attempts at unification are not confined to Europe. They are to be found elsewhere in the world, proving that humanity is realising that only large groups of nations, only States on a continental scale, are

in a position to resolve the immense problems of the present and the future. Unity is the only way of increasing freedom, guaranteeing world peace and realising the ideal of human fraternity, the oldest and most noble human ideal. This is, as very justly observed, the only way which will allow racial and spiritual bonding – *homonoia* or *concordia*.

Nationalism therefore cannot meet this ideal. Quite the reverse, it goes against this ideal of human fraternity because, as Benedetto Croce so aptly put it, nations are constantly trying to tear one another apart. This is why so much hope had been placed in the revival of political union offered by the Venice conference. This is why we thought that if it were impossible to create new political structures to accelerate the process of political union, we could take refuge in the haven provided by the current Treaties, which contain all the provisions needed to advance the unification process and move it from the economic to the political level.

We are now confronted with one of these provisions. It is our responsibility to ensure that the provisions of the existing Treaties are applied correctly and in full so that there is no transgression of the commitments, either the letter or the spirit, entered into by our nations when their respective parliaments ratified the Treaties.

This is why we are pleased that the Commission of the European Community has taken this initiative, an initiative which we totally support. It is courageous. It can be adopted or rejected, but it is not possible to prevaricate or evade the issue. A positive or negative response to this initiative to my mind amounts to the acceptance or rejection of European construction.

Overcoming the Community Crisis

Speech given on 20 January 1966

Some thought that 17 and 18 January would be days of truth. This is to say that they would give rise to a frank and open exchange of views within the Council of Ministers of the Community, allowing all cards to be placed on the table. It would have been what the English call a 'showdown'. Events have unfortunately shown these expectations to be wrong, for what actually took place in Luxembourg on 17 and 18 January, was a negotiation between France on the one hand and the five other governments on the other, and it is a well-known fact that truth never sees the light of day during a negotiation. It was, moreover, acknowledged by Plato that governments had the right not to speak the truth in order to mislead the enemy or conceal something from the public in the interests of the State.

We, however, who do not have governmental functions, have the advantage of being able to tell the whole truth. We can express our thoughts strongly and clearly, we can bare our souls, particularly in that we are encouraged to do so by the well-known courtesy of Mr. Pierre Werner. I am happy to see him here today alongside his two colleagues from Belgium and the Netherlands, united by a kind of 'Benelux' solidarity which seems to me a good example which augurs well for our Community.

Speaking on behalf the Liberal and Allies Group, I would firstly like to congratulate all the governments of the Community member countries sincerely for the obvious efforts they have made, in a true spirit of conciliation, to overcome the problems caused by the serious crisis of 30 June and to put the European Community back on the rails. I say all the governments, which means that I no longer intend to exclude France from these commendations. Positive factors are noted in the French attitude. These must be justly recognised and acknowledged.

To my mind, one of these positive factors is the fact that they accepted the Council of Ministers' extraordinary meeting to try to overcome the present difficulties. There is another, which is the fact that the tariff reductions under the Treaties have been applied since 1 January. The third is the decision to accept the common external tariff when the time comes.

I believe, therefore, that we can commend all the governments of the Community member countries, even though our concerns have not yet been removed. These concerns remain despite what we have heard this morning, more as a result of what was not said than of what was said.

From this viewpoint, Mr. Werner's speech was very eloquent, despite its extreme caution, which – I have committed myself to speak the truth – could be described as reticence.

Our concerns are based above all on two factors. I shall say nothing about the timetable, which doubtless results from nothing other than a small 'gaffe'. I shall consider two main points, namely the French questions regarding the role of the E.E.C. Commission and the rule of Council votes by a qualified majority.

Regarding the Commission, the impression one gets from the newspapers (furthermore not contradicted) is that it should act as a kind of scapegoat for the differences in views between France and its five partners.

It may be that some of the criticisms are founded. It may be that some members of the Commission in fact failed to maintain the essential reserve which should have prevented them from publicly criticising one of the governments of the member countries. It may be that this attitude could be thought incorrect. But when we talk of correctness, it has to be said that this should not be a one way affair, it must obviously be reciprocal and the members of the E.E.C. Commission also have the right to request and require that the governments respect them and their role in the same way that the governments justifiably claim the respect of the Commission and its members.

Be that as it may, if this is the reason which led to the E.E.C. Commission coming under criticism, there seems to me a high level of disproportion between cause and effect. It would have been fairer and more logical to have held a frank discussion between the Council of Ministers and the E.E.C. Commission. To wish, however, to judge the Commission in its absence and to refuse it the right to defend itself is – I would say – outrageous.

In this respect, I would like to ask the Presidents of the Council of Ministers whether or not it is true that the duties of the President of the E.E.C. Commission are required to be permanently unstable, since such permanent instability obviously does not help the Community's functioning and causes amazement, particularly if such a requirement emanates from a structure which has made itself out to be the epitome of public service stability. The second question is whether or not it is true that what was requested was total renewal of the E.E.C. Commission and the replacement of all its members? I have to say that the Parliament has commended on several occasions the extraordinary merits of the E.E.C. Commission, which, through its competence, its spirit of initiative and its dynamism, has been the mainspring of the tremendous progress made by the Common Market, progress which has attracted the attention and admiration of the whole world. Mr. Hallstein and his colleagues, who have served Europe well, cannot now be humiliated in this way.

I would like to point out candidly that what worries us most is that advantage may be taken of this situation, or that it may be used as a pretext to change the role of the E.E.C. Commission, in other words to transform it from a political institution into a technical institution.

The E.E.C. Commission is a Community political institution. The Treaty is specific on this point, stating that the Commission is responsible to the European Parliament. The Parliament can, using the appropriate procedures, force its resignation by a censure motion. As a result it is a political, not a technical institution under the terms of the Treaty. One can, therefore, only imagine that the Council of Ministers' intention is to change the Commission's role without even using the procedure provided to revise the Treaty. The Commission's role is not assigned by decisions of the Council of Ministers but solely by the Treaty of Rome.

The other question which worries us in this respect is the following. Let us suppose that it is possible to change the Commission's role and to transform it into a technical institution. Who will be responsible to the European Parliament? If the members of the Commission become Community officials, I do not think it could be claimed that they were responsible to the

European Parliament. I know of no examples of democratic countries where the officials are personally responsible to the parliament. Political responsibility is always and everywhere the responsibility of the government. Is the Council of Ministers, which intends to be the Community's sole political institution, prepared to be responsible to this Parliament, to appear before this Parliament and possibly to suffer the effects of our censure motion? This would evidently amount to asking the impossible.

There then remains only one solution – and it is this which is worrying us – namely that as a result of a Commission reorganisation, the European Parliament may be divested of its prerogative under the Treaties of Rome, namely the exercise of political control over actions by the executive.

Let us move to the other point, the qualified majority for decisions by the Council of Ministers. In this respect, I would like to give an impartial personal opinion. I consider that the rule of the qualified majority will never in practice be applied to decisions by the Council of Ministers. The compromise rule will, quite naturally, continue to be applied. It is inconceivable for a State to be placed in a minority position by the others. *Hodie mihi cras tibi*, today, me, tomorrow you. Today France, tomorrow Germany and then Italy. What will happen is what happens in the Swiss Federal Council, where the constitution makes provision for majority decision but where, in reality, decisions are never taken on a majority but unanimously on the basis of a compromise.

It should, however, be added that the rule of the qualified majority, provided under the Treaty cannot be removed. The rule must exist because it is there to dissuade any possibility of a veto being used to prevent certain rules being applied or to form obstacles to the unification process. This rule correctly exists as a warning that it is not possible to prevent progress by the use of a simple veto. This is the main function of this rule. It is a type of deterrent, a dissuasive force, which no-one intends to use, but which must be available to deter potential aggressors.

Above all, however, it would be outrageous to claim that this rule can be removed on the basis of what is called, incorrectly in my opinion, a *gentleman's agreement*. How? It would be possible, using subterfuge, to amend the Treaty of Rome surreptitiously, by avoiding the stumbling block of the parliamentary procedure and thus preventing discussion at the time of ratification by the national parliaments. This would be unbelievable and intolerable. I would say, with no desire to offend anyone, that this would be an *agreement* but certainly not a *gentleman's agreement*.

For this reason, if it is true that the French government made this proposal, those who opposed it did very well. Others who have also done well (and I would particularly like to congratulate Mr. Spaak, who is present today) are those who have fought with such intelligence, enthusiasm and creativity to find formulas which may possibly satisfy the French government without compromising the provisions of the Treaty of Rome.

The three points of the so-called 'Spaak Plan' (we know it under this name because it has been presented in this way in the press) contain, I believe, some positive factors. As far as the first point is concerned: *nulla questio*. It is unacceptable to change by a majority decision something which was previously adopted unanimously. There is no doubt that this would be utterly wrong. I don't think that anyone has wanted such a thing. The first point is therefore superfluous.

Consequently one could, if one wished, give this assurance to the French government. With regard to the second point, I am raising no objection. Some measures could have been decided upon unanimously in 1965 and were not, because of the crisis. This was due to the 'strike' by the French government. Long experience has already taught us that, during strikes by the public services, legal sanctions are never applied. I am therefore unable to see why one should this time apply sanctions which would consist precisely of a majority vote on issues which should have been settled unanimously in 1965.

As far as the third point is concerned, I share some of the concerns expressed by the previous speaker. This system of three readings disturbs the equilibrium of legislative procedure under the Treaty of Rome. The Community's legislative work should, according to the Treaty, have a triple foundation. It should be the result of the combination of three factors, all three of which are indispensable. The Commission makes the proposal, the Parliament gives an opinion and the Council reaches a decision. Therefore if it is always the case, as it should be, that the Parliament's opinion is requested before the Commission proposal is submitted to the Council, it is clear that when the Commission is subsequently called upon by the Council to amend its proposal for the second reading and then again for the third reading, the opinion expressed by the Parliament would lose all significance. This opinion would relate to the initial proposal but would have no relationship whatsoever with the second or the third proposal. I would then put this question to the President of the Council of Ministers. Would it be too much to ask that, if this procedure were to be adopted, the Parliament could be consulted at each reading, before the submission of each proposal to the Council of Ministers? I am well aware that it has sometimes happened and still does happen that the Parliament is not consulted when the Commission amends its proposal after discussion within the Council. We have found and are still finding this procedure deplorable and consider it to be contrary to the spirit of the Treaty of Rome. To institutionalise such a practice would form an unquestionable betrayal of the spirit and the letter of that Treaty.

It seems to me that Parliament was notably absent from this two day discussion in Luxembourg. We can be pleased that no-one has suggested that we should be sanctioned or penalised but we find it regrettable that none of the members of the Council, as far as we know, defended the role, prerogatives and powers of the European Parliament.

I hope that during subsequent meetings, the Ministers here today will have an opportunity of taking this comment into account and coming to the defence of the European Parliament.

We are aware of the gravity of the European crisis affecting our Community. We are aware of the already unfortunate effects of this crisis. Our sympathy goes more specifically to the Atomic Energy Community. The latter has nothing to do with the problem of the common agricultural policy and its Commission has not had to withstand criticism, but it has suffered most of all from the crisis of 30 June. By way of digression I would say that this is, to my mind, the most flagrant proof that the failure to reach agreement on the common agricultural policy on 30 June was nothing other than an opportunity – if not a pretext – for a crisis which in fact has far deeper and more serious roots.

At the present time, the European Atomic Energy Community is in the situation of not being able to apply the current system of provisional twelfths allowed for other budgets to its research budget and is therefore totally unable to meet its commitments. It has obligations it cannot fulfil and I believe that this problem should be referred urgently to the Council of Ministers in order that a remedy can be found.

We are aware of the serious nature of this crisis and we believe that everything possible should be done, examining all ideas and all solutions, to reach agreement. This should be done in the hope that in the spirit of conciliation now becoming apparent in all the governments of the Community's member countries, we may find a formula to put the Community back on its rightful path.

I believe that your efforts as representatives of the Council of Ministers, will be strongly supported by the entire European Parliament, but only as long as the principles of the Treaties of Rome are faithfully followed.

We do not doubt your resolution, having seen it clearly on many occasions. We are sure that you will try to respect your commitments. But it must not be forgotten that the structure of the Treaties of Rome forms the only safeguard against betrayal of the final objective of the unification process. It is therefore essential that this structure is protected as carefully as possible.

Our fear is that in the anxious search for a solution to the serious crisis affecting this process, we might finally give way to the temptation to amend something *de facto* which it seems cannot be justly amended *de jure*.

Therefore, the European Parliament's formal appeal to you, as representatives of the Council of Ministers, is to grant no concessions and show no weakness. Perseverance, patience and good will are essential. Perhaps, during your difficult task, you may find comfort, support and encouragement William of Orange's words: It is not necessary to hope in order to begin, it is not necessary to succeed in order to persevere.

European Scientific Research

Speech given on 30 June 1966

Mister Chairman,

I would firstly like to thank you most sincerely for your congratulations, as spokesman for all our colleagues, on my recent appointment as Rector of the University of Rome. In this connection, I would like to assure you that despite the responsibility, importance and weight of the new duties which have been added to my already considerable workload, I shall continue to make my modest contribution to our common ideal, the construction of Europe.

A good deal of time has passed since 28 April and I was tempted to withdraw the question I raised since it has lost a good deal of its relevance, particularly in view of the fact Mr. Chatenet wrote me a very courteous letter, for which I would like to thank him once again, saying that he had only intended to express personal ideas in his interview. It is regrettable that this was not clearly stated when it was published in the Paris newspaper. Unfortunately President Chatenet was the victim of one of the disasters which often occur during the life of a politician. I'm sure that none of us would want to be too hard on him.

I would thus very willingly have withdrawn my question, but I thought that President Chatenet's interview could form a basis for the exchange of some useful ideas and thus give rise to a constructive and helpful debate on achieving our objectives. Is it or is it not true that Euratom's work has been disappointing and futile? It is obvious that Mr. Chatenet no longer thinks this, given that he shares the views just expressed by Vice-President Carelli on behalf of the executive Commission.

For our part, we particularly appreciate what has been achieved. Four large research centres have been set up, a remarkable contribution has been made to the progress of nuclear physics and, even more important, preparations have been made for the dawn of the era of industrial atomic energy. This was Euratom's main objective under the Treaty of Rome, in other words to provide the right conditions for this industrial use and for the development of a powerful nuclear industry. This is precisely what the Treaty of Rome provides. This objective has been attained. In fact it could be said that as a result of the research carried it will soon be possible to produce electricity at a competitive cost compared with other sources of energy.

The information given in the executive's report, which Mr. Carelli has just mentioned, supports further our favourable opinion of the work carried out by the Commission of Eurotom. The cause of greater concern in President Chatenet's interview were the views he expressed on the usefulness of the Rome Treaties for European construction. Yes, it is disturbing to find the President of Euratom's Commission expressing a lack of confidence in the Treaties of Rome as an instrument for the economic and political construction of Europe.

When Mr. Chatenet speaks of 'tailor-making' Europe, when he quotes the example of the neutron reactors which are of interest principally to France, Great Britain and Germany and must form the subject of agreement between these three countries, even if this means concluding other agreements in different sectors with other countries, I get the basic impression that he is seeing the integration process under the Treaties of Rome as a process of industrial cooperation between sovereign states. This is, however, contrary to the principles of the Treaties of Rome and all

those who are hold representative or executive office within these 'Treaties' institutions, I repeat all, have the duty to inspire the others with confidence and not breed distrust. Luckily it must be acknowledged that Mr. Chatenet's interview contained a note of optimism since he considered that although Euratom was disappointing, it was also rich in potential for the future. This is what he meant in his interview when he recommended 'not throwing the baby out with the bath water'.

I believe that this is, above all, the aspect to concentrate on when dealing with the discouragement, concern and fear roused amongst hundreds of researchers who are dependent on the European Atomic Energy Community by the merger to unite the three executives.

What will happen, not only to each person's own future but also to the work they have achieved so far and to which they are so attached? We have a duty to reassure these researchers as quickly as possible.

Euratom constitutes a precious instrument for the coordination and development of research in all fields of science and scientific research in general. To my mind, it is significant that, almost at the same time as Mr. Chatenet's interview in *Le Figaro*, the Liberal and Allies Group had decided to put forward a motion for a resolution seeking to transform the European Atomic Energy Community into a genuine Scientific Research Community, in order to give this Community the task of implementing scientific policy, this being absolutely essential to European life and progress.

You all know better than I that scientific research in the European Community is at present falling far below that of other countries and is giving cause for concern. According to figures now published, compared with 93 dollars per capita spent in the United States on scientific research in 1963, Great Britain spent scarcely 33 and the Community countries taken as a whole only 17. Against a million researchers employed in the Soviet Union in 1963 and one million three hundred thousand in the United States, there were scarcely five hundred thousand in the European Community during the same period. This is not all. During the same year, 1963, there was a truly impressive migration of researchers, 2 232 of whom went to the United States, abandoning the Community's member countries where they found inadequate encouragement for their work and less attractive working conditions. We could quote other figures demonstrating the backwardness of scientific research in western Europe, whereas this continent was at one time the only source of scientific progress in the world. Science is developing at a breathtaking rate, in line with a geometric progression. The Americans are calculating that in 1975 their industrial production will include 40% of products which are at present unknown and whose existence cannot be imagined. Western Europe is therefore in a very dramatic situation and we must endeavour to remedy this insufficiency as quickly as possible by giving a really effective impetus to scientific research in our six countries. This is why it is absolutely essential to form a common scientific policy. We have an adequate instrument, Euratom, which already has the experience and the resources to introduce a common scientific policy. This task should be given to Euratom. Euratom should become the Scientific Research Community.

It is with this aim in mind that we have put forward our motion for a resolution. It is the positive conclusion which I believe emerged from the debate which followed President Chatenet's interview in *Le Figaro*. All in all, we think that we should not abandon an idea which we

consider neither disappointing nor futile. On the contrary, we should retain it for the richness of its potential. We also think that we should use the instruments provided by the Treaties of Rome for the construction of an economically and politically integrated Europe to their full extent

At the end of this debate, the Liberals and Allies Group, with reference to Article 46 of the Procedure, will put forward a motion for a resolution with application for an immediate vote. I believe that this motion for a resolution will receive the unanimous approval of this Assembly because it forms an exact expression of the deep feeling of all members, regardless of their political affiliation. It is along the same lines as the proposal presented recently by the Liberal and Allies Group, which is now under study within the committees concerned, but is, however, quite different. It does not have the same content, so that its adoption would in no way prejudice the relevant committees' and this Assembly's view of the other motion for a resolution during October, when we shall have to enter into a full and coherent discussion on the common scientific policy.

POLITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- MARTINO G., La Scuola nella vita nazionale, Le Monnier, Florence, 1956
MARTINO G., Per la Libertà e la Pace, Le Monnier, Florence, 1957
MARTINO G., Verso l'avvenire, Le Monnier, Florence, 1963
MARTINO G., Foi en l'Europe, Le Monnier, Florence, 1967
MARTINO G., Gretna Martino e l'Europa: Dalla Conferenza di Messina al Parlamento europeo, Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Rome, 1995.

SCIENTIFIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

- MARTINO G., Contributo alla conoscenza della funzione dei lobi ottici nel colombo, Boll. Soc. ital Biol, sper. 1926, 1, 239-342.
MARTINO G., Effetti dell'inanizione sui caratteri sessuali del gallo, Boll. Soc. ital Biol, sper., 1926, 1, 279-282.
MARTINO G., Contributo alla conoscenza della funzione dei lobi ottici nel colombo, Ach. Fisiol., 1926, 24, 282-292.
MARTINO G., Differenze sul comportamento chimico e fisiologico dei muscoli freschi di diversi specie di pesce, Arch. Sci. biol., 1926, 9, 247-260.
MARTINO G., Su alcune recenti nozioni relative ai fenomeni chimici connessi colla attività muscolare, Arch. Farmacol. sper., 1926, 42, 256-271.
MARTINO G., Effetti dell'inanizione acuta e cronica sulle funzioni del testicolo e dell'ovaia, Arch. Sci. biol., 1927, 9, 339-353.
MARTINO G., Ricerche sulla rialimentazione dopo il digiuno. Nota I: Variazioni sulla capacità del consumo alimentare nei vari periodi della rialimentazione, Boll. Soc. ital Biol, sper., 1927, 2, 41-43.
MARTINO G., Ricerche sulla rialimentazione dopo il digiuno. Nota II: Sulle modalità della ripresa del peso nel corpo dei colombi rialimentati a grano e a granoturco, Boll. Soc. ital Biol, sper., 1927, 2, 202-206.
MARTINO G., Ricerche sulla rialimentazione dopo il digiuno. Nota III: Rialimentazione dopo un digiuno immediatamente successivo alla ripresa di un digiuno precedente, Boll. Soc. ital Biol, sper., 1927, 2, 265-267.
MARTINO G., Ricerche sulla rialimentazione dopo il digiuno. Nota IV: Sulla quantità minima di alimento necessaria al mantenimento del peso corporeo prima del digiuno e nei vari periodi della rialimentazione nel colombo, Boll. Soc. ital Biol, sper., 1927, 2, 267-269.
MARTINO G., Effetti dell'inanizione sul comportamento della glicemia alimentare nel colombo, Boll. Soc. ital Biol, sper., 1927, 2, 316-320.
MARTINO G. e AMANTEA G., Morfinizzazione ed epilessia da eccitamenti afferenti nel cane, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1927, 2, 311-316.
MARTINO G., Su una sostanza sperglicemizzante ottenuta dal succo pancreatico e dal pancreas di cane, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1927, 2, 329-396.
MARTINO G., Contributo alla conoscenza dell'iperglicemia da morfina, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1927, 2, 388-390.
MARTINO G., Sull'azione dell'insulina nei colombi digiunanti, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1927, 2, 545-548.
MARTINO G., Sui rapporti tra glicemia digestiva e funzione pancreatica nel cane, Nota preliminare. Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1927, 2, 777-779.
MARTINO G., Su una sostanza iperglicemizzante ottenuta dal succo pancreatico e dal pancreas di cane, Arch. Sci. biol., 1927, 10, 408-437.
MARTINO G., Glicemia digestiva e funzione pancreatica nel cane, Arch. Sci. biol., 1927, 10, 438-455.
MARTINO G., Sulla presenza di fosfogeno nel cuore, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1927, 2, 1019-1022.
MARTINO G., Sulla possibile utilizzazione di recenti dati sperimentali per la diagnosi di occlusione del dotto pancreatico, Policlinico, Sez. prat., 1928, 35, 3-5.

MARTINO G., Diverso contenuto in fosfogeno di muscoli striati a contrazione rapida e a contrazione torpida. R.C. Accad. Lincei, 1928, 7, 79-82.

MARTINO G., Curarizzazione e contenuto in fosfogeno di muscoli striati, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 3, 114-116.

MARTINO G., Variazioni del contenuto in fosfogeno dei muscoli striati per azione del cloroformio e di alcuni alcoli, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 3, 225-229.

MARTINO G. e CARBONARO G., Contrattura muscolare da alcuni alcaloidi e fosfogeno, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 3, 218-221.

MARTINO G., Ricerche sulla rialimentazione dopo il digiuno. Nota V: Comportamento del tasso glicemico e della glicemia alimentare durante la rialimentazione nel colombo, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 3, 265-268.

MARTINO G., Ancora sui rapporti tra glicemia digestiva e funzione pancreatica, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 3, 403-407.

MARTINO G., Sui rapporti tra fosfogeno e contratture muscolari. Ricerche sul muscolo e sul succo muscolare, Arch.Fisiol. 1928, 26, 362-378.

MARTINO G., Sul significato delle variazioni del fosfogeno nell'accorcimento muscolare, Arch.Fisiol. 1928, 26, 379-384.

MARTINO G., Ricerca del fosfogeno in vari organi, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 3, 622-623.

MARTINO G. e ZANGHI G., Sulla distribuzione del fosfogeno nei vari tratti delle fibre muscolari, Boll.Soc.ital.Biol. sper. 1928, 3, 720-723.

MARTINO G., Alcune particolari osservazioni sul comportamento del fosfogeno nel succo muscolare, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 3, 824-826.

MARTINO G., Azione dell'insulina su embrioni e larve di teleostei marini, Mem. Com. Talass. ital. CXL 1928.

MARTINO G., Sulla rialimentazione dopo il digiuno nel colombo, Arch. Sci. biol., 1928, 13, 421-422.

MARTINO G., Osservazione su un particolare caso di epilessia umana riflessa, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 4, 413-414.

622-623.

MARTINO G. e ZANGHI G., Ancora sulla presenza di fosfogeno nel cuore, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1928, 4, 551-552.

MARTINO G., Sul comportamento del fosfogeno nel tetano muscolare, R.C. Accad. Lincei, 1929, 9, 1038-1043.

MARTINO G., Effetti della stimolazione pagale sul fosfogeno del cuore e dello stomaco, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1929, 4, 962-964.

MARTINO G., Sul determinismo della glicemia digestiva, Amer. J. Physiol, 1929, 90, 447.

MARTINO G., Sul significato fisiologico della fosfocreatina muscolare, Arch. Farmacol. sper. 1929, 50, 31-41.

MARTINO G., Sulla presenza di protamine nel polline, Arch. Farmacol. sper. 1929.

MARTINO G., Sul potere glicolitico della sostanza cerebrale, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1930, 5, 92-94.

MARTINO G., Sul potere glicolitico della sostanza cerebrale, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1930, 30, 228-238.

MARTINO G., Comportamento dei glicidi di vari segmenti centrali nei colombi stricninizzati, Arch. Fisiol., 1930, 29, 274-277.

MARTINO G., Sul comportamento della fosfocreatina nei muscoli enervati, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1931, 6, 168-170.

MARTINO G., Variaciones del contenido en glucidos de varios segmentos centrales en las palomas estricnizada, Arch. Soc. Biol. Montevideo-Suplemento, Fascicolo III, 1931, 719-722.

MARTINO G., Sobre el comportamiento de la fosfocreatina en los musculos enervados, Arch. Soc. Biol. Montevideo-Suplemento, Fascicolo II, 1931, 270-273.

MARTINO G., Comportamento della fosfocreatina del cuore nella stimolazione del simpatico cardiaco, Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper., 1931, 6, 171-173.

MARTINO G., Sull'azione del cloralosio e sull'epilessia sperimentale da eccitamenti afferenti nel cane, Arch. Fisiol., 1931, 29, 412-424.

MARTINO G., Sulla predisposizione alla epilessia sperimentale da eccitamenti afferenti nel cane, Arch. Fisiol., 1931, 30, 51-92.

MARTINO G., Su alcuni fenomeni elettrici della zona corticale sensitivo-motrice del cane, Arch. Sci. biol., 1931, 16, 160-182.

MARTINO G., Sobre la predisposición a la epilepsia refleja experimental en los perros del pais, An. Inst. Nac. Paras., Asunción, 1932.

MARTINO G., Sobre las relaciones entre le actividad exócrina y la endócrina del páncreas, Rev. Cent. Estud. Med., Asunción, 1932.

MARTINO G., Azione del cloralosio sugli elementi corticali della zona sigmoidea del cane, Arch. Fisiol., 1932, 186-199.

MARTINO G., Contenuto in glicidi ed attività dei centri sensitivo-motori corticali del cane, Nota preliminare. *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1931, 6, 989-991.

MARTINO G., Sugli effetti dell'alimentazione orizantica esclusiva in vari uccelli, *Arch. Fisiol.*, 1932, 336-346.

MARTINO G. e CHENÜ-BORDON J.C., Sul valore alimentare della mandioca, Nota preliminare, *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1932, 7, 757-759.

MARTINO G., Contenuto in glicidi ed attività dei centri sensitivo-motori corticali del cane, *Arch. Sci. biol.*, 1932, 17, 169-184.

MARTINO G., Sul valore alimentare della mandioca, *Arch. Sci. biol.*, 1932, 17, 305-319.

MARTINO G., Contribución al conocimiento de los factores que rigen la duración de la apnea voluntaria, Nota preliminare. *Prensa mod. arg.* 1933, 20, 644-645.

MARTINO G., Hiperventilación pulmonar y tetania paratireopriva, Nota preliminare. *Prensa med. arg.* 1933, 20, 685-686.

MARTINO G., Epilepsia experimental e humana, *Rev. da Ass. Paul. de Med.*, 1933, 2, 128-139.

MARTINO G., Nouvelle contribution à la connaissance de l'hyperglycémie digestive, *C.R. Soc. Biol.* 1933, 112, 1002-1003.

MARTINO G., Contributo alla conoscenza dei fattori che regolano la durata dell'apnea volontaria, *Arch. Fisiol.*, 1933, 32, 437-450.

MARTINO G., Iperventilazione polmonare e tetania paratireopriva, *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1933, 8, 814-816.

MARTINO G., La panificazione mista con mandioca, *Quad. Nutr.*, 1934, 1, 149-152.

MARTINO G., Effetti dell'alimentazione lattea sullo sviluppo sessuale nei polli, *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1934, 9, 217-219.

MARTINO G., Sulla partecipazione delle zone riflesse dell'aorta e dei seni carotidei al fenomeno dell'epilessia sperimentale riflessa, *Arch. Fisiol.*, 1934, 33, 598-603.

MARTINO G., Alimentazione orizantica e funzioni sessuali del gallo, *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1934, 9, 540-541.

MARTINO G., Sull'azione del veleno crotalico (*Crotalus ferriricus*) direttamente applicato sui centri nervosi, *Arch. Fisiol.*, 1934, 34, 133-160.

MARTINO G., Sulla duplice natura della vitamina F, *Quad. Nutr.*, 1934, 1, 180-184.

MARTINO G. e DE FINIS M., Alcalosi ed eccitabilità dei centri sensitivo-motori corticali, *Arch. Fisiol.*, 1933, 32, 361-378.

MARTINO G. e OZORIO de ALMEIDA M., Alcune osservazioni sul comportamento della cronassia dei centri sigmoidei nell'epilessia sperimentale del cane, *Arch. Fisiol.*, 1933, 32, 593-606.

MARTINO G. e KNALLINSKY A., Sul contenuto in fattore E della radice di mandioca, *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1933, 8, 819-821.

MARTINO G., Sul quoziente beri-berico nell'alimentazione orizantica dei polli, *Quad. Nutr.*, 1934-1935, 1, 413-423.

MARTINO G., Necessità dell'ordinaria via afferente, costante e insostituibile nel meccanismo del riflesso associativo, *Atti Accad. pelorit.*, 1936, 38, 67-74.

MARTINO G. e ALIBRANDI A., Analisi di un particolare riflesso condizionato (dell'ammiccamento) nel cane, *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1936, 11, 763-764.

MARTINO G., Un biologo del '600: Giovanni Swammerdant, *Realtà*, 1937, 22, 53-61.

MARTINO G., Sulla probabile esistenza d'un ignoto fattore alimentare stimolante lo sviluppo sessuale, *R.C. Acc. Lincei*, 1937, 25, 333-336.

MARTINO G. e ALIBRANDI A., L'attività riflessa dei centri sensitivo-motori corticali sotto l'azione di stimoli condizionati, *Arch. Fisiol.*, 1937, 37, 533-548.

MARTINO G., Sulla sensibilità dell'analizzatore ottico del cane per raggi luminosi di diversa lunghezza d'onda, *Atti Accad. pelorit.*, 1938, 40, 89-94.

MARTINO G., Un errore fisiologico: la distinzione tra riflessi congeniti e riflessi acquisiti, *Kongressbericht II des XVI. Internationalen Physiologen-Kongresses*, 1938, 117.

MARTINO G., Die physiologische Bedeutung des Gluxckagons, *Z. ges exp. Med.*, 1938, 103, 771-774.

MARTINO G., Perché l'appetito viene mangiando? *Boll. Soc. ital. Biol. sper.*, 1938, 13, 1073-1074.

MARTINO G., Riflessi fisiologici e riflessi psichici, *Realtà*, 1938, 24, 50-58.

MARTINO G. e FULCHIGNONI E., Über die Bedeutung bedingter Reize (für den Bahnungsprozess) bei der durch Strychninisierung der occipitalen Rinde reflektorisch erzeugten Epilepsie, *Pflüg. Arch. ges. Physiol.*, 1938, 240-212-220.

MARTINO G. e FULCHIGNONI E., Il fenomeno dell'agevolazione nell'epilessia riflessa da stricninizzazione occipitale, sotto l'azione di stimoli luminosi condizionati, *R.C. Acc. Lincei*, 1938, 27, 125-128.

MARTINO G. e ALIBRANDI A., L'agevolazione e l'inibizione in rapporto alla qualità dello stimolo luminoso, nel riflesso condizionato dell'ammiccamento, Arch. Fisiol., 1938, 38, 200-219.

MARTINO G. e ALIBRANDI A., Nuove osservazioni sui riflessi condizionati dell'ammiccamento per stimoli acustici, R.C. Acc. Lincei, 1938, 28, 168-171.

MARTINO G., Sull'importanza degli eccitamenti afferenti per la diffusione dell'attività nei centri corticali sensitivo-motori durante l'accesso epilettiforme sperimentale, R.C. Acc. Lincei, 1939, 29, 626-628.

MARTINO G., Le variazioni dell'eccitabilità centrale nel meccanismo dei riflessi associativi, Livro de homenagem - Proff. Alvaro e Miguel Ozorio de Almeida, 1939, 429-434.

MARTINO G., Sugli effetti della stimolazione elettrica nei centri corticali sensitivo-motori del cane, R.C. Acc. Lincei, 1939, 29, 426-429.

MARTINO G., Il contributo italiano agli studi sulla circolazione del sangue negli ultimi cento anni, Un secolo di progresso scientifico italiano: 1839-1939, S.I.P.S., 1939, 4, 309-320.

MARTINO G., Reflektorische Atmungsregulierung, Kongressbericht III des XVI Internationalen Physiologen-Kongresses, 1938, 81.

MARTINO G., Sul meccanismo dei riflessi genitali condizionati, nel cane, R.C. Acc. Lincei, 1939, 29, 695-698.

MARTINO G., The conditioned Reflex of Blinking, J. Neurophysiol., 1939, 2, 173-177.

MARTINO G., Sobre la sensibilidad del analizador optico del perro para rayos luminosos de diversa longitud de onda, An. Fac. Med. Paraguay, 139, 31-35.

MARTINO G., Le ricerche eseguite in Italia nel campo della Fisiologia negli anni XIV, XV, XVI e XVII E.F., Relazione della XXVIII Riunione S.I.P.S., 1939, 2, 587-690.

MARTINO G., Elementi di Fisiologia, Ed. Principato, Milan, 1958.

MARTINO G., Dizionario di Fisiologia, A.P.E., Catane, 1945.

MARTINO G., Sul consumo di proteine animali in Italia, da Studi in memoria di Carmelo Sgroi, Bottega d'Erasmus, Turin, 1965.

European Parliament

Gaetano MARTINO
Ten years in the European Parliament
A scientist at the service of Europe

Parliamentary Speeches

Edited by Massimo Silvestro

2001.IV

ISBN

Key words : University, European Construction, Kennedy, Messina,
scientific research, powers of the European Parliament, national parliaments.