

MEETING OF THE HEADS OF STATE OR GOVERNMENT

THE HAGUE

1-2 DECEMBER 1969

Documents in this collection include:

The Hague Summit reproduced from the Bulletin of the European Communities, No. 1, 1970.

Background

Speech by Jean Rey, President of the Commission to the Parliament on 11 December 1969

Communiqué

Memorandum of the Commission to the Heads of State or Government of 19 November 1969

Report of the Dutch Government to the States General on the Progress and out-come of the conference of Heads of State or Government

Resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 3 November 1969 on the Hague Summit, Reproduced from the Bulletin of the European Communities, No. 12, 1969.

The "Summit Conference" at the Hague, Statements made by the Heads of State or Government on 2 December 1969, Reproduced from the Bulletin of the European Communities, No. 2, 1970.

I. THE HAGUE SUMMIT

I.

At the 76th session of the Council of the European Communities on 22 and 23 July 1969, the French Government laid before the other Governments represented "a proposal for a meeting by the end of the year in The Hague of a *conference of Heads of State or Government*, with a view to examining the problems arising for the Community, principally in the matter of its completion, its consolidation and its enlargement". This proposal met with the approval of the Council members. At a lunch on the occasion of the 79th session on 15 September 1969, the date of the Summit Conference was fixed for 17 and 18 November 1969. Subsequently, at a press conference held by M. De Koster, Netherlands State Secretary for Foreign Affairs and President-in-office of the Council, and by M. Maurice Schumann, French Foreign Minister, at a lunch in connection with the Council session of 10 November 1969 (86th session), the organization of the Summit and, more especially, the main items for discussion were specified. Ultimately, the date of the Conference was postponed to 1 and 2 December to enable the Foreign Ministers of all the member countries to take part. Prior to the Conference, the European Parliament met in extraordinary session on 3 November 1969 in Luxembourg to determine its attitude to the fundamental problems of European and Community policy. It adopted a resolution which it passed to the Community Governments and to the Council and Commission.¹

The Commission of the European Communities, for its part, expressed its attitude to the decisions to be adopted in a memorandum to the Conference of Heads of State or Government, submitted to the Governments of the Member States on 19 November 1969.

The Summit Conference was opened on 1 December 1969 in the historic Ridderzaal in the centre of the Binnenhof by M. P.J.S. de Jong, Prime Minister of the Netherlands.² The same hall had witnessed in May 1948 the European Congress which was the start of the Council of Europe and the European Movement, on 11 November 1967 the twentieth anniversary celebration of the foundation of the European Movement, and on 8 November 1968 the opening by Queen Juliana of the European Parliamentary Congress.

The delegations were led by M. Georges Pompidou, French President, M. Gaston Eyskens, Belgian Prime Minister, M. Willy Brandt, German Chancellor, M. Mariano Rumor, Italian Prime Minister, M. Pierre Werner, Luxembourg Prime Minister, and M. P.J.S. de Jong, Netherlands Prime Minister.

¹ Bulletin 12-69, Ch. VIII, "European Parliament".

² M. de Jong's opening speech and the declarations made by the other Heads of State or Government, and published, will be given in full in a chapter of Bulletin 2-1970.

The national delegations meeting only on the afternoon of 1 December and on 2 December, with the Commission, represented by M. Rey and M. Martino, in attendance, reached agreement on a number of items, which are indicated in the final communiqué. The results of the Summit Conference were analysed on 11 December in Strasbourg by M. Rey before the European Parliament, during the annual Joint Meeting between the Community institutions.¹

M. Rey's address to the European Parliament, the final communiqué of the Conference specifying the elements of agreement between the representatives of the Six, and the Commission memorandum to the Governments on the eve of the Conference are given below.

Address by M. Jean Rey to the European Parliament

(11 December 1969)

In his address on 11 December 1969 to the European Parliament, the President of the Commission of the European Communities, M. Jean Rey, drew up a balance-sheet of the results of the Conference of Heads of State or Government of the six member countries in The Hague. M. Rey stressed the positive achievements at The Hague and commented on the aspects of European policy on which progress will have to be made in future.

1. The leading positive factor is the spectacular declaration of the political aims of the Community. At a time when certain circles, mainly outside the Community, were tending to the opinion that it could be regarded as a mere trade preference area, it was essential to make clear to European and world opinion that after twenty years the Community had abandoned none of its political aims. In the three sectors with which it dealt, the Hague Conference gave the Community the means to proceed further.

Firstly, with regard to completion, the Commission sees in the events at the end of 1969 a proof that it was right not to propose any extension of the transitional phase. This decision was not easy for the Commission to take, nor was it easily accepted outside. Only recently, this or that member of the European Parliament was publicly asking whether the transition period should not be prolonged because certain tasks which should, in the normal way, have been completed by the end of 1969, would probably not be done with until the following year. Developments have shown that the Community was right not to delay the entry on the final phase.

¹ See Part Two, Ch. IV, European Parliament.

Some of the decisions adopted had already been made before the Hague Conference. For instance, the regulation on the social security of migrant workers was definitively adopted after five or six years' work. The regulation on commercial policy will enable this to become truly common as from 1 January 1970. In the matter of external relations, a series of very important negotiations had been unblocked or opened in the cases of Austria, Yugoslavia, Spain and Israel, and a commercial agreement between the Community and Japan had been outlined. However, of all the progress achieved by the Council during recent weeks, the most spectacular in the view of European opinion is undoubtedly the decision adopted on Euratom, which, after several years of crisis, now has its future confirmed. The existing instrument is to be preserved and its conversion to a number of new activities has been approved by the Heads of State or Government themselves.

Few items in the Hague Conference communiqué are as spectacular or promising as that on strengthening the Community. The Heads of State or Government declare their agreement "that within the Council, on the basis of the memorandum presented by the Commission on 12 February 1969, and in close collaboration with the latter, a plan in stages will be worked out during 1970 with a view to the creation of an economic and monetary union". In addition, "they are agreed to arrange for the investigation of the possibility of setting up a European Reserve Fund which should be the outcome of a joint economic and monetary policy". Never in 12 years had the necessity for monetary solidarity in the Community, the absence of which was first spectacularly demonstrated by the events of 1969, been expressed so forcefully or with such authority. The impending activities of the Commission will concern a number of problems: the co-ordination of economic and monetary policies, the reform of agricultural structures in the Community (1970 will be the year of decisions in this field), industrial problems, research and technology (the present progress of work indicates that next year decisions will be reached in the Community with the collaboration of the non-member countries which have been invited to take part in this effort), the reform of the European Social Fund, cited explicitly by the Hague communiqué, regional policy, and energy policy.

In the matter of enlargement, the Community is on the eve of a great international negotiation. This time, unlike the unhappy procedure followed in 1961-63, it is no longer the Member States meeting in a mere intergovernmental conference which are to negotiate with Britain, Ireland, Norway and Denmark, but the Community as such. The Hague communiqué says explicitly: "The Heads of State or Government have indicated their agreement to the opening of negotiations between the Community on the one hand and the applicant States on the other". This is tremendous progress. It would be incomprehensible if negotiations concerning the common policies at present in operation in the Community were to be pursued other than by the Community as such, represented of course by the appropriate organs and institutions.

The Commission will play a considerable part in these negotiations, and it is actively preparing for them.

These results of the Hague Conference, M. Rey added, which are so important for the future and the development of the Communities, would suffice in themselves to justify the French President's initiative.

2. However, said M. Rey, along with this credit side, the Conference had not been able to solve all the problems. Some remained pending, and some factors were wanting in the decisions adopted; this might be called the debit side of the Conference.

Thus, Europe's role in the world was not raised at all. To be sure, this was not the subject of the Hague meeting and we should not be surprised that it was not discussed. This role, already so important in relations between the continents, will become even more so when the Community is enlarged and when its responsibilities towards the developing countries have increased. If these problems are mentioned only in passing in the Hague communiqué, it is because, as is well known, important debates are to be held on them in our institutions.

What is much more regrettable is that the Conference, like the communiqué, hardly mentioned political union at all. The fact that the Foreign Ministers were asked to make proposals in six or seven months is certainly not discouraging, but many had expected some important diplomatic initiative from this Conference on the part of one or other member country. In the memorandum submitted to the Governments and discussed at The Hague, the Commission had recommended progress towards political union. It had previously expressed the wish that, failing the establishment of institutions or the drafting of constitutional texts, agreement should at least be reached on a programme of action appropriate to a political Europe. In this way, Europe as such should try to help solve the economic and social problems which are partly responsible for the present drama in the Middle East. Similarly, if the Community as such were to attack the problem of easing the tensions between East and West, it could perhaps bring the solution nearer. Thirdly, repetition of the errors of the old national states at continental level must be avoided, and, at a time when the world is becoming organized in terms of continents, the establishment of relations of mutual trust between these is at least as important as the establishment of peaceful relations between the European states.

A second subject of regret is that the strengthening of the Community institutions, so essential for the progress of the Community, was not discussed at The Hague. The construction of the economic and monetary union, like enlargement, demands the strengthening of the institutions. Enlargement of the Community is inconceivable with distorted institutional machinery such as we have at present. How is it possible to imagine that all decisions,

even minor ones, could be adopted unanimously in a Community of ten states? In the coming months the Commission will do its utmost to get the Council to consider this matter of the strengthening of the Community at institutional level with all the attention it merits, since it is so absolutely essential. A third matter for regret as regards the institutions is that the Conference did not see fit to make any positive pronouncement on direct election by universal suffrage to the European Parliament. The Commission said at the Conference that since, although not able to begin discussion of the renewed project for political union, the Conference wished to demonstrate the political nature of the Community, it could at least declare its readiness to have the European Parliament elected by universal suffrage. The Conference did not take this decision and the final communiqué simply says that the work in hand will be continued, and there is no question of a favourable attitude. The communiqué does, however, come out for strengthening the budgetary powers of the European Parliament.

3. In conclusion, M. Rey said, 1970 was not only the first year in the final period, the period when Community affairs will cease to be of a transitional nature, but also a year which will be marked by two great anniversaries. The first is the centenary of one of the great armed conflicts of modern times, one of the civil wars which have set against each other European States today reconciled and members of our Community. But 1970 will also see the twentieth anniversary of the declaration by Robert Schuman. On 9 May 1970, twenty years will have elapsed since Robert Schuman made the memorable declaration in the Salon de l'Horloge of the Quai d'Orsay which launched the Community enterprise. The recent events will enable us all to celebrate this great anniversary without a feeling of remorse towards the great figure and the political initiative of Robert Schuman, since the Community is on the way to recover the creative drive which had been missing in recent months. On 9 May 1970 the Parliament, Council and Commission will together demonstrate, with a better conscience and renewed energy, their will to hasten the building of Europe.

Final communiqué of the Conference

(2 December 1969)

1. "On the initiative of the Government of the French Republic and at the invitation of the Netherlands Government, the Heads of State or Government and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the European Communities met at The Hague on 1 and 2 December 1969. The Commission of the European Communities was invited to participate in the work of the Conference on the second day.

2. Now that the Common Market is about to enter upon its final stage, they considered that it was the duty of those who bear the highest political responsibility in each of the Member States to draw up a balance-sheet of the work already accomplished, to show their determination to continue it and to define the broad lines for the future.

3. Looking back on the road that has been traversed, and finding that never before have independent States pushed their co-operation further, they were unanimous in their opinion that by reason of the progress made the Community had now arrived at a turning point in its history. Over and above the technical and legal sides of the problems involved, the expiry of the transitional period at the end of the year has, therefore, acquired major political significance. Entry upon the final stage of the Common Market not only means confirming the irreversible nature of the work accomplished by the Communities, but also means paving the way for a United Europe capable of assuming its responsibilities in the world of tomorrow and of making a contribution commensurate with its traditions and its mission.

4. The Heads of State or Government therefore wish to reaffirm their belief in the political objectives which give the Community its full meaning and scope, their determination to carry their undertaking through to the end, and their confidence in the final success of their efforts. They have a common conviction that a Europe composed of States which, in spite of their different national characteristics, are united in their essential interests, assured of its internal cohesion, loyal to its friendly relations with outside countries, conscious of the role it has to play in promoting the relaxation of international tension and rapprochement among all peoples and, first and foremost, among those of the entire European continent, is indispensable for preserving an exceptional seat of development, of progress and culture, for world equilibrium and for peace.

The European Communities remain the original nucleus from which European unity sprang and developed. The entry of other countries of this continent into the Communities — in accordance with the provisions of the Treaties of Rome — would undoubtedly help the Communities to grow to dimensions, still more in conformity with the present state of economy and technology. The creation of special links with other European States which have expressed a desire to that effect would also contribute to this end. A development such as this would enable Europe to keep up its traditions of an open attitude to the world and increase its efforts on behalf of developing countries.

5. As regards the completion of the Communities, the Heads of State or Government have reaffirmed the will of their Governments to pass from the transitional period to the final stage of the European Community and, accord-



ingly, to lay down a definitive financial arrangement for the common agricultural policy by the end of 1969.

They agree to replace gradually, within the framework of this financial arrangement, the contributions of member countries by the Community's own resources, taking into account all the interests concerned, with the object of achieving in due course the integral financing of the Communities' budgets in accordance with the procedure provided for in Article 201 of the Treaty establishing the EEC and of strengthening the budgetary powers of the European Parliament.

The problem of direct elections will continue to be studied by the Council of Ministers.

6. They have asked the Governments to continue without delay, within the Council, the efforts already made to ensure a better control of the market by a policy of agricultural production making it possible to limit the burden on budgets.

7. The acceptance of a financial arrangement for the final stage does not exclude its adaptation by unanimous vote in an enlarged Community, on condition that the principles of this arrangement are not watered down.

8. They have reaffirmed their readiness to expedite the further action needed to strengthen the Community and promote its development into an economic union. They are of the opinion that the integration process should result in a Community of stability and growth. To this end they agreed that, within the Council, on the basis of the memorandum presented by the Commission on 12 February 1969, and in close collaboration with the latter, a plan in stages will be worked out during 1970 with a view to the creation of an economic and monetary union.

The development of monetary co-operation should be based on the harmonization of economic policies.

They agreed to arrange for the investigation of the possibility of setting up a European reserve fund which should be the outcome of a joint economic and monetary policy.

9. As regards the technological activity of the Community, they reaffirmed their readiness to continue more intensively the activities of the Community with a view to co-ordinating and promoting industrial research and development in the principal pacemaking sectors, in particular by means of common programmes, and to supply the financial means for the purpose.

10. They are further agreed on the necessity of making fresh efforts to work out in the near future a research programme for the European Atomic Energy

Community designed in accordance with the exigencies of modern industrial management, and making it possible to ensure the most effective use of the Joint Research Centre.

11. They reaffirmed their interest in the establishment of a European university.

12. The Heads of State or Government acknowledge the desirability of reforming the Social Fund, within the framework of a closely concerted social policy.

13. They reaffirmed their agreement on the principle of the enlargement of the Community, in accordance with Article 237 of the Treaty of Rome.

In so far as the applicant States accept the Treaties and their political aims, the decisions taken since the entry into force of the Treaties and the options adopted in the sphere of development, the Heads of State or Government have indicated their agreement to the opening of negotiations between the Community on the one hand and the applicant States on the other.

They agreed that the essential preparatory work for establishing a basis of negotiation could be undertaken as soon as practically possible. By common consent, the preparations are to take place in the most positive spirit.

14. As soon as negotiations with the applicant countries have been opened, discussions on their position in relation to the EEC will be started with such other EFTA members as may request them.

15. They instructed the Ministers for Foreign Affairs to study the best way of achieving progress in the matter of political unification, within the context of enlargement. The Ministers are to make proposals to this effect by the end of July 1970.

16. All the creative activities and the actions conducive to European growth decided upon here will be assured of a greater future if the younger generation is closely associated with them. The Governments have endorsed this need and the Communities will make provision for it."

Memorandum from the Commission to the Conference

(19 November 1969)

"The Commission welcomes the meeting of the Conference of Heads of State or Government.

The meeting takes place at a time when the transitional period of the Community is approaching its end, when its enlargement is once more entering

an active phase, and when recent difficulties of an agricultural and monetary nature have made a keen impression on opinion inside and outside the Community.

This being so, it is essential that the Conference should be crowned with success and give a new political impetus to the creation of Europe, with a view to the decisions to be adopted by the Community institutions.

1. At a time when anxiety is felt at the present state of the Community, the Commission feels it should point out that despite numerous difficulties considerable results have been achieved during recent years: the establishment of the customs union, the elaboration of the common agricultural policy, vigorous economic expansion, higher living standards, the active policy of aid to the Associated States and the Community's cohesion and growing authority at international level.

2. So that the results thus far achieved, notably in the customs union and the common agricultural policy, should not be subsequently jeopardized, it is essential that the Heads of State or Government affirm their will to continue the building of a genuine Community, i.e. to complete the customs union by the establishment of an economic and monetary union in the years ahead.

To this end, the Council and Commission should be invited to determine speedily the stages leading to this objective and in particular to define the necessary action for the next five years, notably in the matter of common economic and monetary policies, the Community's industrial and technological development, and social and regional action designed more particularly to cope with the changes taking place in these fields.

3. Enlargement of the Community is an essential factor in the creation of Europe; the Commission thus feels that the Conference of Heads of State or Government should note the unanimous will to bring about this enlargement.

The Commission trusts that the Opinions it sent to the Council in 1967 and 1969 will form a useful point of departure for the negotiations to be undertaken.

4. As it said recently — in its Opinion of 1 October 1969 — the Commission considers that the strengthening and the enlargement of the Community should go hand in hand. Besides the decisions taken at the end of the year, strengthening includes the measures necessary to progress towards economic and monetary union and the reinforcement of the Community institutions.

5. Reinforcement of the Community institutions has become essential. As the Community develops, it needs stronger institutions to ensure its internal government. It needs them equally to enable it to cope with the danger of

unwieldiness which it runs by enlargement. It is therefore essential to re-establish normal functioning of the institutions as laid down in the Treaties, without waiting for any institutional strengthening which may be envisaged when the Communities are merged. The Community should also be made more democratic by adopting without delay election to the European Parliament by universal suffrage, and thus giving the peoples of Europe an interest in the destinies of the Community.

6. In conclusion, the Commission recommends that the Conference stress the essentially political character of the task in hand and accordingly indicate its will to impel Europe towards political union.

7. Important decisions for the day-to-day life of the Communities are called for in the immediate future. The adoption of the general lines which the Commission has set out above would greatly help in these decisions. Accordingly, the Council should indicate the political will of the Member States that the institutions take these decisions by the end of the year and in particular adopt the procedures for co-ordinating economic policies and the machinery of monetary co-operation, the multi-annual Euratom programme, the common agricultural policy financing regulation for the final period, and the decisions on the creation of the Community's own resources and greater budgetary powers for the European Parliament.

It should also express the political will of the Member States that the date when negotiations on the enlargement of the Community are to be reopened be determined at the same time.

The Commission urgently draws the attention of the Heads of State or Government to the above. It is convinced that if the Conference can agree on these lines of advance it will have imparted decisive stimulus to the building of Europe. Its deliberations will thus have profound repercussions in Europe and throughout the world."

Netherlands

Report of the Dutch Government to the States General on the progress and outcome of the conference of Heads of State or Government

At the request of the Second Chamber, the Government published a report on the summit meeting. As regards the first four paragraphs of the communiqué, the Government explained that these would have been expressed in far more practical terms had this depended on the Netherlands. The ideas that had been put forward, notably on economic and monetary policy, showed that the member States were ready to pursue integration in the various fields.

a) Completion

As regards the points to be settled in pursuance of the EEC Treaty before the end of the transitional period, the only point discussed was the new financial regulations. The Dutch expressed their willingness to reach a settlement for the final period as soon as possible but this must be subject to certain general conditions, namely a reasonable sharing of burdens and a form of own resources which could be adjusted to cover the necessary expenditure. The financing was to a large extent only a reflection of the agricultural policy pursued and this needed to be balanced and reasonable. The Dutch laid great emphasis on the absolute necessity of coupling the creation of the Community's own resources with wider powers for the European Parliament.

All the delegations were unreservedly willing to go on to the final phase in the EEC Treaty in the following year. They were also ready to finalize the financial regulation before then although it was generally recognized that this could not easily be implemented in so short a period.

The Dutch and Italian request that reference should be made in the communiqué to a reasonable sharing of burdens was acceded to in so far as the phrase 'a consideration of all the interests involved' was used. This (less explicit) clause gives sufficient support for upholding the Dutch wishes at the talks in Brussels.

The need to arrive at a better organization of the agricultural market as soon as possible and at a limitation of the financial burdens of the agricultural policy, was generally accepted and this found expression in the communiqué.

Technological co-operation was discussed only in general terms. Apart from the fact that the Heads of State or Government spoke in the communiqué of 'reaffirming their willingness' to promote the activities of the Community in this field, it should be pointed out that the current procedure for implementing the Aigrain Report should be acted upon. It was to be hoped that this declaration of willingness would impart a new impetus.

The passage in the communiqué relating to Euratom should have come under 'completion' given that this was a field where the Council had for a long time lagged behind in implementing a European treaty. The Chairman pressed for an effort to draw up a programme. The statement of the French President gave rise to some hope for France was ready to co-operate with such a programme. The idea of a 'modern industrial enterprise' (referred to in the communiqué) came from Germany and deserved further study. The passage on the European university and the reform of the Social Fund contained few practical points to latch on to.

c) Enlargement

It was clear, right from the beginning of the summit meeting that its success would depend to a large extent on the question of being able to take a practical decision on the opening of negotiations with the applicant States. To begin with, France did not seem to be in a position to make any general - i.e. very positive - statement of its willingness to open the negotiations although most of the other delegations including the Netherlands were quite firm on this point. The result finally achieved, especially in the light of the course the meeting took in view of France's attitude, was regarded as very important. The six Governments not only stated in the communiqué that the preparatory work between the Six could go forward as quickly as possible in the most positive spirit but also they agreed on a formula regarding the actual date, which the Chairman reported as follows :

'All the delegations agreed that the various questions dealt with in the communiqué relating to the preparatory work for entry should be resolved before the beginning of negotiations with the United Kingdom and the other applicant States and decided upon in the first half of 1970. This means before 30 June. The negotiations with the applicant States should then begin directly.'

The talks between the Six on the common line they are to adopt at the negotiations were bound to be difficult. One guarantee was that they would not last longer than was strictly necessary - in accordance with the terms quoted above - subject to the restriction that the preparatory work must be 'indispensable' to establishing a common basis for negotiations. In this connexion it should be pointed out that it was explained, regarding a passage in the communiqué on agricultural financing, that the 'final' character of the financial

Extraordinary session of 3 November 1969

The European Parliament met in extraordinary session in Luxembourg on 3 November 1969 to define its attitude to the fundamental problems of European policy with the Conference of Heads of State or Government in the offing. It discussed a proposed resolution presented by the Political Affairs Committee.

12 - 1969

91

M. Scarascia-Mugnozza (Christian Democrat, Italy), rapporteur, said that the Summit Conference ought to be a constructive meeting which would banish all distrust. It should provide a wider political base for concrete achievements. The Heads of State were aware that a clear and precise statement was expected of them; disappointments and postponements had become intolerable. There should therefore be an end to equivocal statements; the Heads of State should make an unambiguous declaration of what they want to do. M. Scarascia-Mugnozza said however that this Conference was no substitute for the Community's institutions and he urged the Commission to play an active part in the Summit. Referring to the Bonn communiqué of 18 July 1961, he appealed to the spirit in which this communiqué had been drafted and urged that 1969 be the year in which the will to form a political union would be given shape and substance. "Completion, reinforcement, enlargement" together formed a global, interdependent programme, a harmonious framework. Just as the resolution listed items without giving priority to one point or another, the Political Affairs Committee did not see why priority should be given to one or another element of the triptych. The opening of negotiations with the applicants would undoubtedly create a calmer atmosphere in which the Six could advance. The important thing was that a political will should prevail and that the Governments should give proof of this will.

On behalf of the Christian Democrat Group, M. Lückner (Germany) spoke about the aspects of the political situation in the Community which were a source of anxiety to him. He felt that the crisis of the common farm policy was no more than the most tangible evidence of a more deeply-rooted crisis. This situation was due to two types of problem. In the first place, the Community was feeling the effects of growing disequilibrium between the level of integration achieved under the common agricultural policy and that achieved in the economic and monetary field. The monetary manipulations in France and Germany had shown that the assumption that the economies of the Member States were developing in parallel was false. Secondly, the Community was suffering from disequilibrium between the economic advances which had been made and the delays which had occurred in the political field. Since the Luxembourg Agreement of 1966 the Community spirit had deteriorated to such an extent that the only successes to which the Community could point were the result of carefully measured compromises or the "little by little" technique. There was no longer any political impetus. These imbalances were at the heart of the present dilemma.

M. Lückner appealed for political and monetary collaboration, which was the only way of preserving what had been achieved by the Community and a prerequisite for progress. He considered however that nothing could be done unless some powers were delegated to the Community and its institutions. This was the price that would have to be paid to achieve economic and monetary union. Without this union it would not be possible to maintain the common agricultural market.

M. Lückner said that the Christian Democrat Group reserved the right to vote, for or against transition to the definitive stage of the common market depending on the outcome of the Summit Conference. He hoped that the summit would provide the Community with concrete stimulus by giving its institutions specific instructions and decisions.

M. Burger (Netherlands), on behalf of the Socialist Group, was more pessimistic. The Summit Conference, which he termed a "rescue operation", should define the Community's place in the general political context. The Community must open negotiations for British membership immediately. The obligation to negotiate was a Treaty principle as was the principle of farm financing. He hoped that the Council would revert to a voting procedure which was in conformity with the

Treaty, and that its right of initiative, which could not be effectively exercised in the absence of majority decisions within the Council, be restored to the Commission. The speaker also expressed the hope that the institutions would be democratized. This would mean that the Parliament would have to be elected by direct universal suffrage and given real budgetary powers. M. Burger criticized the Commission's proposals; in the first stage they represented no real advance on the present situation, and no date had been fixed for the second stage. M. Burger proposed implementing arrangements for the second stage at once, whether or not "own resources" were created, and making arrangements for giving the Parliament legislative powers at a later stage.

M. Berthoin (France) for the Liberal Group urged the Heads of State and Government to make an all-out effort to ensure that the Summit would be a success.

M. de la Malène (France) for the EDU said that although his Group had its own views it would give the resolution its unanimous support so that it could be adopted by the Parliament. The speaker felt that too much importance should not be attached to the Summit but hoped that it would act in two fields: there was a need for a unanimous will to support common objectives; and there was a need to correct distortions in the Community's development and re-establish balance in certain fields. A refusal to advance towards political union would create "fundamental distortions" within the Community. M. de la Malène hoped that the Summit would give Europe a shot in the arm so that it could recover its political attractiveness, progress in the economic field and regain its desire to be independent.

M. de la Malène referred to the completion/reinforcement/enlargement triptych and said that the Community with its associates already numbered 23 countries and that enlargement would bring the total to more than 40.

M. Amendola (Italy) for the Communists explained why he and his colleagues would not be able to support the resolution. It was regrettable that the text did not approach the situation in a realistic way. In M. Amendola's view the Community was in a grave crisis; he even went so far as to use the term "agony".

M. Amendola considered that they would get nowhere by limiting discussion to the Hague triptych. There was no point in hiding the fact that the Community would have to be reshaped following its present crisis and British entry. Another point was that the Conference would not discuss a problem which M. Amendola considered to be of paramount importance—the European security conference. The speaker was convinced that Europe would be saved because she would refuse to be the pawn in negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

M. Luns spoke to the debate in his capacity as President-in-office of the Council and in his personal capacity. He welcomed this extraordinary session of the Parliament. Europe's crisis had acquired disquieting proportions. He hoped that the Hague meeting would produce clear guidelines but he warned the Parliament against expecting too much. The President of the Council felt that the preparatory work for the Conference was inadequate. The Council would meet again on 10 and 11 November with the Commission to discuss the Summit. If the Hague meeting was a failure, Europe's future would be gloomy.

M. Luns felt, like M. Burger, that there was a political, if not a legal, link between completion, reinforcement and enlargement. It was probable that an approximate date for the opening of negotiations would be fixed. The solution to the other problems however was more problematical. In reply to M. Lüscher, who had said that the crisis dated back to early 1966, M. Luns said that the Luxembourg compromise had at least enabled the Community to continue to work in "an acceptable

manner". The President of the Council reminded the House of what he had said in July to the effect that the Governments should not be allowed to usurp the Council's place; he also referred to the Commission's attendance at the Conference.

M. Luns commented on the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph and said that the wording of the text in the matter of political union left the nature of this union vague. Regarding the transition to the final stage, the Governments were already in agreement. As for general and short-term economic policy, M. Luns doubted if the Conference could do more than define a number of guidelines. He approved the paragraph on the need to apply all Treaty provisions in their entirety and the following paragraph in which the Parliament expressed its concern about Euratom. As for the question of electing members of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, the President of the Council did not believe that there would be a decision on this, but the resolution was very valuable in this connection. M. Luns spoke of the possibility of organizing elections within the Benelux countries for the appointment of members of the present Parliament. He considered that the Summit Conference should produce concrete results on the question of negotiations with countries which had applied for membership. Lastly M. Luns assured the Parliament that the Council and the Hague conference would take note of the resolution which was to be put to the House. He ended by urging members to make their voices heard in their own parliaments.

M. Furler (Christian Democrat, Germany) felt that the Summit Conference should take two decisions; first, there should be a clear decision on the opening of negotiations with countries which have applied for membership; secondly, there should be a decision on the reinforcement of the Community. M. Furler felt that the decisions which would have to be taken to democratize the Community were of particular importance. He was very disappointed with the Commission's proposals for strengthening the Parliament's budgetary powers. The first stage gave the Parliament derisory powers and no date had been fixed for the second. Although M. Furler did not speak specifically of a motion of censure, he insisted that the Commission should have the Parliament's confidence. Its flimsy proposals in the matter of budgetary powers and the attitude it would adopt at The Hague, notably with regard to the choices made by the Parliament, would determine whether and to what extent the Assembly would continue to place its trust in the Executive.

The resolution and six amendments, five of which had been presented by the Socialist Group, were put to the vote. The Parliament approved an amendment moved by Mlle Lulling including social policy and the reform of the Social Fund in the dossiers on which the Summit Conference should make progress. An amendment tabled by four political groups, and moved by M. Habib Deloncle (EDU, France), urged that the Commission conduct the membership negotiations in accordance with the terms of its Opinion of 1 October 1969.

The following resolution was adopted by a majority. The three Communist members present voted against, and M. Vredeling abstained because he was not clear as to what type of political union was being advocated.

The European Parliament

— Considering the particular importance of the forthcoming Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Member States of the Community, in whose proceedings the Commission of the European Communities should participate in its capacity as interpreter of the Community interest;

— Aware of the advances which have been made and the considerable difficulties which have been overcome to date but profoundly disturbed by the present situation, which puts all that has been achieved in jeopardy;

— Aware also that a political union of the people of Europe is now more necessary than ever if these difficulties are to be overcome and if Europe is to make a contribution to world equilibrium and peace;

1. Urges and expects the Heads of State or Government of the member countries to determine in an unambiguous manner a common will to reach agreement on the aims of European integration, and on the place and role of a united Europe, and to decide, in the spirit of the Bonn communiqué of 18 July 1961, to achieve the political union of Europe by stages and give it form during 1970;

2. Urges the Heads of State or Government to give proof of their common will by giving a fresh impetus to the activities of the European Communities and deciding on an action programme for the completion, reinforcement and enlargement of the Communities which would enable the Community's institutions, on the basis of proposals already made by the Commission:

A. to make arrangements for the transition to the definitive stage of the common market on the date specified;

B. to define without delay a genuine common general and short-term economic policy which is the only way in which the particularly acute problems which have made their appearance in many sectors, and notably in the monetary and agricultural fields, can be solved;

C. to promote a common social policy and to press ahead amongst other things with the reform of the European Social Fund, which should become a genuine Community instrument for a full-employment policy and a means of raising living standards in the Community;

D. to apply all Treaty provisions on the operation and competences of the Community institutions in their entirety, including the provisions on decisions taken within the Council;

E. to impart fresh stimulus to a common scientific and technical research policy, including the continuation of work in the nuclear sector, by assigning new medium- and long-term tasks to the European Atomic Energy Community and by endowing it with the necessary means to carry out such activities, notably within the framework of agreements with European countries which are outside the Community;

F. to make arrangements, on the basis of the draft presented by the European Parliament in 1960, for the election of its members by direct universal suffrage and, in any case, to adopt a procedure whereby the Council and the European Parliament could come together to produce a definitive text;

G. to strengthen the budgetary powers of the European Parliament in accordance with its resolution of 7 October 1969;

H. to bring about cultural co-operation, notably through regular meetings of the competent Ministers within the Council of the Communities, and to create a European Youth Office;

3. Further urges on the Heads of State or Government that negotiations with the European countries which are seeking membership of the Communities under Article 237 of the EEC Treaty be opened in the coming months, it being understood

that it will be for the Commission to conduct these negotiations in the Community interest in accordance with the terms of its Opinion of 1 October 1969;

4. Instructs its President to transmit the present resolution to the Governments and Parliaments of the Member States of the Community and to the Council and Commission of the European Communities."

COUNCIL

The Council met on six occasions during October 1969,¹ twice at the Commission's request (6 and 27 October 1969).

81st session (6 October) — mainly problems raised by the decision of the German Government on the Deutsche Mark

With M. H.J. Witteveen, Netherlands Minister of Finance, in the chair, this meeting was attended by all the Ministers of Finance and of Agriculture, and by the German Minister for Economic Affairs. Others present at this session, which was held in Luxembourg, were Baron Hubert Ansiaux, Chairman of the Committee of Governors of the Central Banks of the Community, and M. Otmar Emminger, Vice-Chairman of the Monetary Committee.

The Council examined the problems raised by the decision taken on 29 September 1969 by the German Government to ask the Bundesbank to suspend intervention on the exchanges at the upper and lower parity limits (i.e. to allow the mark to float). The Council noted that the Commission intended to amend its decision of 1 October 1969.

In the agricultural sphere, the Council endorsed the regulation establishing a system of premiums for the slaughter of dairy cows and premiums for non-marketing of milk products, together with a directive dealing with health problems in intra-Community trade in fresh meat.

In the field of Community external relations, the Council decided to conclude tariff agreements with Switzerland, Finland and Austria.

Lastly, the Council approved instructions for the Commission to negotiate with the United States Atomic Energy Commission (USAEC) an agreement in the field of nuclear information.

82nd session (17 October 1969) — mainly general matters

This meeting was held in Luxembourg. It was attended by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Finance and Economic Affairs of the Member States, with M. J.M.A.H. Luns, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, in the chair.

In connection with membership applications, the Council heard a report by the President of the Commission on the opinion which it had transmitted to the Council on 2 October 1969.

¹ For the various items discussed during the Council's sessions, the reader is referred to the appropriate chapters in this Bulletin.

IV. THE "SUMMIT CONFERENCE" AT THE HAGUE

(II)

The first part of the Hague dossier was published in last month's Bulletin. The statements made by the Heads of State or Government on 1 December 1969, the first day of the Conference, are given below. Only those statements made available to the Press or released by the national delegations are reproduced.

*Opening address by M. P.J.S. de Jong,
Prime Minister of the Netherlands*

(translation)

"It is a pleasure and honour for me to welcome you all. I do so in the first place as Prime Minister of the country which has the privilege of being your host for a few days. Our country's welcome is all the more cordial because you are the high representatives of countries to which we are bound very intimately by political, economic and military links as well as by our common history and civilization. We consider that your stay here consolidates our close mutual friendship.

I also welcome you in my capacity as Chairman of the conference. We took on a difficult task when we agreed to hold this meeting. A gathering of those who carry the highest responsibility, in their respective countries, for the issues with which we shall have to do in the next few days is an occasion that arouses expectations among our peoples. I would mention that in the past days, and even today, I have had visits from leading European figures, and have received petitions and many letters. They all expressed the hope that this conference would find a solution for the problems which now face us and which we are to discuss. By meeting here, we are also assuming obligations to our peoples. And it was for this reason that some of us reacted somewhat hesitantly at first to the proposal of our French friends. The doubters asked themselves whether such a meeting could really be a success. We have overcome this hesitation and thus created confidence in the willingness of all partners to make a genuine contribution to solving our problems. So I know that I am speaking for our six Governments when I voice the hope that we shall accomplish the task we have set ourselves by holding this conference.

Our membership of the European Communities has brought us together here. This is far from being the only bond between us; but it *is* the decisive factor in the composition of this conference, and it will also dictate the topics we shall discuss. As partners in a Community which, in the limited form of the European Coal and Steel Community, has existed ever since 1952, we must

examine our achievements to date, and see where we have failed and what we still can and must do to attain our objectives. It will not be for us to take decisions which the Treaties vest in the European institutions. However, the Member States are required to facilitate achievement of the aims of these institutions under Article 5 of the EEC Treaty, and the States have also been assigned their own tasks. It seems worthwhile for us to consult together with a view to fulfilling these aims and tasks. The Commission will be able to assist with this tomorrow.

I shall now briefly consider the points we have to discuss during this conference.

In my view, the first question we have to ask ourselves as Governments is whether we still agree on the aims of our joint action. Here, I am not thinking primarily of the establishment of a common market or the development of a Community nuclear industry for peaceful purposes. I have in mind, above all, the political foundation of our work. The Preamble to the ECSC Treaty — inspired to a considerable extent by declarations of its founding-father, Robert Schuman — already states the Member States' resolution to establish, by creating an economic community, the basis for a broader and closer community among the peoples concerned. The Coal and Steel Community was thus seen as a step towards a united Europe. The signatories of the EEC Treaty expressed the same view of the Community which they were to set up when they stated, in the Preamble, their determination "to establish the foundations of an ever-closer union among the European peoples".

Before ascertaining whether this determination still exists, we must know what is meant by "Europe" and which European peoples the six Governments were referring to. I think that this question is answered by another passage in the Preamble to the EEC Treaty, where the contracting parties call on "the other peoples of Europe who share their ideal to join in their efforts". The Europe which the parties had in mind was thus not limited to the Six. It was to include all the like-minded and similarly orientated — that is to say, in any case democratic — countries of Europe.

I should like to submit to you all, as a first point for discussion, the question of whether we are still determined to establish that Europe, that close union among the European peoples. In my view, we could find every inducement to do so not only in the Treaty texts which I have just quoted but also in the present world situation. It is time Europe realized its responsible position in all kinds of fields and united to discharge these responsibilities. I feel that an affirmative answer to my question entails two distinct consequences. Firstly, it means a positive reaction to the application of the United Kingdom, Denmark, Norway and Ireland for negotiations to join the Communities. Secondly, such an answer would demonstrate our readiness to extend and intensify co-operation on the basis of the European Communities. Both are necessary to attain that "ever-closer union among the European peoples".

I can already declare here, in the name of my Government and of the entire Dutch people, that we are still determined to establish this union and accept both the consequences I have mentioned. We are convinced that unless the European Communities are enlarged, and unless they are strengthened, they will increasingly mark time and even go into reverse.

The fear has been expressed, however, that precisely the inclusion of new members would weaken the dynamism of the Communities and deprive them of their specific character. We may have to discuss the matter further, but please allow me to make a comment on it here and now.

I said at the beginning of my address that, after discussing the aims of our common action, this conference will also have to consider the present state of affairs in the Communities. I think that I am bound to point out now that disappointment and frustration over this state of affairs is gaining ground among many political groups and sections of the population in our Communities. We can react to this in two possible ways. We can say that people expected too much; or we can admit that we have not altogether succeeded in our task. I incline to the second reaction. In my opinion the Treaties, in themselves, offer sufficient scope for eliminating the main causes of the unsatisfactory situation. These causes are, I feel, a certain lack of readiness to take decisions and a certain imbalance in progress in the various areas of integration. The Member States bear the main responsibility here. This does not mean that the Community institutions make no mistakes; but the Member States can play a key role in the development of policy through their representatives in the Council of Ministers. This requires, however, a greater unity of aims and more determination to achieve them than have been manifested so far. Once the difference of opinion on the accession of new members has been resolved, this unity of aims will doubtless come more to the fore. We shall then be able to devote ourselves with united strength to the extensive task which still awaits us.

As already stated, apart from enlargement to include new members, a confirmation of our political aim would entail declaring our willingness to extend and intensify co-operation on the basis of the European Communities. When it took office, the French Government used a neat phrase in this connection — that it was ready to go as far as its partners wished to go. Well, I should like to respond on behalf of my Government and to call on the other Governments to follow suit. The Dutch Government is prepared to go very far with European economic integration in a broader European context. It considers that this is not just an economic matter but is a decisive step towards political unification. My Government is prepared to extend the integration process to other fields. It considers, however, that the independent position of the Community institutions must be recognized and strengthened. But this should not be taken as meaning that it is in favour of a highly centralized policy in the Community. In addition, my Government feels that substantial further integration is virtually out of the question unless it is brought under

parliamentary control. Integration is exerting more and more influence on the social life of our peoples. So it is absolutely vital for these peoples, in their turn, to be able to influence integrated policy at European level through normal democratic procedures.

In conclusion, a word about co-operation in the field of foreign policy. I know that in the past our Governments have been very far from seeing eye to eye on this question, and especially on its link with the accession of new members to the Communities. It therefore seems to me that the possibility of our taking a step forward with political co-operation depends primarily on progress in this matter of accession.

To sum up, I would propose the following programme. It seems to me to be very important for us to try, first of all, to achieve greater clarity concerning our aims. To do so, we shall have to define our standpoint on the position of our unification process in Europe and in the world. This means, in the first place, a decision on negotiations with the applicants for membership. In this connection, we shall have to establish at the same time how far we want to go with unification. If it is possible to agree on these two points — and we shall have to do our utmost to achieve this — it will be much easier to lay down a common course of action on a number of more practical points. If there are no objections in principle to negotiations with the applicant countries, we shall have to settle the date when they can be opened and our attitude on the main subjects which they are to cover. As regards the internal development of our Communities we shall have to determine what can be done, in the light of the agreement achieved on our common aim, to get back on schedule and to take early decisions to round off and expand what we have already achieved.”

*Statement by M. Georges Pompidou
President of France*

(translation)

“When I suggested that the leaders of the Six should come together in The Hague — and I thank the Dutch Government for offering us their hospitality — it was because it seemed to me that the months ahead were particularly significant ones for the future of the Community.

We are reaching the end of the transition period. Customs duties are now a thing of the past between our countries. The single market in agriculture has been painstakingly developed. But there are many questions which we need to answer. For instance, are the price disturbances caused by parity changes jeopardizing the future of the common market in agriculture? Will the growing burden of farm surpluses force us to find a new production policy?

Are the Six prepared to extend joint action to other fields? Do we or do we not intend to press ahead with the co-ordination of economic and monetary policies, technological co-operation, tax harmonization, and company law?

These are some of the questions we must answer in clear terms. And I do not forget the very important issue of the membership applications submitted by a number of countries, in particular Great Britain. Now is the time to raise this issue too and to discuss it without preconceived ideas but without giving anything away. Now is the time to decide amongst ourselves on preconditions for the opening of negotiations, and on procedures for these. And on their objectives too. In other words, are we prepared to open the door to Great Britain and the other applicants if this means that the Community will be weakened and begin to crumble away? Or do we intend to forge ahead to build a stronger Community, making membership subject to firm undertakings with regard to what has been achieved and what still remains to be done?

As you can see, there are many reasons why we should get down to discussing the real issue and choose between allowing the Community to wither away and giving it a fresh lease of life. Public opinion in our six countries expects a great deal from this meeting. I hope we will not disappoint our peoples and for this reason I feel that we must explain ourselves clearly. This is what I now propose to do on behalf of France.

As I have just said, and as you all know, there are three problems facing us at the present time:

- First we have the problem of “completion”, in other words the changeover to the definitive period and the adoption of the definitive financial arrangements;
- Then there is the problem of “strengthening”, sometimes called “development”, which concerns the prospects for Community growth;
- And lastly, we have the problem of “enlargement”, in other words the applications for membership.

An examination of these three problems depends in fact on our answer to one question and this question is — are we determined to continue building the European Community? What would be the point of this Conference if we did not succeed in reaching agreement in our own minds and between ourselves and creating an atmosphere of mutual trust? Without this any action would be doomed to failure and the Community to slow, inexorable disintegration. This is why I am answering this question with a clear, distinct, and unequivocal “Yes”. France does want to maintain the Community and to develop it. I am convinced that it is on the basis of the Treaty of Rome and all that has been done over the past ten years to implement and expand it that Europe has a chance to unite and thus to recover at all levels — including the political — the means of its development and of its influence which will enable it to make its voice heard in all areas of world politics.

But if we decide to continue building the Community this means that what has been done must be jealously guarded and that completion — including the financial regulation which is a typical Community instrument — must become a definitive reality within a specified period of time.

It means that we must get to work without delay to develop and deepen Community action, our special aim being the convergence of our economic and monetary policies. If we are to do this we must set ourselves a precise and realistic list of objectives spaced out in time. I will have some suggestions to make about this.

Lastly, it means that the membership applications from Great Britain and the other three countries must be discussed in a positive spirit without losing sight of Community interests or the interests of existing members. It means that the negotiations must be prepared between the Six to agree on a joint Community position and that the negotiations themselves must be conducted on behalf of the Community and in a Community spirit.

It is on these points then that our discussions should turn. Because time is short we will produce results only if we put aside timidity and procrastination and get down to action right away. At a time when, as we all know, the superpowers — the Soviet Union, but also the United States — view European problems as they affect their own interests, and cannot but view them thus, we owe it to our peoples to revive their hopes of seeing Europe in control of its own destiny. It was because of this and with this idea in mind that I suggested calling this Conference, whose outcome will condition not only the Community's future but also the future policy of each of the nations assembled here, and certainly that of France”.

*Statement by M. Willy Brandt
Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany*

(translation)

I

“If all were well with Europe, we would not be meeting today. If the Community were able to speak with one voice our main topic here would be foreign policy: the question of the peaceful organization of Europe, negotiations with the countries of Eastern Europe and our interests with regard to the conflict in the Middle East.

Instead, the success or failure of this Conference will rightly be judged on whether or not we can steer the Community vessel back into navigable waters. While we concentrate on narrower issues, we cannot shirk the decisions

which are needed if our fellow citizens are to appreciate once more that Europe is not merely a matter of market regulations and if the young are to see that Europe is something more than the remembrance of a part dark, part glorious, past.

We would all surely agree that our Community should not constitute another bloc but should, rather, be a model which could serve as a component of a balanced all-European peace order. It is in this spirit that the Federal Republic of Germany is seeking an understanding with the East in co-operation and agreement with its partners in the West.

The links that have been forged between us must be indissoluble and must grow ever closer. If we want to achieve the necessary harmonization we must give each other support, that is to say, we must apply solidarity in practice. On behalf of the German Government, I declare that we are ready to do this. And German public opinion is behind us in this.

But the public naturally also wants to know what consequences our European commitments have for them. My Government, like the others, must be able to show that the contributions it is called upon to make are meaningful, reasonable and well-defined and that our chosen path towards unity in Western Europe is the right one politically.

We do not consider that our meeting here is usurping the established institutions of the Community. Our Conference is more than an elevated form of the necessary Brussels routine.

II

This is why I say with complete frankness that the German Parliament and public expect me not to return from this Conference without concrete arrangements regarding the enlargement of the Community.

This issue has been exercising our minds for years. The Treaty makes it one of the cardinal issues of our Community, and nowhere is it written that it should not be dealt with until after the transitional period. The German attitude to this issue has been known for years. I mean that we may not put it off any longer.

In the first place, experience has shown us that postponing the question of enlargement threatens to paralyse the Community.

Secondly it would be in the common interest if the Community were to be enlarged at a time when we are trying to bring East and West closer together.

Thirdly, the Community must grow beyond the Six if it wants to hold its own, economically and technologically, against the superpowers and meet its worldwide responsibilities.

And I do not hesitate to add a fourth argument: those who fear that the economic strength of the Federal Republic of Germany could upset the balance within the Community ought to favour enlargement for this very reason.

In any event, I want to say that without Britain and the other countries which have applied for membership Europe cannot become what it should and can be.

I got the impression from the talks which preceded this Conference that we are agreed in principle that the Community should be enlarged. This agreement should not be underestimated. At this point I would like to address the French President in particular: if France responds today to our clear will to complete and develop the Community with the trust which is a condition for enlargement this will be a source of satisfaction and rejoicing for us.

Over and above the question of principle, we are agreed that the applicants would have to accept the Treaties, the aims of the Treaties and the common legislation adopted since the Community was established.

It has also been agreed that any guidelines we may adopt on the Community's future development should be referred to the applicants. Once they have been translated into formal decisions, these too would have to be accepted by the applicants. Such a procedure would make it possible — and I think this is important — to synchronize Community development and accession negotiations so that neither would hamper the other but that each would benefit to the greatest extent possible from the other.

Thus the starting positions for the negotiations have now progressed to such a stage that no obstacle stands in the way of their being put into final form in the near future. I therefore suggest that we let the applicants know that we consider it possible for negotiations to begin in the spring of 1970.

During the negotiations themselves we should take the necessary decisions on the applicants' demands as regards adaptation and transition, and present them to our partners as the Community position.

Discussion is often now confined to Britain but this should not be interpreted as meaning that we are neglecting the other applicants.

III

Europe's interest also makes it imperative that we should not ignore our future relationship with other EFTA countries. As far as my country is concerned, I am thinking here in particular of Austria and Switzerland. As we

all know, Sweden poses a question which is still open and which in the end it can only answer itself in its close contact with the other Scandinavian countries.

The close economic ties between the non-aligned countries and the Community, the free trade which operates within EFTA and also the political role of these countries in the European system of States, make it essential to find a comprehensive economic solution which would include them. A Community which resolutely pursues its economic development and political objectives can justify vis-à-vis the outside world the adoption of such a solution which is necessary in the interests of Europe as a whole. The fact that it takes exceptional measures to deal with exceptional situations does nothing to change the Community's character. It will not become a preference area itself but will continue to be a community.

The Federal Government feels that the countries in question should make their wishes known in good time and that they should be kept informed of the possibilities open to them. I therefore suggest that we hold a round of talks with the applicants and those countries interested in other forms of co-operation. Such talks should take place as soon as possible after the accession negotiations begin.

IV

Although our Conference will be mainly concerned with other problems, I think it would be well for us to decide to make a fresh effort to co-operate in the field of foreign policy. This effort should involve more than the mere resumption and continuation of discussions within Western European Union.

Past differences about who should participate in a well-defined form of co-operation in the foreign affairs field would disappear if the enlargement of the Community and political co-operation could be placed in the same perspective. In this way we could reaffirm the "finalité politique" of the Community in a wider circle without the areas of economic integration and political co-operation having to be completely identical.

I therefore propose that we instruct our Foreign Ministers to draft an agreement on the gradual development of political co-operation amongst the Member States of our Community, on the assumption that the Community will be enlarged.

At the moment the important thing is that we should agree amongst ourselves on our attitude to the topics to be discussed at an all-European conference. I hope that in the next few days our representatives on the NATO Council will help to make a constructive contribution here. There should be no shadow of doubt that, after careful preparations and with the participation of our American allies, we wish to help to find solutions which would mean greater security with fewer arms and make more practical East-West co-operation possible.

The growing integration of the economies of our six countries has made their overall economic development increasingly interdependent. Any economic disequilibrium between them now has a direct and rapid impact on the overall development of the Community. Inflationary tendencies in one country soon become a threat to the stability of another and to equilibrium within the Community. This leads to distortions and restrictions on movements of goods, services and capital; it also endangers the common agricultural market. This type of development can harm the Community as a whole. The only way of warding off the danger is to move more rapidly towards a stable, expanding Community.

My Government is willing to move along the road to economic and monetary union, soberly and realistically, step by step. Structural differences between our States, and the differences which still persist in our economic targets and behaviour, are facts which can only be changed by perseverance and joint efforts. Converging attitudes on the part of the main social groups will also be needed.

As a first step, effective co-ordination of short-term economic policy will need to go hand in hand with the harmonization of targets. In this context it is important to fix quantitative medium-term economic targets. If we succeed in elaborating a common economic policy in this way, it will be possible to implement economic and monetary union in a second stage.

Such a development will call for the creation of a European Reserve Fund. Here too I offer my Government's full co-operation. Once the necessary conditions exist, we will help to create the European Reserve Fund and to determine procedures for it. We would then be prepared to transfer a given proportion of our currency reserves into such a fund to be administered jointly with the proportionate reserves transferred by our partners.

The Federal Government has proved in the past that it is willing to practise solidarity in monetary matters. We would like to see the relevant Council decisions being given concrete form this very month.

We should also try to fix a deadline for the creation of the economic and monetary union in the sense of an outward-looking Community of stability. I suggest that the Council be asked to examine this important issue, to work out the detailed stages of a plan of this kind in close co-operation with the Commission and to adopt this phased plan during 1970.

If we take this decision we shall be giving a clear indication of our solidarity. Let us resolutely make a new start.

VI

We have all come to appreciate the need for co-operation between our countries in the scientific and technical fields; much has been said and written about this but we have been slow to act accordingly. A number of sensible proposals are now before the Community but they need to be embodied in a coherent technological policy for Europe. This calls for political decisions.

This is particularly true of Euratom. May I say quite frankly that it would be quite unacceptable and alien to the spirit of our co-operation if, while discussing the question of completion, development and enlargement, we were to allow the future of Euratom's Joint Research Centre, established at great expense, to be placed in jeopardy because we cannot agree on the provision and utilization of funds which are negligible in proportion to the estimated expenditure for the Community as a whole.

It seems to me that our present method of producing jointly approved and extremely detailed Community programmes confined to the nuclear field will not get us forward quickly enough. We cannot go into the details of the research programme here but we can, and I suggest that we do, show that we all want to settle the Euratom crisis. To this end we should agree to ensure the continued existence of the Research Centre, to extend its activities to non-nuclear fields and to introduce greater flexibility into its structure and methods of work.

VII

While I am on the subject of the Community's development I must say something about its institutions. We have to count on these institutions working in the way planned by the Treaties. This will really become evident when we reach the enlargement stage.

I suggest

- that the Council's method of working be tightened up
- that the Commission's executive functions be widened where required
- that the powers of the European Parliament be broadened, particularly by giving it budgetary control.

The structure of the Community must be brought into line with the principles of parliamentary control. In doing this, we must not lose sight of the principle of direct elections laid down by the Treaty.

we all press resolutely ahead with our structural policies and co-ordinate them in such a way that they will promote the growing-together of our national economies.

To ensure that there are no misunderstandings here, or in discussions over the weeks ahead, may I say quite frankly that I not only have to represent the interests of the German taxpayer but also the future of the German farmer. One of the planks of my domestic reform programme is the development of a modern and competitive agriculture.

This is the context in which we see the problem. It follows that the Federal Government will only be able to agree to the definitive financing arrangements if it can be sure that discussions of the surplus problem, in other words the reform of the market regulations, will begin immediately and be pursued energetically on the basis of ideas likely to lead to success. All member Governments will have to instruct their representatives on the Council to speed up proceedings energetically in co-operation with the Commission. The role hitherto played by prices cannot remain taboo in this connection. What we need is a concrete picture of the situation in good time to enable us to make an early assessment of our potential commitments.

Only then would the Federal Government be in a position to recommend that the legislature approve the financing arrangements. This approval is needed under Regulation 25 of 1962, which makes express provision for the initiation of the procedure described in Article 201 of the EEC Treaty.

The German Parliament naturally also sees an inner connection between farm financing and the enlargement issue. I have noted with satisfaction that other Governments have expressed the opinion that the farm system, including the financing arrangements, will have to remain adaptable, especially in view of the enlargement of the Community.

If we can reach agreement along these lines, the way will be open for the adoption of definitive agricultural financing arrangements. The Commission has made proposals for such a settlement to the Council which are of special value, seen as a whole. But it is no secret to any of us that extremely difficult decisions will have to be faced on individual issues in the weeks and months ahead.

IX

To this outline of my Government's attitude I would only like to add that we must choose between a courageous step forward and a dangerous crisis.

What I am saying here is what I have already said at home: the people of Europe are expecting and urging our statesmen to place the will to succeed on the side of the logic of history. Europe needs our success.

If I might refer once more to the younger generation, let me say that the Federal Government would like to see a European Youth Organization created. We feel encouraged in this by the success of the Franco-German Youth Office.

On the world scene our Community, while becoming stronger and larger, should pursue a twofold aim. First, by pooling its resources, it should enable Europe to hold its own economically, scientifically and technologically with the superpowers and in this way to preserve its identity. In the second place, it should put Europe in a position to make a vigorous contribution to the great task which is clamouring for more and more attention from the industrial countries: development aid.

We can render our ideals of peace and humanity no better service”.

*Address by M. Mariano Rumor
Italian Prime Minister*

(translation)

“This Conference of Heads of State and Governments of Europe, which you have convened at the welcome instigation of the French President, with the agreement of the other Community member Governments, makes it incumbent on us not to disappoint the expectations and the profound hopes of our peoples. Courage and vision, the necessary qualities which mark great historical choices, are required of us today. It is urgent that we should put an end to a period of uncertainty and stagnation and ensure that the peoples of democratic Europe realize that they have once more become masters of their own destiny. The complexity of the problems confronting us and the developments of world policy require that our discussions be marked by awareness of the situation and of the needs which arise from it, and inspired by maximum frankness and spirit of conciliation.

We must therefore recover the spirit and language of those who preceded us on the road to the creation of Europe. They raised up our continent again from the ruins of war precisely because, overcoming age-old rivalries, they were able to close a tragic chapter in our history in order to open another based on mutual understanding and solidarity.

The present Summit is the fourth in the history of our Community. I think I shall be expressing the general desire when I say that it will have to be the expression of an authentic political will to proceed, with full awareness of present trends, towards more incisive and concrete forms of integration and towards more closely aligned approaches to the question of enlarging the Community.

The discussions opened, which are to go on with the participation of the Commission, will have to show us the way to solve specially urgent problems on which the existence, development and future of our Community depend.

The success of the Community system, which cannot be ignored even by its opponents, is not only the prerequisite for the achievement by Europe of an economic and social dimension adequate to meet the challenge of our times, but is also the very condition for the construction of Europe as an entity capable of making its voice heard in the dialectical confrontation between the super powers, in response to historical developments in the world.

In the preparatory multilateral and bilateral meetings of this Summit conference, we agreed to attack the problems of the economic and political development of Europe from the starting point of the outline suggested by our French friends, who instigated the meeting, in the form of a "trptych" consisting of the completion, strengthening and enlargement of the Communities.

Let us consider this logical outline as a useful tool for identifying a set of problems, the solution to which will have to ensure the relaunching and the success of the European idea, but let us remember that the three parts of the "trptych" must be considered, not separately, but, in accordance with the terms of the Treaty, in their essential political unity.

It seems to us indeed that the solutions we find to the problems of completion cannot logically be divorced from those we find to the questions of strengthening and enlargement. What we have to seek and find is a constructive harmony. It is to be sure a difficult task, but a stimulating one.

On 1 January next the Communities will enter what the Treaties call the "final" period and we mean to face up to our obligations. It would however be sufficient merely to list the most important problems of strengthening to realize at once the profound changes likely in the coming years of Community activity in a world and in a continent which feel increasingly impelled towards authentic economic integration. We are in a historic period of great changes in international relations, in the scale of production, of technology and of science, in social structures, in the aspirations of nations to prosperity, to peace, to security and to freedom.

We must therefore — and this is certainly the wish in Italy — accomplish within the time limits of the Treaties and Community laws, the tasks necessary for the internal construction of our Community in a fair negotiation which takes into account the requirements of the parties, at the same time making the order so established impartial and thus as stable as possible. We must define the lines of the subsequent integration process to which we mean to pledge our countries and also those other European States which wish to join our Community; we must make a practical approach, with definitely determined procedures and dates, to the themes of Community enlargement. This task is rightfully set by the Treaties.

A great deal is at stake. In our view we can no longer confine ourselves to preventing a slowdown in the operation of the Community system.

Substantial economic and social integration is necessary in addition. For this purpose we are ready to make our contribution by approving a financial regulation for the common agricultural policy valid for the final period, based on a fair distribution of the burdens on the economies of the Member States, together with rules for the agricultural sectors, such as wine and tobacco, for which there is not yet a market organization, and the reform of the Social Fund. The Euratom multiannual programme will have to ensure the future of European co-operation in nuclear matters and the safeguarding of the Joint Research Centre.

But one need seems fundamental and cannot wait: a definite expression of our will to put in hand without delay and without vagueness all the necessary steps for the enlargement of the Community to include the countries which have applied to join it. The procedures, conditions and criteria, in the spirit and letter of the Treaty, must naturally be harmonized among the Six. But it is essential to end the vagueness concerning dates and procedures which surrounds this need on which there is also wide agreement among our public, which is bringing lively pressure to bear. It is moreover a matter of achieving geographical enlargement of our Community and making it more representative at the historical and cultural level, no less than on the political and economic plane.

In our view the end of March allows reasonable time to make the necessary preparations among the Six to set going constructive negotiations in earnest without delay.

But it is a political aim that has to be achieved. The delay in the process of political integration caused by the course of events and the failure of efforts in the meantime to get it moving again are the source of the situation of weakness and, let us admit it, inferiority to which Europe has fallen.

Europe as such is absent from the world dialogue.

On the political level, the necessary progress without which Community unity runs the risk of being confined to the sphere of economic relations with the rest of the world is not yet on a par with the economic and social consolidation of western Europe resulting among other factors from the security offered by the Atlantic Alliance.

It is obvious that the status of a politically united Europe would certainly not be inferior to the status the Community already has in the economic field. To reach such a target, it is however necessary to find a link between the requirements of those who call for the prior achievement of certain internal objectives and of those who look for the development of institutions capable of determining a common policy and ensuring democratic control. We cannot indeed

remain unaware that in each of our countries increasingly authoritative and numerous voices call for the control of the Community, with all the resources which are or will be at its disposal, by a Parliament elected by the people.

Not to give the Community political institutions would be to fall short of the demands of our peoples and all those outside our frontiers whose eyes are on Europe.

We should not forget that our work has served as a model for those in other continents who hope to find in unity a solution to their problems and a democratic answer to the wish to travel speedily along the road to economic and social progress.

As I have said, the dialogue between the great powers has for some time been continuing without Europe. Let us now be on the watch for developments which may affect the future of our own continent.

There is no doubt that of the vast assembly of world problems those concerning East-West relations, disarmament and the hope for a genuine relaxation of tension are of such pre-eminence as to determine the course of European policy in the years to come.

Our countries are today confronted with the beginning of the dialogue between the two great world powers, even if this is seriously hampered by the occurrences in Czechoslovakia. But relaxation of tension is an objective which cannot be given up. In the interests of the Czech people themselves, the dialogue had to be resumed and has been resumed. The discussions between the USSR and the USA, which precisely in the last few days have made a promising beginning in Helsinki, today induce us to express the most sincere hope of success.

But if this is our hope and if, at the same time, we recognize that America does not omit to consult its allies, we cannot fail to see the full extent of the difference there would be in the situation of Western Europe if it could express itself with its own voice, developing its own political unity, and coherently pursuing its own plans for enlargement.

This is the more true if we consider the East-West conference to which we have also devoted our attention within the Atlantic Alliance. Therefore, to achieve a genuine relaxation of tension and a stable and durable peace, it is necessary for a united Western Europe to be able to make its views felt on a problem which is essential to it.

The current situation in the Mediterranean should accordingly receive serious thought and should impel Western Europe to united and intensive action to bring stability to this area.

We cannot, however, hope for the achievement of this union without preparation, without overcoming difficulties, without creating the conditions for it by means of realistic solutions acceptable to all. It will therefore be an objective to be achieved in stages, but, we hope, at a progressive and steady pace.

These thoughts have prompted our earnest support of today's meeting.

We believe that it can and should lead to a pledge to find solutions to fundamental Community problems. We believe that the Community needs a fresh start capable of infusing faith and creating a turning point in the European situation. Let us safeguard the existence of our Community and consolidate our institutions; let us enlarge our boundaries geographically; let us at the same time reinvigorate the process of integration by means of structural action on all the necessary fronts, even if not covered by the Treaties of Rome, using all the energies of our countries and responding to the rightful and vigilant impatience of youth, which today thinks and acts with a European mind.

At this point we confront the particularly important problems in the development of a Community which is intent on becoming a new event in history: problems of culture, science and technology:

If we do not make the decisions, events will take over and leave us standing.

I know how complex the problems which I have been discussing are. The target is not easy to reach. We think nevertheless that it is not beyond the powers of our countries, provided that the Governments have the sincere determination to reach it and not to fail to rise to this historic occasion. From this city, whose name is inseparably linked with initiatives for peace and the creation of institutions destined to govern relations between States on a basis of law, we would like to see a new impetus start, which after Messina and Rome, will mark an important stage in European unity".

*Statement by M. Pierre Werner
Prime Minister of Luxembourg*

(translation)

"I would like to thank the Netherlands Government for bringing us together here in The Hague — at the instigation, moreover, of the French President to whom I am also happy to pay tribute — to give us an opportunity of assessing the Community's present situation and providing the political impetus needed to press ahead with the construction of Europe. I was privileged to attend the three earlier conferences. It is true that the tangible progress made there fell short of expectations but, despite divergences of opinion as to the

scale of a united Europe and means of achieving it, each of these Conferences showed that there was a willingness to push ahead towards the final goal of a strong, politically organized Europe.

The world expects more from this Hague Conference. It so happens that the Community is entering the definitive stage of its development as far as the precise, literal objectives of the Treaties of Paris and Rome are concerned. The transitional period laid down by the Treaty of Rome ends on 31 December of this year. Measures to implement the Treaty are not yet sufficiently advanced to meet this deadline. On the other hand, the dynamism inherent in pooling the energies and resources of advanced European countries is bound to lead to the expansion and development of the machinery and range of European co-operation and a widening of the geographic area in which it operates.

This advance is being frustrated by doctrinal quarrels and clashing national interests. Confusion and scepticism have gained ground over the years, particularly amongst the young, and have tainted the freshness and generosity of the European idea. Even quarrels about issues which are very real and very tangible to our people can admittedly be regarded as a form of European collaboration, albeit in terms of the conflict of interests. But I believe that we need to open up brighter, more striking and more hopeful prospects for the future. Not that we here, by waving a magic wand, can banish all the clouds, and produce formulae to deal with all the difficulties raised by the day-to-day working of the Communities. Far from it. The future pace of progress within the Communities will depend rather on our example, on our determination to give an unambiguous lead on a limited number of current issues charged with significance for the years ahead. Clear guidance is expected because international public opinion is beginning to wonder about the real strength of the European idea and the Community's place in the world.

The Hague Conference ought to go down in history as the meeting that confirmed the fundamental political and economic objectives of the Treaties and made further Community developments possible.

I would now like to review the three main issues facing us at this time, indicating the Luxembourg position on each of them.

A. Completion of the European Communities

1. In the communiqué to be issued when our talks end, our Governments should reaffirm their willingness to change over from the transitional period to the definitive stage of the European Economic Community at the end of 1969, and to accept all that this implies.
2. The EEC Treaty and derived Community law impose a number of requirements which the Member States must meet before passing to the definitive stage of the Common Market.

We can note with satisfaction that most of these have been met already or are on the point of being so.

3. The main problem to be dealt with before this deadline is reached is finalizing the definitive farm financing regulation.

Two essential elements of this definitive regulation — Community preference and financial solidarity — have already been accepted.

4. To facilitate the adoption of definitive financing arrangements before the end of the year, we must lose no time in finding ways of reducing and eliminating farm surpluses which are jeopardizing the very existence of the common agricultural policy. Market control is one of the essential elements on which the financial solidarity of the common agricultural policy must be based.

5. Secondly, and again with a view to smoothing the adoption of definitive farm financing arrangements, we must make headway with our studies and negotiations on the reform of European agriculture. This reform is imperative but it must be a gradual process to avoid unnecessary disturbances and to allow for the human and social factors involved.

6. Lastly, existing market organizations must be supplemented by arrangements for commodities such as tobacco and wine before the end of the year.

7. So far the Council of the European Communities has failed to agree on a new multiannual programme for Euratom. The uncertainty which has been hanging over this Community and the future of its research centres for a long time now cannot be allowed to continue. Scientific and technical research are as important for Europe's future and Europe's independence as the economic and customs union.

B. Enlargement

We are very pleased that there now seems to be a general feeling that the enlargement of the Community is desirable and not synonymous with weakening.

Negotiations with the applicants should therefore open as soon as possible, the Community negotiating from a joint approach to the problems raised by their admission, as has been the practice in negotiations of all kinds between the Community and non-member countries.

A decision must be taken before the end of the year on the completion of the Common Market and the changeover to the definitive period. Once this has been done the Community should arrive at a joint position, based notably on the Commission's opinions, during the early months of the New Year.

The final communiqué of the Hague Conference should also affirm that we are determined to open negotiations as soon as the Community has fixed its attitude to the problems posed by the membership applications by approving a negotiating mandate.

C. Strengthening the existing Communities

There is an urgent and pressing need for the Community to define policies to be implemented and action to be taken in a number of fields. If it fails to do so, there is a danger that the impact of the advantages of a large single market will be lost.

Such resolutions and directives, jointly drafted by the Six, could be referred to the applicants for membership so that common conclusions could be reached in conjunction with these countries.

As to the areas in which the Community could be strengthened, the first that comes to mind is monetary and financial co-operation. Recent monetary developments — and the repercussions and consequences of these for the common agricultural policy in particular — have proved that any common policy is likely to become precarious at a moment's notice until such time as the Member States take a decisive step towards monetary co-operation and the alignment of financial policies.

To create the conditions for economic union, economic planning and the co-ordination of short-term economic policies must develop side by side. Many people consider that the attainment of these objectives is the essential preliminary to monetary integration.

I am not convinced of this and I am very much afraid that if we refuse to accept a modicum of financial discipline of a Community nature a co-ordinated short-term economic policy will never see the light of day.

Recent events on the monetary scene threw the common agricultural policy into disarray and proved that economic and monetary policy form one indivisible whole. This is why my delegation advocates a programme which would lay greater emphasis on our willingness to advance in this field, which has both political and economic overtones.

A first step in this direction was taken with the Council's approval in principle of short-term monetary assistance between the Member States.

In addition, the Commission's proposals for medium-term financial co-operation and increased co-ordination of medium-term economic policies are to be discussed within the Council as soon as possible.

But, if we are to succeed, we must go much further than this. It is not for a meeting like ours to define the technical details of a programme for future monetary union. A number of possible and more or less daring approaches have been suggested.

Be that as it may, the Luxembourg delegation would be happy to see a reference in the final communiqué to our willingness to create a monetary union before a specified date by introducing a series of appropriate arrangements, mechanisms or agencies backed by the co-ordination of economic policies which these will be expected to stimulate.

D. Strengthening the institutions

Almost all our national Parliaments have made it clear that they are prepared to ratify the financial regulation and the allocation of the own resources to the Community only if the powers of the institutions are adjusted at the same time. Public opinion is running along the same lines.

Of course it can be argued that there is a close link between increased powers for the European Parliament and the election of its members by direct universal suffrage. I have no wish to deny this link but I cannot believe that its existence should prevent us from acting in either field.

We must progress on these issues in a realistic way, in step with advances achieved in other areas of European integration.

To sum up then, our final communiqué should affirm:

- (i) that our Governments are ready to change over to the definitive period of the Common Market at the end of the year;
- (ii) that they are prepared to shoulder on that date all the obligations imposed by the Treaty and derived Community law, and in particular to put the final touches to the definitive financing arrangements;
- (iii) that the Community should lose no time in producing a mandate for negotiations with the applicants for membership, these negotiations to begin once the mandate has been approved;
- (iv) that, side by side with the production of a negotiating mandate and parallel with the negotiations themselves, decisions will be taken in those areas in which the Community needs to be strengthened, including scientific and technical research, the gradual realization of monetary union and a common economic policy;
- (v) that this economic, monetary and financial strengthening is to be matched by a reinforcement of the institutional provisions of the Treaties to increase the powers and competence of the European Parliament and make provision for a first step towards the election of its members by direct universal suffrage.

E. Final remarks

Has the time also come to reopen the dossier on political co-operation as such? The Luxembourg Government is not opposed to this, since in the long run it is impossible to conceive of economic union coming to full flower without minimum co-ordination of foreign, cultural and defence policies. We feel, however, that in the early months the stress should be on strengthening the economic and political aspects of collaboration between the Six, using existing agencies to solve urgent problems.

This meeting of the leaders of our member countries, which is being attended by the institution we created to provide the inventiveness and objectivity which all communities must have if they are to advance, is taking place as the period allowed us in 1957 to take the decisive step towards the future we have decided to share draws to a close.

1. United by geography, our countries then wished to meet a challenge of the post-war years — an ideological challenge which threatened our humanist and individualistic civilization, a technological and economic challenge which threatened to reduce Europe to utter and complete dependence. We wished to take up this challenge with our inner strength and faith in our own destiny.

A page of history was turned in 1951 when our Governments met in Paris to sign the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community and declared that they were resolved “to lay the bases of institutions capable of giving direction to their future common destiny”.

2. This political objective, which led us to the road we have been travelling ever since, was confirmed in 1957 with the signing of the Treaties of Rome.

3. In the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, this political objective finds expression, not only in provisions mainly aimed at ensuring economic and social progress and a constant improvement in the living and working conditions of our people, but also in the introduction of genuine common policies.

4. The solid foundation on which our action is based is, like its final objective, an expression of our political readiness to advance towards an integration in which no-one loses his identity but which gives us new values, wider dimensions, increased power and more responsibility.

5. What we have created, and what still remains to be done, will only work smoothly and develop if we move steadily ahead. Recent years have taught us that any halts by the wayside or slackening of pace are dangerous and may even jeopardize what seemed to have been accomplished.

This is why we feel that our faith in this Community, a Community which our people wanted yesterday and still want today, should find concrete expression in a continuous process of creation which, without disregarding natural or economic laws, would stamp events with the indelible imprint of our Community resolve”.