Parliamentary Assembly
Assemblée parlementaire
https://pace.coe.int

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Doc. 8
20 May 1952

Integration of the O.E.E.C. and the Council of Europe

Report
Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy
Rapporteur: Mr Georges BOHY, Belgium, Socialist Group

A. Draft Recommendation

" The Assembly,

Considering that the welcome given by the Committee of Ministers to the British proposals accords with the wish of the Assembly that the Council of Europe shall become the organ of co-ordination of all European organisations ;

Recognising the difficulty raised by the differing membership of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation and the Council of Europe;

Believing that this difficulty might be overcome if, when considering economic matters, the Committee of Ministers were composed of representatives of all Member States of the Organisation for European Economic Co-opération; and if, when economic matters are under discussion, representatives from States which are Members of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation but not of the Council of Europe attended the Consultative Assembly as observers;

Recommends to the Committee of Ministers that the Member States of the Council of Europe, signatories of the Convention for European Economic Co-operation, enter into negotiations with the other signatory States in order to reach agreement on the steps to be taken for merging the organisation created by virtue of the said Convention with the Council of Europe. "

B. Explanatory Memorandum

1. Introduction

1. In paragraph 8 of the Report of the Committee of Ministers to the Consultative Assembly (4th Session, 1952 : Doc. 2) we are informed that the Committee of Ministers has adjourned consideration of the draft New Statute (3rd Session, 1951 : Recommendation 23) until such time as a decision has been reached on the proposals made by the United Kingdom for the future development of the Council of Europe. The report continues : " The Committee of Ministers will then be in a better position to make known its attitude in regard to the Assembly's proposals " . in regard to the Assembly's proposals " . It is, however, well known that the British proposals were made as an alternative to the draft New Statute, which had been found unacceptable to Her Majesty's Government. Some apprehension is therefore felt lest Recommendation 23 may in the event prove to have been adjourned sine die.

2. This position is especially unfortunate, because it assumes that the draft New Statute is a document which must be accepted or rejected as a whole. Mr. Mackay, my predecessor as Rapporteur for this question, went to great trouble to emphasize that : " The New Statute has been so drafted that each of the five proposals can be considered separately without the acceptance of one involving the acceptance of another. This is designed especially for the Committee of Ministers... ".

3. ft will be recalled that the five proposals were :

a. Integration of the O. E. E. C. and the Brussels Treaty Organization with the Council of Europe (Article 1 (d) and the First Protocol to the Statute) ;

b. Integration of the Specialized Authorities with the Council of Europe (Chapter VII and Second Protocol to the Statute);

c. Mandatory consultation (Chapter VI);

d. Convention-making (Chapter VIII)

e. Miscellaneous proposals, most of them already accepted (Chapter X — " Executive Agencies " — largely duplicates Chapter VII : " Specialized Authorities ").

The unity of the Recommendation as a whole lay in the fact that the proposals taken all together would have the effect of conferring on the Assembly powers greater than those of a mere consultative body without making of it, however, a federal legislative organ.

4. The only aim of these five proposals was progress " à quinze " . Had the aim been a degree of integration for a community limited to the six countries of the Schuman and Pleven Plans, it would have gone much further. Instead, it was decided to make a last attempt to re-codify the common ground existing between all fifteen countries, in the realization that the alternative was that the Council of Europe would be divided into " 1st and 2nd class Members progressing towards unity at different speeds and on different levels. The only criterion therefore whereby the draft New Statute can be judged is the degree to which it succeeded in finding a formula acceptable to the British and Scandinavians. In the Explanatory Memorandum it was stated, " The proposals contained in this Report have been designed to meet the British half-way" (3rd Session, 1951 : Doc. 68); and it was Mr. Mackay's belief, when he drafted the New Statute, that he had found a via media which the British would accept.

5. In the event these hopes were not realized. Britain's final answer (which is true both of a Conservative and of a Labour Government) was given by Mr. Eden in the statement he made at the meeting of the Committee of Ministers on :19th March, 1952 : " I cannot help feeling some doubt whether the Council of Europe will be taking the right road if it develops along the lines of the draft New Statute, which the Consultative Assembly adopted at its last Session. I need not enter into a detailed discussion of this draft now. But it appears to have as its aim the eventual transformation of what is now a purely consultative body into a quasi-federal institution with legislative and executive powers, and the right to be consulted by Member Governments on certain matters within its competence... »

6. This British rejection of the Mackay compromise, however, requires further elucidation. If we interpret the statement made by Mr. Eden in the light of the analysis of the draft New Statute contained in para. 3 above, we can see that the British Government has rejected :

a. Mandatory consultation;

b. Convention-making.

But there remain two further proposals :

a. Integration of the Specialized Authorities with the Council of Europe;

b. Integration of the O. E. E. C. and the Brussels Treaty Organization with the Council of Europe..

Of these the first is the subject of the new British proposals, which in fact correspond fairly closely to Chapter VII of the draft New Statute, as the Committee itself pointed out in the Resolution adopted 21st March, 1952; the second poses a question which has not yet been answered.

7. "With regard to the first of these proposals, the Committee on General Affairs, it may be recalled, in its Resolution of 21st March, 1952, reminded the Committee of Ministers of the contents of Recommendations 1 and 4 (1950) and Chapter VII •—• which in turn reflects the Report on Specialized Authorities (3rd Session 1951 : Doc. 13), and contains the chief ideas embodied in Chapter X of the draft New Statute concerning Executive Agencies). As the British proposals were made on 19th March, 1952, it is to be hoped that the Ministers' Deputies will have concluded their examination of them in time for the Ministers, when they meet on 22nd May, to refer them to the Consultative Assembly for its opinion. It will then be possible for the Assembly to consider how far the British proposals, as modified, fulfil the wishes of the Assembly.

8. What remains, and it is of the greatest importance, are the proposals contained in the draft New Statute for the integration of the O. E. E. C. and the Brussels Treaty Organization with the Council of Europe. These proposals are examined in the Third and Fourth Parts of this memorandum.

2. Co-operation of the Western nations : the general pattern

Overlapping

9. In paragraph 46 of the Ministers' Report we read that the Ministers had been considering Recommendation 11 for lowering European tariff barriers. The Report continues : " Previous to this Session, it was learnt that a special sub-committee of the Working Party set up by G. A. T. T. was due to meet in February, 1952 " to study essentially the same question. " It was learnt... " In this phrase is summed up all the confusion and overlapping among international Organizations which the West appears to regard as sufficient answer to the threats which surround it. The whole of the Ministers' Report teems with further examples. Thus paragraph 48 : " In March, 1951 the Secretary-General submitted to the Governments a preliminary draft Convention on the control of International Cartels. The attention of the Committee has since then been directed to the work carried out in this field by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC)"; Or again, paragraph 80 : " The Committee of Ministers has not been able so far to take action on Recommendation 19 (1951) concerning the protection in the event of war of works of artistic or historic value. The Brussels Treaty Organisation is at present examining a draft unilateral Declaration on this question which differs from that drawn up by UNESCO. In addition, the latter Organization is preparing an international Convention in this field. " Some of the further cases of overlapping mentioned in the Report are :

a. Information on national full employment policies already sent to O. E. E. C. (para. 40);

b. European Airline Companies : — O. E. E. C. studying whether it should concern itself with this problem (para. 51);

c. European housing problem, under study by the United Nations and O. E. E. C. (para. 66);

d. The ill-defined division of labour on the refugees question between the I. L. 0., P. I. C. M. M. E. (Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for Migratory Movements from Europe), the Council of Europe, the O. E. E. C. Manpower Committee, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. In addition, we are informed in Section III of the Ministers' Report that the Secretariat-General has entered into relations with nine other international organizations...

Public opinion

10. With the best will in the world, the average European citizen finds it difficult to give much attention to international affairs. His chief concerns are those which touch him most nearly, such as whether there will be a war; whether he will be able to afford enough food to eat if prices continue to rise ; the health of his family, or his amusements. The world of international conferences is quite beyond his ken, and, as he can see little connection between the results of their labours (if any) and his own pressing daily problems, he ceases to give the matter further thought. As a result, it is doubtful if 5 % of the population of Europe have any idea of what the initials O. E. E. C. mean, or whether the Council of Europe still exists. Apart from the general need

for showing the ordinary European the very real connection which exists between this international co-operation and his own personal activities, there are two major difficulties which must be overcome. The first is that the public is completely bewildered by an ever increasing flood of initials, such as M. D. A. P., M. S. A., O. D. M., 0. E. E. C, S. H. A. P. E., SACLANT, SACEUR, I.S.A.C., I. C. C. I. C. A., I. C. I: T. O., I. C. A. O., ECOSOC, G. A. T. T. and P. I, C. M. M. E., not to mention better known organizations such as I. L. O., W. H. O., F. A. 0. and UNESCO. The second is that even the well-informed public is uncertain as to the division of labour between these various organizations : what precise and separate functions does each fulfil, and what is the nature of the relationship between each of them? Thus, it is reported that Mr. Morrison, when British Foreign Secretary, wondered how he, as a member of the Ministerial Council of the 0. E. E. C, could send a report on the economic situation of Europe to himself as a member of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, then reply to himself, and, finally, draft a reply to that reply.

11. These difficulties might be largely solved, at least in Europe, if there were one central European organization, dealing with all forms of co-operation. The public might begin to take some interest; and some order would be introduced into the present confusion which we are pleased to call " the pattern of Western co-operation ". As our colleague, Mr. Boothby, has said, the West will never stop Russian tanks by a swarm of Committees; and the reforms indicated by common sense, but so far prevented by private interests, are long overdue.

3. The Brussels Treaty Organisation

12. The central arguments for including the social and cultural activities of the Brussels Treaty Organisation in the Council of Europe were set out by Mr. Mackay in a document presented to the Committee. The chief purpose of the Brussels Treaty Organisation was that of defence; in 1949 this passed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. Why, therefore, not simplify the position by merging the remaining social and cultural functions of the Brussels Treaty Organisation with the Council of Europe? This wish was expressed by the Assembly in Recommendation 19 (1950) adopted on 19th August, 1950 by 94 votes to 0, with 12 abstentions : " The Assembly, Recommends that the Committee of Ministers examine with the Consultative Council of the Brussels Treaty Powers the appropriate procedure whereby the social and cultural organisations of the Treaty might be incorporated in the Council of Europe and the activities of these organisations continued within the framework which the Council supplies, and expresses the hope that this transfer may be effected within a reasonable period of time. " On 23rd November, 1950 the Assembly renewed this hope in Recommendation 55 (1950) by 73 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions. The request was again renewed in May, 1951 (Reply to the Report and Message of the Committee of Ministers, Chapter II, paras. 2-3), and for the last time in Article 1 and the First Protocol to the draft New Statute, which was adopted by the Assembly by 62 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions on 11th December, 1951 (3rd Session, 1951 : Recommendation 23).

13. Meanwhile the Committee of Ministers had decided, on 2nd May, 1951, to transmit Recommendation 19 to the five of their own number who formed the Consultative Council of the Brussels Treaty Organisation. The reply of the Brussels Treaty Organisation to this Recommendation was accepted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 19th March, 1952, twenty months after the adoption of the original Recommendation (4th Session, 1952 : Doc. 2, Report of the Committee of Ministers, para. 26).

14. It should not be thought, however, that the opposition to Recommendation 19 was purely self-interested. Essentially the four Powers were loath to destroy any special link joining Great Britain with the Continent; and they felt, with the British, that they could perhaps go further in matters of, say, social and medical assistance, with the signatories of the Brussels Treaty than with some of the Member States of the Council of Europe. The recent use of Article 4 of the Treaty in the British guarantee to the European Defence Community reflects the same tendency. The question at issue, however, is whether the reply received from the Brussels Treaty Organisation is satisfactory.

15. In the Ministers' Report, these proposals are summarized as follows (para. 26) : "...the Secretariats-General will at regular intervals send each other copies of any social and cultural material likely to be of interest to their respective organisations. Consultation will also take place regularly. An annual Report on the social and cultural work of the Five Powers will be sent to the Council of Europe. The Chairman of the Consultative Council may be invited to present the Report to the Assembly. "

16. It seems clear, then, that the two Organisations remain separate, and to that extent there might appear to be a duplication of effort. On the other hand, let it be understood that the aim of the Assembly was not " empirebuilding " but rather to make the machinery of Western co-operation more efficient. In this context, it would seem that the Brussels Treaty Organisation should be regarded as an example of a regional

organisation (if not a partial agreement) among five Member States, analogous in some ways to the Scandinavian regional group which is being formed. The only conditions which it is the bounden duty of the Assembly to lay down would be (i) exchange of all documents and information; (ii) the submission of an annua] report by the Brussels Treaty Organisation to the Assembly. These are precisely the provisions foreseen in the new agreement.

17. A final consideration which suggests the acceptance of the reply of the Brussels Treaty Organisation is that, were Recommendation 19 to be re-stated at the same time as the Assembly once more requested the fusion of the Council of Europe and the O. E. E. C , this latter—and infinitely more important— development might be jeopardised.

18. If these arguments are valid, the appropriate course would be for the Assembly to take note of the new agreement with the Brussels Treaty Organisation, and to urge its rapid implementation. In particular, the Assembly should express its wish that the Chairman of the Consultative Council should present the first Report of the Brussels Treaty Organisation to the Assembly, as suggested in the Ministers' Report (para. 26), during the Second Part of the Fourth Ordinary Session to be held in September-October, 1952. At the same time the Assembly should reserve its right to reconsider the question of a complete fusion of the two organisations when the new and closer methods of co-operation have been given a fair period of trial.

4. The O. E. E. C.

The general case for integrating the 0. E. E. C. with the Council of Europe

19. The argument for simplifying tho "pattern of Western co-operation" has been put so many times in the Assembly and in the European press that there is no point in repeating it here. Rationalisation is as desirable in international co-operation as in economics. It is the argument of common sense.

20. The first consideration in the merger of any two organisations is whether their aims are the same. Thus, paragraph 6 of the 0. E. E. C. Convention of 16th April, 1948 cites the High Contracting Powers as being : " Determined to join together to make the fullest collective use of their individual capacities and potentialities, to increase their production, develop and modernise their industrial and agricultural equipment, expand their commerce, reduce progressively barriers to trade among themselves, promote full employment and restore or maintain the stability of their economies and general confidence in their national currencies. " It may well be asked in what way these aims differ from those set out in the Preamble and Article 1 (b) of the Statute of the Council of Europe. Indeed, if the text of the 0. E. E. C. Convention is compared with the Statute, the wording is seen to be almost identical. Why, then, are there two organisations instead of one?

21. The answer is simply an historical one. The various European organisations set up since the war were the result of no preconceived plan. On the contrary, they were purely ad hoc responses to given situations. Thus, the 0. E. E. C. was set up initially as the European organisation to administer Marshall Aid (" As their immediate task, the High Contracting Parties will undertake the elaboration and execution of a joint recovery programme " , Article 1 of the 0. E. E. C. Convention). Had the Council of Europe existed in 1948, its economic department could have been strengthened to perform just these tasks, and the overlapping of functions between the two organisations would never have taken place.

Why the arguments of common sense have not hitherto been followed

22. The answer is that, whenever an international organisation is formed, a kind of institutional sclerosis seems to set in, which effectively prevents any modification of the organisation's position or prerogatives. Our colleague M Rolin expressed this in the Assembly in May, 1951 : " I remember a remark of Aristide Briand who said, during the period when we were hoping to bring about a reduction in armaments : ' You see, the difficulty is that every time we scuttle a battleship wë send an admiral to: the bottom'. When we have created still more international organisations and we propose to co-ordinate them, we shall find that each time we try to scuttle one of them, we shall be sending a Secretary-General and a few permanent officials to the bottom. " (3rd Session, 1951 : Official Report, p. 54, col. 1.) Mr. Mackay also drew attention to this point in a document presented to the Committee, with regard, specifically, to O. E. E. C. : " The second difficulty is a delicate one to mention, but we believe it is better to face the issue frankly. It is that in 0. E. E. C. there is a body of 900[1]international civil servants, and there are some 200 in the Council of Europe. Both organisations have developed a sovereignty-consciousness : neither wishes to be ' eaten up ' by the other. And, because

1. Now reduced to 600.

parliamentarians and Ministers meet infrequently, these permanent civil servants do much to determine the political attitude of their respective organisations. To these fears, there are two replies. The first is that the proposed amalgamation will not lead to the suppression of posts. On the contrary, the administrative needs of a United Europe are growing every day, and the help of all able and experienced European civil servants is needed. There are not too many : there are too few. The second answer is more drastic : if Europe needs a single organisation rather than two, then the private interests of certain civil servants must not be allowed to prevent it. " Now, as parliamentarians we are well prepared to admit that able and experienced international civil servants should have some security of tenure. Nevertheless, if it is really a European interest that the Council of Europe and the O. E. E. C. should be merged, then surely this should be the primary consideration overriding all others?

How serious is the amount of overlapping between the two Organisations?

23. There is no point now in going back over the examples of duplication of effort in the past. Sufficient indication is to be found in the Report of the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, which has just been submitted to us (4th Session, 1952 : Doc. 2). In this document we note :

a. duplication in regard to information concerning national full employment policies (para. 40) ;

b. the only result of the Assembly's Recommendation for a Raw Material Resources and Purchasing Board is that the O. E. E. C. has been " requested to include in its report to the next Session of the Assembly an account of the present stage of international co-operation in the matter of raw materials " (para. 4 1) ;

c. in the matter of the Association of European Airline Companies, proposed by Count Sforza, we are told " a special Working Party was recently appointed to consider whether the O. E. E. C. should concern itself with the question " . And, pending a decision by this Working Party, " the Committee of Ministers decided to defer further action on this Recommendation (para. 51);

d. in the question of housing, the Committee of Ministers promises it " will not fail to inform the Assembly of the results achieved in this matter by O. E. E. C. and the United Nations " , while " duplication of effort" is specifically mentioned by the Ministers themselves concerning Recommendation 14 (c) (para. 66) ;

e. the activities of 0. E. E. C. in the refugee question have already been touched upon (cf. Section 9 (iv) above.

Some attempt has been made, it is true to deal with such a confusion of functions. But the net result of the efforts made in three years to establish co-operation between the two organisations on the official level (as distinct from those of the Liaison Committee, which has done very useful work) is summarised as follows : " The Committee of Ministers at its Tenth Session gave its approval to a proposal enabling the Secretary-General to consult with his opposite number in 0. E. E. C, in order to obtain technical counsel or any other information likely to assist in solving the problems with which the Ministers[2]have to deal. " (4th Session, 1951 : Doc. 2, Report of the Committee of Ministers, para. 23).

The need that 0. E. E. C. has for the support of public opinion

24. Officials of O. E. E. C. recognise that the greatest difficulty experienced by their Organisation arises from the fact that it has no direct contact with public opinion. This the parliamentary Assembly at Strasbourg could provide; and it is the realisation of this need that accounts for the fact that the O. E. E. C. now sends its Reports to the Assembly. Mr. Mackay pointed out in this connection in a document presented to the Committee : " The measures worked out in 0. E. E. C. involve the very economic existence of ordinary men and women. Any attempt to move further towards the aim of free movement of goods and human beings in Western Europe will affect the employment patterns of wide sections of the European community, and they will only be accepted if the body in which they originate is in the closest touch with public opinion. What is more, parliamentarians must bring home to their constituents just what these measures will mean to them as individuals, and why they are necessary. "

Earlier Recommendations of the Assembly

---

2. All the States which are represented in the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe are likewise represented in the Ministerial Council of the O. E. E. C.

25. The history of Recommendation 18 (1950) from the Assembly side was as follows : it was adopted on 18th August, 1950, by 94 votes to 0, with 12 abstentions; renewed on 23rd November, 1950 in Recommendation 55 (1950) and again renewed in the Reply to the Report and Message of the Committee of Ministers in May, 1951. In the draft for a New Statute the original proposal for a " Common Council " was developed into an outright Recommendation for a merger of the two organisations (Article 1 of the First Protocol), and this the Assembly adopted by 62 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions. (3rd Session, 1951 : Recommendation 23).

26. Recommendation 18 was considered by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in November, 1950, when it was transmitted to the O. E. E. C. The O. E. E. C. had meanwhile, on 5th January, 1951, been seized of a very similar Swedish proposal, drafted by M. Hammarskjôld, and eventually, on 12th July, 1951, the Council of the O. E. E. C. set up a Committee to examine the whole problem of the relations of O. E. E. C. with other international organisations. Meanwhile, Recommendation 17 (1950) for the use of O. E. E. C. experts by the Assembly had given rise to the creation of a Council of Europe/O. E. E. C. Liaison Committee. The decision of the O. E. E. C. Committee on Recommendation 18, which was originally made in August, 1950, was not made known until March of this year. And in the Ministers' Report we now read : " The implementation of these proposals met with certain difficulties, largely owing to the fact that the two organisations have not the same membership " . (4th Session, 1952 : Doc. 2, para. 25). Early this year your Rapporteur was given to understand unofficially by a senior official of O. E. E. C. that " the question was no longer of political importance ".

The present position, May, 1952

27. The question of "political importance" has, however, assumed a somewhat different complexion in the interval. Two specific developments have occurred :

a. O. E. E. C. has not been absorbed into N. A. T. 0.;

b. With the end of Marshall Aid (30th June, 1952) the rôle of the 0. E. E. C. has been reduced to administering the E. P. U., making recommendations to its own Council, and making Reports to the Consultative Assembly. Since it no longer has large funds at its disposal, (a fact which has led to a considerable reduction in its staff), it has become largely a consultative and co-ordinating body, not dissimilar to the Council of Europe itself. There are also, of course, the vertical committees of the O. E. E. C. which still exist, and the recently established Steering Board for Trade.

These facts indicate that, although O. E. E. C. has lost its erstwhile position, both the European countries and the U. S. A. wish there to remain a purely European economic organisation. Equally, neutral countries, like Sweden, could not remain members if 0. E. E. C. were absorbed into N. A. T. 0. This latter development, which appeared likely during last summer because half of the time of the ablest O. E. E. C. officials was devoted to the preparation of the report by the Three Wise Men, is now less likely because N. A. T. 0. has established its separate economic staff (Secretariat), even if certain national delegations to the two organisations are the same.

28. This position of O. E. E. C.—an organisation which has, over a number of years, collected under its wing a unique group of economists versed in European problems—must be viewed in the light of Mr. Eden's proposals concerning the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe is destined to become the central co-ordinating body for all the various European organisations and Specialised Authorities. Moreover, O. E. E. C. has itself always felt the lack of a sounding-board for public opinion such as the Assembly represents. What therefore more natural than that the two organisations should be merged?

29. The only practical difficulty (apart from the permanent one of the " sovereignty " of international organisations) is that cited by the O. E. E. C. ad hoc Committee, namely differing membership. This question (Austria, Portugal, Switzerland and Trieste are concerned), was of course, carefully considered by the Committee on General Affairs when it adopted the draft New Statute. The solution proposed by the Committee was that the States who were members of both organisations should not refer the Recommendation of the Assembly to a body other than the Council of Europe for decision, as occurred with Recommendation 18 (1950), but should negotiate directly between themselves, by-passing the Council of 0. E. E. C, and thus avoiding any possible veto by the States not members of both organisations. At the same time, it was fully expected and desired that Switzerland and the other countries should remain closely associated. This proposal was never considered by the Committee of Ministers because consideration of the whole draft New Statute was adjourned sine die.

30. The present position seems to be that any new Recommendation which merely repeated Article I of the First Protocol to the draft New Statute would be rejected. It is necessary to justify a Recommendation by :

a. Adducing new political circumstances;

b. Overcoming the difficulty represented by the fact that Portugal, Austria, Switzerland and Trieste are members of 0. E. E. C. but not of the Council of Europe.

The first of these conditions has been fulfilled by the British proposals, which present a real chance of rationalising the whole tangled position of European international organisations in one move. The whole principle of the British proposals is that the Council of Europe should be the co-ordinating body for all existing and future European organisations. Thus the Coal and Steel Community and the European Defence Community are to be the Council of Europe working à six for certain specific matters. If the Schuman Plan and the E. D. C. can thus be integrated with the Council of Europe, why cannot the 0. E. E. C ? We therefore feel that the Eden proposals have provided the " new political circumstances " which make another attempt to solve the problem both realistic and likely to succeed. At the same time, we believe that the Eden proposals have provided a formula for solving the second difficulty of differing membership. For this second difficulty remains. Portugal, Austria, Switzerland and Trieste are members of the 0. E. E. C, but not of the Council of Europe. If this were accepted at its face value, it would mean that, once set up, 0. E. E. C. could never cease to exist unless all member States agreed. In fact, under such conditions certain member States would withdraw. A solution must be-found to this problem, if any new Recommendation is to avoid the fate of its predecessors. One formula that might be considered is that, just as the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe will now meet à six to consider Schuman Plan questions, and à quinzeto consider consultative questions, so it should meet à dix-huit when considering 0. E. E. C./E. P. U. questions. This would still permit Canada and the U. S. A. to attend as Associate Members. Austria already sends observers to the Consultative Assembly, and Portugal and Switzerland could he invited to do so when O. E. E. C./ E. P. U. matters came under discussion[3].

31. Two last points are important. The first is that this is a political question, not an economic one. It is therefore within the competence of the Committee on General Affairs, not the Committee of Economic Questions. The 0. E. E. C./Council of Europe Liaison Committee is by-passed by the proposal made here, which, while recognising the useful work performed by that Committee, goes to the root of the question of the relationship between the two organisations.

32. The second point is a question of expediency. The Eden proposals for the future of the Council of Europe have made every Member Government reconsider its whole attitude towards the various European organisations, and the time is thus peculiarly opportune to rationalise the whole position. If the tide of interest created by those proposals is allowed to ebb without our achieving the integration of the 0. E. E. C. and the Council of Europe, then the opportunity will have been lost. In any case, the delays imposed by the cumbrous procedure of adopting a Recommendation for subsequent consideration by Committees of Experts, and eventually by the Committee of Ministers, means that a Recommendation which the Assembly adopts in May, 1952 will not be seriously considered by Governments before July. If the Assembly itself does not find time to adopt a Recommendation until the Second Part of the Session in September-October, it means that the Recommendation will receive no effective consideration before 1953. For these reasons, it would be a fatal error to let the opportunity slip. The Liaison Committee is functioning well : let it continue to do so. It represents a "functional approach" to the relationship of the two organisations. It will continue to exist, even if this Recommendation is not adopted by the Committee of Ministers. But the Assembly should not for this reason lose the chance of making a more radical approach to the problem, such as is presented by the Eden proposals and the strong current of feeling that European international organisations should be rationalised.

Discussion in committee

33. After giving careful consideration to the Explanatory Memorandum of the Rapporteur, and especially to Sections 32 and 34 thereof, the Committee on General Affairs adopted the following draft Recommendation unanimously, which it submits to the Assembly.

---

3. It is worthy of noto that Austrian representatives also attended the Expert Committee on Patents, as did representatives from Switzerland. Both countries also sent representatives to the Agricultural Conference which was held in Paris, 25th-28th March, 1952.