

This Schuman Plan Assembly is expected to serve also the European Defence Community. When it meets, however, to consider problems concerning the European Army, France, Germany and Italy, as the largest contributors in money and men, will have an additional three delegates, giving them each twenty-one votes. In the Council of Ministers for the European Defence Community there will also be a weighted voting procedure to take into account the differences in the contributions of the various member-states. The normal method of taking decisions in this Council will be by majority vote. Since there will be six ministers, it was necessary to find a procedure to deal with cases where the voting results in a tie. Whenever this happens, the side which includes the nations making two-thirds of the aggregate contribution in funds and manpower would be considered to have the majority. In cases where a two-thirds majority is required, the four countries in the majority would have to include those providing two-thirds of the budget and troops. In some cases, however - they will be few but important - the Council of Ministers will only be able to give directions to the executive body of the European Defence Community by unanimous voting.

These are all very important developments in the field of European international organization and they would have been unthinkable twenty years ago. There are, however, those on this continent who are impatient because more progress has not been made, and who think that during the last five years, all national boundaries should have been eliminated in Western Europe, all national traditions and loyalties lost in the larger European concept.

The surprising thing, however, is not that so little has been done, but so much. As President Truman said in his message to Congress on March 6, Europe "has moved faster toward integration in the last five years than it did in the previous five hundred". Our impatience, in fact, might well be directed, not at the Europeans but at those who, in Mr. Walter Lippmann's words, produce "grandiose and superficially conceived schemes for remaking Europe by the end of last week."

We in North America should, I think, be hesitant to try to apply the patterns and the formulae of our own federations to other peoples and other regions of the world. The happy circumstances and conditions which made possible the creation of the American union and the Canadian federation may not be paralleled elsewhere. Countries have different histories and traditions and the solutions to their problems may not necessarily be found in consolidating or adapting existing political forms and institutions. New situations may call for entirely new ideas, new solutions, some of which may be as yet unknown to the students of political science.

Impatience is also being shown in another direction. It is argued that European unity is not only too late; it is too little; that there must be Atlantic Federation or Union, if the Western World is to prosper, or even to survive. So proposals to this end have been made and are being actively pursued.

In all such proposals a distinction should, of course, be made between those which are based on the participation of governments as units, and those under which representatives will be directly elected to international bodies by the people of the participating countries. The latter, if they exercise real powers, come much closer to what we usually describe as a federation. By analogy with existing federal states, a