

time." Well, he's naturally entitled to that view. It isn't my view and it isn't the view of many of us in Europe. We think that in order to make certain that you Americans will come to our rescue in 20 years' time we must intertwine our vital interests on both sides of the ocean to such an extent that it will be natural for you to come to our rescue, and that it will remain natural for you to do so even beyond that. It is against that background that we view the integration of Europe as we conceived of it in 1954.

It was a rather revolutionary thing, you know. Your former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, who was in Holland about a month ago, or six weeks, spoke on this very subject. He compared the Common Market as launched in '58, with the American Revolution of 1776. He said, "This development in Europe is just as revolutionary as our revolution was in the 18th Century." And why? Because in the Common Market we have accepted in principle the majority decision, a qualified majority with weighed votes; two things at the same time; things that we have been discussing for years in the United Nations without being able to make them come true - because every nation there resents the idea that it may have a vote that weighs less than the vote of someone else. But we have accepted the principle, to be applied gradually, so that in the last stage of the Common Market - as you know, we have given ourselves 12 years to build the thing - an increasing number of major decisions may be taken by a qualified majority.

It means that we have signed away the old-fashioned notion of national sovereignty. It means that in the Common Market, in the last