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INTRODUCTION

BY SIR GEOFFREY DE FREITAS, KCMG, MP (UK)

One of the founders of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference

I congratulate Mr. Harned* and Dr. Mally** on this timely study. It has been undertaken because of growing concern in Western Europe and North America over the proliferation of Western parliamentary institutions. Their overlapping powers, membership and activities result in duplicated effort, overwork of parliamentarians and confusion as to the purpose of the various bodies.

The study seeks more efficient alternatives by analysing various proposals for improving the existing parliamentary assemblies. In this context it deals with their possible rationalisation and evolution into one consultative assembly representative of Western Europe and North America which could serve as a parliamentary basis for some future Atlantic partnership.

Some of us who have, over many years, advocated an Atlantic assembly are disappointed that so little has been achieved. But in fact we have come a long way since 1951 when it was considered remarkable that members of the United States Congress and of European Parliaments should debate together. We must not give up.

*Mr. Joseph Harned is an American staff member of the Atlantic Institute.
**Dr. Gerhard Mally is an Austrian research fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.

March, 1965
“Principles find their visible embodiment in institutions which when accepted by the people, are the cement holding society together. The form of these institutions is never rigid. Their purpose is to protect individual freedom and human dignity and to allow their development. They have to adapt themselves to social and intellectual developments. They are subject to a perpetual process of refinement and improvement.”
Hans Kohn (1).

PART I

The Problems

There exist today eight major intergovernmental organizations within the Atlantic community, namely the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (3), the Council of Europe (4), Western European Union (WEU), the European Communities (EEC, ECSC, EURATOM), the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the Nordic Council and the Benelux Economic Union. While the statutes of OECD and EFTA do not provide for separate parliamentary bodies, the remaining six organizations do have their respective parliamentary assemblies: the NATO Parliamentarians’ Conference (NPC, an unofficial body, Paris), the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (Strasbourg), the European Parliament (Strasbourg), the Western European Union Assembly (Paris), the Nordic Council (Oslo), and the Benelux Inter-parliamentary Consultative Council (Brussels).

Five of these six bodies are of consultative or deliberative nature, the exception being the NATO Parliamentarians’ Conference which is an ad hoc body; none of them has legislative powers. Though OECD has a parliamentary affiliation with the Council of Europe Consultative Assembly, this arrangement is unsatisfactory insofar as the Council of Europe’s membership does not include all OECD countries (e.g., both Canada and the United States are excluded). NATO, the second largest “Atlantic” organization, is supported by an unofficial conference of parliamentarians.

On the other hand, the largest “European” body, namely the Council of Europe, has had a consultative assembly, with official
character, since 1948. (In view of the fact that the parliamentary bodies of WEU, the European Communities, the Nordic Council and the Benelux Union deal primarily with regional matters, they will not be covered in this report.)

Thus certain major factors may be isolated: there exists one European assembly with a membership encompassing the other European bodies, namely the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, in which the great majority of the European members of OECD and NATO are represented. However, while it appears that both OECD and NATO need a parliamentary back-stop, neither the Convention establishing OECD (OECD), nor the Treaty of Washington provide for such an assembly. Moreover, the efforts of the NATO Parliamentarians’ Conference to “formalize” its status and become a consultative assembly for NATO have not yet met with success.

While the need for an Atlantic assembly with deliberative powers has become increasingly evident, it is generally acknowledged that the creation of a new assembly would lead only to greater dispersion of competence among existing bodies and make the parliamentarians’ problem of attending sessions of seven assemblies almost insoluble. Most of the itinerant delegates in Europe and America are already overburdened by present commitments to their respective national parliaments and the six Western assemblies. It is against this background that a change of the status quo has become imperative.

PART II
Reform Proposals

The first official initiative for a meeting between European and North American parliamentarians came from the Council of Europe in Strasbourg. Its Committee of Ministers adopted a resolution on March 17th, 1951, stating that “the Committee would welcome any initiative of the Assembly designed to establish links with the Canadian Parliament and the United States Congress”. (5) When the Consultative Assembly met in May of that year, it unanimously adopted a resolution (May 12th, 1951) in which it called for a meeting in Strasbourg “between delegations of the U.S. Congress and the Consultative Assembly . . . to discuss problems of common interest”. (6) Under the terms of the resolution, the European and American delegations
were to meet on equal footing; the problems under consideration were to be primarily those of the Atlantic area. An observer noted at the time: "during the May session of the Strasbourg Assembly, a number of statements were made which reflected a swing towards the broader Atlantic approach to a solution of the problems of the Western world". (7)

The response from the other side of the Atlantic came promptly. On June 28th, 1951, a Concurrent Resolution was tabled in both American Houses of Congress, proposing that the Consultative Assembly's invitation be accepted. (8) Thus the first meeting between European and American legislators took place in Strasbourg from November 19th-23rd, 1951. It was opened by Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak, then Chairman of the Delegation from the Consultative Assembly, who welcomed the members of Congress and expressed the hope that the joint meeting might deepen the friendship between the United States of America and the people of Western Europe. (9) Lord Layton, a British member of the European Delegation, later reporting on the conference, stated that "the meeting of Americans and Europeans at Strasbourg, was vigorous and colourful. There was, of course, common ground between the two sides on the need for pressing on with the unification of Europe. What is new—and valuable—is the reaction of a representative group of Americans to the situation which they found in Europe. Their speeches insisted not only on the need for unity in Europe, but also on the wide extent to which this opinion prevails in the United States". (10)

There is little doubt that the Strasbourg meeting contributed to a better understanding of the common problems between the European and American delegates. In the words of one of the early advocates of an Atlantic assembly, Senator Guy M. Gillette: "the Strasbourg conference will be regarded as an important step forward and as a valuable precedent. It is true that this new legislative form of co-operation was only a temporary bridge across the Atlantic. But there appears no compelling reason why this temporary bridge should not be replaced later with a more durable structure capable of bearing a much heavier and more continuous flow of traffic. There is need for a continuing trans-Atlantic forum where legislators can co-operate in solving common problems". (11) The former Democratic Senator from Iowa went on to suggest the permanent institutionalization of such a meeting: "I would welcome the creation of a North Atlantic Assembly, and I believe people in all the Atlantic countries
would also welcome it. I should like to see an Atlantic Assembly that brings the peoples' representatives together for free and frank debate on the issues that are affecting the well-being and the lives of all of us who live in the Atlantic community". (12)

Senator Gillette's proposal of November 20th, 1951, served as the basis for an informal conference of Canadian and American legislators which met in Ottawa to discuss questions relating to "Atlantic Union". In a resolution adopted on May 1st, 1952, these legislators called for "the creation of a North Atlantic Assembly, composed of parliamentary representatives of the people concerned which will have as its objective the implementation of Art. II of the North Atlantic Treaty." (13)

In Europe as well these ideas continued to gain acceptance. In examining the possible establishment of a liaison between existing Western institutions, a prominent European official, writing under a nom de plume, suggested that "the moment has come for closer co-operation between the Council of Europe and NATO. It might, for instance, be possible for agreements to be reached between the two bodies for the exchange of information . . . following the OEEC example; NATO might also be invited to submit questions to the Council of Europe for consideration both by the Committee of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly." (14)

The necessity for an Atlantic organizational framework was again stressed shortly thereafter by Sir Anthony Eden in the so-called "Eden Plan". Launched in spring, 1952, the plan was elaborated upon in an address to the Consultative Assembly in September of that year. The British statesman, commenting on the proposed European federation, expressed his belief that "an Atlantic and not a purely European framework will be needed to keep the policies and development of the new federal unit in line with the interests of the free world". (15)

Thus, as early as January, 1953, Livingston Hartley could predict that the manifest interest in a consultative North Atlantic assembly "appears likely to grow as the need for means of promoting the unity of the Atlantic Community becomes more apparent. Establishment of such an assembly, moreover, is one of the most practicable steps toward greater unity open to the North Atlantic nations at this time". (16) With confident foresight, Mr. Hartley outlined the possible advantages of taking this step. Among these, he included the likelihood of the growth of a sense of "community" among the NATO peoples through public
debate in the Assembly by well-known legislators; the stimulating effect of the Assembly's recommendations on the NATO Council and national bodies; and the possible evolution of a common Atlantic policy-basis towards the rest of the world. (17) The purpose, membership, location, functions and scope of activity of such a North Atlantic Assembly, including its relationship to NATO, were also examined. (18) While the author stressed that the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe would indeed provide the best model for a North Atlantic Assembly, he added that the latter should not be amalgamated with the former. Instead, he proposed a new parliamentary organ for NATO and called for annual meetings of parliamentarians of all NATO countries. The resolutions emanating from this new "NATO Consultative Assembly" would be presented to the NATO Council and (or) the national legislatures. As well, the NATO Council might submit an annual report to the Assembly which would in turn study questions referred to it by the Council and make recommendations. (19)

In a subsequent article, Mr. Hartley elaborated on the organization, selection of delegates, representation of members, voting requirements and financing of the proposed assembly. (20) Possible arguments against the creation of a new Atlantic Consultative Assembly were considered, particularly that of its uneconomical effect (proliferation of institutions). Any amalgamation between the Council of Europe and NATO was thought to be unrealistic, "in view of the basic differences between these two overall organizations. . . . It would require a fundamental transformation of the Council of Europe, the withdrawal of some of its members, and the loss of many of its functions. It seems both easier and wiser to create a new North Atlantic consultative mechanism than to remove so many wheels from the existing European machinery." (21)

As to the means of establishment of such an Atlantic body, Mr. Hartley envisaged the signing of a treaty or statute by the NATO governments following a preliminary conference of legislators from NATO countries. He concluded: "The primary problem is whether a consultative North Atlantic assembly would contribute enough to the unity of the NATO countries to be worth creating. . . . If it would . . . the first step towards its establishment is to promote serious consideration of its potentialities by the legislators, governments and peoples of the North Atlantic Community." (22)
In the fall of 1953 a new, semi-official call was made for the creation of an Atlantic advisory body by the Second International Study Conference on the Atlantic Community (the forerunner of the Atlantic Treaty Association), held at Copenhagen from August 30th to September 5th, 1953. Its first commission adopted the following resolution: "The Conference . . . considering that public and parliamentary support of NATO as well as mutual understanding and the growing sense of community between the Atlantic peoples could be effectively promoted by regular meetings of their elected representation; recommends to the North Atlantic Council and its member governments that they consider favourably the creation within the framework of NATO of a conference, advisory in nature, representative of the parliaments of member nations, which would meet periodically to discuss common problems concerning the development of the Atlantic Community, in particular those relating to the implementation of Art. II of the Treaty." (23)

This unofficial call for an Atlantic advisory body was followed by an official one in December, 1953, when the then Secretary General of NATO, Lord Ismay, submitted to the Ministerial Conference of the NATO Council the following recommendation: "The Council in Permanent Session has recently agreed, as a first step, to suggest that member governments should encourage the setting up of groups of parliamentarians especially interested in NATO. These groups might develop their own contacts with each other and may perhaps wish to have a combined meeting, say in Paris, to discuss matters of common interest. The international staff would, of course, give all possible information and technical assistance." (24)

Lord Ismay's recommendation provided the incentive for a number of parliamentarians to support the idea of an Atlantic consultative assembly in their own legislative bodies during the following year. It gave encouragement to Senator Wishart McLean Robertson, then Speaker of the Canadian Senate, to form the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association, and to Mr. Finn Moe, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, as well as to Sir Geoffrey de Freitas, KCMG, British Member of Parliament, to advocate the creation of an Atlantic consultative assembly.

Speaking at the House of Commons on January 21st, 1954, Sir Geoffrey de Freitas, who—as a member of the British Delegation to the Council of Europe—had supported the idea of an
Atlantic assembly since 1951, declared: “Over the last three years I have been talking on various occasions of the desirability of creating a Council of the Atlantic (deriving) from the Council of Europe. An Atlantic assembly, based on the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, would bring parliamentarians of the Atlantic countries together to debate common problems. ... I offer this consultative assembly ... as a most important forum of debate for the formation of opinion amongst the parliamentarians of the Atlantic.” (25) Mr. de Freitas thus supported the thesis that the Council of Europe should develop into an Atlantic assembly and suggested as its possible seat Quebec, Canada. (He did not, however, propose a consultative assembly of NATO, because of the difficulties for the Neutrals to join as full members in such a body.)

The efforts of these parliamentarians were assisted by the sponsors of the “Declaration of Atlantic Unity” who, on October 4th, 1954, called for “the creation of an advisory Atlantic assembly, representative of the legislators of the member nations, which would meet periodically to discuss matters of common concern.” (26)

Throughout 1954, both the sponsors of this Declaration and the Secretary-General of NATO were instrumental in arranging the discussions between leading parliamentarians of Europe and North America which eventually resulted in the first “Conference of Members of Parliament from the NATO countries” in 1955. The meeting, initiated primarily by the Hon. Finn Moe of Norway and the Hon. Wishart McLean Robertson of Canada, was held at the Palais de Chaillot in Paris from July 18th-23rd, and attended by 200 delegates from the 15 NATO countries. Though this was not an official “NATO conference”, the Palais de Chaillot was placed at the disposal of the legislators from the Atlantic Community through the courtesy of Lord Ismay and his staff. After the election of Senator Robertson as President of the Conference, and briefings on NATO by Lord Ismay, General Gruenther, Field Marshal Lord Montgomery, General de Chassey and others, the General Debate was opened. The delegates were primarily occupied with matters affecting the future of the Conference. The basis for discussions on this subject was a Canadian proposal for the creation of national NATO parliamentary groups in all 15 countries and for these to be linked by an International NATO Parliamentary Association, as well as for the establishment of a permanent Secretariat which should arrange an annual confer-
ence at Paris. Because many delegates had expected the issue of a parliamentary Atlantic Consultative Assembly to be a major point for debate, it was an anti-climax to find that discussion centred on the status of the proposed Secretariat. Opposition to the Canadian draft resolution calling for national parliamentary groups and an International NATO Parliamentary Association was mainly due to the already numerous commitments besetting Members of Parliament; as to the status of the Secretariat it was agreed that it should function on a part-time basis. The final resolution, adopted unanimously, established the Conference unofficially: "The present meeting of the parliamentarians of the NATO Group invites the Speakers of the various Parliaments concerned, according to the procedure which they think appropriate, to send delegations to a similar meeting each year". (27)

Shortly after the end of the first Conference of NATO Parliamentarians in Paris, a renewed initiative for closer Atlantic unity came from Washington. Hearings were held before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate July 25th and 29th, 1955, on a "Resolution Relating to the Calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention", previously sponsored in 1949 and 1951 by the late Senator Kefauver and fourteen other Senators. In this Concurrent Resolution the American President was requested to invite the other NATO members to name delegates to a convention for the purpose of exploring means of further unity among the democracies. (28)

New initiatives were being taken in Europe as well. At the end of 1955 the "Friends of Atlantic Union" in London published a pamphlet in which two approaches to an Atlantic assembly were presented, one proposed by Mr. Donald McLachlan, the other by Sir Geoffrey de Freitas. While both British writers favoured the creation of an Atlantic assembly, they disagreed on the form that it should take. The basis of their disagreement was that Mr. McLachlan called for an Atlantic assembly additional to, and independent of, the Council of Europe; while admitting that there would be overlapping, he felt at that time that if the Council of Europe were used as a nucleus for an Atlantic assembly, its neutral members would almost certainly feel bound to withdraw (since they could not participate in debates concerning NATO's military problems). He was against the proposed enlargement of the Council of Europe into an Atlantic assembly, since "such a merger, even if it were possible, would weaken the European unity movement without strengthening the Atlantic idea
... I suggest that it would be better to risk some overlapping between the Atlantic assembly and the Council of Europe". (29)

Sir Geoffrey de Freitas saw the problem differently. He did not believe in the possibility of a separate Atlantic assembly. He wrote that "it would be difficult to find parliamentarians with sufficient time to work in two (international) assemblies. It is difficult enough with the Strasbourg assembly. There is always the danger of the membership degenerating into itinerant internationalists of no importance in their own parliament ... I suggest we consider the evolution of the Council of Europe with its Committee of Ministers and Consultative Assembly into a Council of the Atlantic with a similar representation of governments in a Committee and of parliamentarians in an Assembly." (30)

In the fall of 1956, the second conference of NATO Parliamentarians took place in Paris. Substantial improvements were made in the organization of the conference, in particular the inclusion in the agenda of committee sessions (political, military, economic and cultural). However, the conference had not clarified its actual status and consequently invited "the Standing Committee to undertake ... a review of the questions raised in debate on the functions of this Conference ... whether the Conference should seek advisory or consultative status ...". (31)

In its report to the North Atlantic Council in the Ministerial session on December 13th, 1956, the Committee of Three ("Three Wise Men") acknowledged the work of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in the following terms: "Among the best supporters of NATO and its purposes are those Members of Parliament who have had a chance at first hand to see some of its activities and to learn of its problems and to exchange views with their colleagues from other parliaments. In particular, the formation of national Parliamentary Associations and the activities of the Conference of Members of Parliament from NATO countries have contributed to the development of public support from NATO and solidarity among its members." (32)

A new impetus toward greater Atlantic unity came from a Conference on the Atlantic Community held in Bruges, Belgium, from September 8th to 14th, 1957. This Conference, sponsored jointly by the University of Pennsylvania and the Collège d'Europe, was composed of over one hundred distinguished Europeans and Americans. Its special commission for institutional problems of the Atlantic Community proposed that: "The
NATO Parliamentarians' Conference should be strongly supported. Its budget should be increased, and its value should be reinforced by the national governments as by NATO itself.” (33)

Consequently, the third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, which met in Paris from November 11th to 16th, 1957, called for "greater permanence, continuity and effectiveness" of their institution. Furthermore, the Conference instructed "the Standing Committee and Political Committee to arrange a meeting of leading citizens representative of the national committees and of those organizations whose co-operation would be valuable and appropriate for the convening in 1959, tenth year of the North Atlantic Treaty, of an Atlantic Congress comparable to the Hague Congress of 1948". (34) Moreover, it recommended that the governments bring about the citizens' conference described below.

When the fourth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference opened at the Palais de Chaillot on November 17th, 1958, the committee structure was revised, establishing an Economic Committee as separate from the cultural section of the former General Affairs Committee—the latter becoming the Cultural Affairs and Information Committee. In its final resolution, issued on November 21st, 1958, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference stressed "the need for appropriate assistance for committee work of the annual NATO Parliamentarians' Conferences in political, military, economic, cultural and scientific matters . . . (and urged) upon parliamentarians in member countries to give active support to the national committees for the Atlantic Congress 1959". (35)

It was, in fact, mainly due to the initiative of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference (particularly the Standing Committee and the International Secretariat) that the Atlantic Congress could be held in London from June 5th to 10th, 1959. This Congress of 650 delegates was opened by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II in London's Westminster Hall and had as its major task the examination of the record of the first ten years of NATO and prospects for the following decade. The Congress examined the full range of problems facing the members of the Atlantic Community in their relations with each other, with the free and uncommitted world and with the Communist bloc. Five main committees, assisted by 16 subcommittees, studied these problems under the watch-word "outward and forward looking". Moral and spiritual values of the Atlantic Community, information and education, and the crea-
tion of an Atlantic Institute were the main topics of the cultural committee, while the political committee debated the question of policy co-ordination and Atlantic institutions. In its final resolution the Congress requested the governments "to carry out as soon as possible the remainder of the unanimous recommendation of the third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference (out of which the Congress arose) by bringing about not later than the spring of 1960 a special conference composed of not more than a hundred leading representative citizens, directed to convene for as long as necessary in order to examine exhaustively, and to recommend as expeditiously as possible, the means by which greater co-operation and unity may best be developed within the Atlantic Community". (36)

During the same year, from November 16th to 20th, the fifth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference was held in Washington, D.C., upon the invitation of both Houses of Congress. The Conference recommended on this occasion that the Secretary-General of NATO prepare an annual report on the working of the alliance to be used as the basis for discussions in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. Moreover, it reiterated the proposals of the Atlantic Congress for the creation of an Atlantic Institute, and for the organization of a conference of representative citizens. (37)

The first steps toward an actual implementation of the idea of a citizens' conference of NATO countries were taken at a Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate on January 19th, 1960. The Senators debated Concurrent Resolution 17, introduced by then Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and four of his colleagues on March 19th, 1959, calling for a convention of delegates from the NATO countries. At that time the majority of the participants in the Hearing was in favour of an early enactment of this Senate Concurrent Resolution, after General Draper, Hon. Estes Kefauver, Mr. Osborne and Mr. Roper had testified on the question of "Greater Co-operation among Atlantic Democracies". (38)

Thus on September 7th, 1960, through enactment by the U.S. Congress of Public Law 86-719, the recommendation for an Atlantic convention was carried out by providing for a U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO. The latter was to explore with similar citizens' commissions in the NATO countries means by which greater co-operation and unity of purpose might be developed and, to this end, seek to arrange an international convention. (39)
When the sixth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference met in Paris from November 21st to 26th, 1960, it welcomed this American step of creating a U.S. Citizens' Commission and urged the other governments of NATO to proceed with similar arrangements. (40)

This objective—the creation of citizens' commissions of all NATO members—was rapidly attained during the following year (March, 1961). When the seventh NATO Parliamentarians' Conference convened in Paris from November 13th to 17th, 1961, it could express the hope that the forthcoming Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations would fulfil its great potentialities. (41)

The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations took place in Paris from January 8th to 20th, 1962, and constituted an unprecedented meeting of more than 90 citizens appointed by the legislatures of the NATO countries. The purpose of the convention was to explore and recommend ways by which greater co-operation and unity might be developed to the end that democratic freedom could be promoted by economic and political means. The result of these deliberations was the "Declaration of Paris", including a number of resolutions adopted unanimously by the Convention on January 19th, 1962. One of the most significant of these resolutions was that "the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference be developed into a Consultative Atlantic Assembly, to meet at stated intervals, or upon the call of its President or otherwise to receive reports regularly transmitted to it by the Secretary-General of other Atlantic bodies, to raise questions for and to consider, debate and review the work of all Atlantic institutions, and make recommendations to other Atlantic bodies and governments on questions of concern to the Atlantic Community. A permanent secretariat and an annual budget should be provided for by the Atlantic Assembly to ensure continuity. In certain cases, recommendations should be by weighted majority vote. Members of the Atlantic Assembly would be selected by member governments in accordance with their constitutional procedure. They need not necessarily be Parliamentarians. The members thus chosen would have the power to elect a limited number of additional members of equal status." (42)

The convention concluded with the following statement (preface to the "Declaration of Paris"): "We, the citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations ... are convinced that our survival as free men, and the possibility of progress for
all men, demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade". (43)

An official American offer to Europe of an Atlantic Partnership of equals was expressed by the late President Kennedy in his "Declaration of Interdependence" in Philadelphia on July 4th, 1962. Thus the late chief executive announced his "grand design" of a partnership between Western Europe and North America, without, however, elaborating the terms of this proposal. The response to this American challenge came from the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg which, "conscious of the historical importance of the declaration (of interdependence) ... (and) considering it is the duty of the qualified spokesmen of Europe to respond to this proposal", recommended to the Committee of Ministers on September 14th, 1962, "to begin as soon as possible to study the problems raised by this declaration and states its willingness to take part itself in this study, if possible in collaboration with members of the Congress of the United States". (44)

During its eighth annual meeting in Paris from November 12th to 16th, 1962, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference welcomed the recommendation of the Atlantic Convention that the Conference be developed into a Consultative Atlantic Assembly which would review the work of and make recommendations to all Atlantic institutions. Furthermore, the Political Committee stated "its conviction that only two international bodies for the Atlantic nations are needed, one a Parliament for a United Europe and the other an Assembly for the Atlantic Partnership, and that the present various European institutions should conform with this pattern which should come about not by the creation of new bodies but by evolution from existing ones". (45) In order to study this matter the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference created a special sub-committee to submit recommendations on "a constitution or charter for a consultative Atlantic assembly ... the precise powers and functions to be exercised by such a consultative assembly ... a form of association with the OECD or, alternatively, a consultative Atlantic assembly to serve ... as a single consultative parliamentary body both for NATO and OECD with due consideration being given to such special arrangements as may be necessary with regard to the membership and participation of those nations which are members of NATO or of the OECD but not of both". (46)

The idea of a United Europe within the framework of the
Atlantic Community received a dramatic setback on January 14th, 1963, when the French President vetoed British entry into the European Economic Community, and spoke out against any "colossal Atlantic Community". Two days later, however, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe accepted a resolution concerning the future relationship between the Strasbourg assembly and OECD. It was decided that the assembly appoint a delegation to approach the Committee of Ministers and the individual member Governments in order to press for the implementation of the agreement of February 1st, 1962, between the Council of Europe and OECD. Particular reference was made to the necessity of debates with the participation of American and Canadian parliamentarians. (47) On this occasion the French Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, M. Habib-Deloncle, addressing the Consultative Assembly, welcomed the foregoing recommendation and declared that if a parliamentary body was set up in OECD to discuss economic developments with the U.S.A. and Canada, then European representation should emanate from the Council of Europe. (48)

At the same time Mr. Christian Herter, writing in Foreign Affairs, renewed the plea for an Atlantic Consultative Assembly in the following words: "There is no doubt that an Atlantic assembly, even though it were limited to talk and deliberation, without impinging on the power of decision resting with the individual nations, would have a vital rôle to play in giving common counsel and in voicing the conscience of the Atlantic Community". (49)

The need for democratic checks and balances to Atlantic executive organs was underlined anew in a Staff Study prepared for the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The study concluded: "The international business that is conducted by the nations of the West and by the European Community is necessarily the province of a skilled bureaucracy. As the business becomes more and more complex and wide ranging, the restraints on the bureaucracy become weaker. An Atlantic consultative assembly functioning as a link to popular opinion in every member country, would be expected to provide one of the traditional restraints. The problems and responsibilities that are shared by these countries are central to the basic interest of each. A single consultative assembly should promote insight into these matters, and a better understanding by every member of
their precise relationship to the interests of friendly and allied societies.” (50)

The Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. William Fulbright, added personal impetus to this proposal when he declared: “I believe that the establishment of a consultative Atlantic assembly in the near future would be a desirable and feasible measure for the strengthening of the Atlantic Community. . . . This Atlantic Assembly of parliamentarians should serve as a consultative organ for both NATO and OECD. It should consult on the full scope of Atlantic relations, military and political, economic and cultural. . . . The constitution of an Atlantic assembly would of course have to be carefully considered, but one can envision a body authorized to submit recommendations to both NATO and the OECD, which would be expected to reply to all proposals either in writing or by appearance of authorized representatives before the parliamentary body or any of its subsidiary organs. In addition, the delegates to the assembly might be empowered to express their confidence, or lack of confidence, in specific actions or decisions of the two executive bodies.” (51)

The idea of an Atlantic assembly was also considered as an important step toward a genuine Atlantic Community by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the German Bundestag, Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, who wrote that “if the development of an Atlantic community is (to be) successful, NATO and the OECD need parliamentary control. . . . The establishment of a parliamentary or para-parliamentary institution by means of international treaties . . . would be an important step toward the consolidation of a true Atlantic community. For the time being it would not matter too much if its prerogatives were limited to consultative functions.” (52)

While the foregoing proposals came from political leaders in the United States and Western Europe, similar recommendations were made as well by distinguished scholars on both sides of the Atlantic. The Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania was one of the first academic institutions to give strong support to the strengthening of the idea of an Atlantic community when it stated that: “The transformation of the NATO Parliamentarians’ Conference into a NATO consultative assembly would provide not only for a closer link between NATO and the NATO peoples and among the NATO peoples themselves, but also the best school for Atlantic leadership. Here, the great
issues could be debated, and the Assembly could serve as the forcing house of Atlantic personalities.”

Certain Western European scholars have taken a different view. Pierre Uri, speaking for a distinguished group of Europeans, expressed strong doubt as to the efficacy and value of any international assembly lacking an executive body with which it could carry on a meaningful dialogue. As Consultant for Studies to the Atlantic Institute, Uri wrote that once the European Communities are enlarged to include most of Western Europe, and an executive Council of Partnership is created with North America, then the (enlarged) European Parliament could meet with North American representatives in a joint Atlantic partnership assembly.

In the interim, an executive Tripartite Committee embracing the United States, the European Economic Community and the United Kingdom should be established to explore immediate opportunities of concerted action by Europe and America. Each member of this interim Committee would maintain liaison with those countries with which it has special relations—thus the United Kingdom would attend to the Commonwealth and the European Free Trade Association members, and the Common Market to its members in Europe and associated countries in Africa. The necessary parliamentary backstop to this executive Committee could be found in a temporary ad hoc arrangement between the Council of Europe and the North Americans, since the Council of Europe acts today as a “waiting-room” for those nations of Europe which envision eventual association with the Communities. However, the creation of the Tripartite Committee would remain the pre-condition to such a parliamentary arrangement.

A Swedish scholar, Professor Heckscher, the Chairman of the Economic Committee of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, recognized a more immediate need for an Atlantic assembly, when he declared in September, 1963: “We believe that it would be useful to have a parliamentary assembly of one form or another attached to the organization (OECD), if for no other reason than to do away with a number of trans-Atlantic misunderstandings which are continually arising.”

When the ninth NATO Parliamentarians’ Conference met in Paris from November 4th to 9th, 1963, the special committee of the Conference charged with the study of its institutionalization reported that “in view of the contacts which members of the
Working Group have had with senior OECD and NATO officials, members of Governments of NATO member countries and other political figures, and having regard to the replies they received, the Special Committee considers that, as matters stand, it is not at the moment practicable to change the status of the present Conference, because, among other reasons, such a change of status would involve the signing of an additional protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty. The "other reasons" were included in the Report of the Political Committee, notably, "that an Atlantic Consultative Assembly involving OECD nations cannot be created out of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference"; "that a proliferation of assemblies must be avoided"; and, most significantly, because of the "prevailing uncertainty on the part of some members of the Alliance with respect to the aims and intentions of other members of the Alliance". (56) Despite this temporary setback to the institutionalization of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, the Political Committee concluded that "the eventual creation of such an Assembly, with formal status and consultative powers, would be a major, dramatic step towards Atlantic solidarity. The Committee expresses the hope that such an institution will one day evolve." (57)

In the fall of 1964 the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe invited Mr. Wayne Hays, member of the U.S. House of Representatives, to address the Consultative Assembly. On this occasion M. Struye, the President of the Political Commission of the Assembly, stated that "it was our wish that our Assembly or an emanation of it, with the participation of delegates of member parliaments or not, of the Council of Europe, the U.S.A. and Canada, particularly and according to procedures to be determined, could exercise (if not control) . . . at least a right of inspection over the affairs of OECD in which we are still—and this is a reason more for union—associated". (58) Referring to a question about possible parliamentary links between Strasbourg and Washington, Mr. Hays replied: "So far as having a liaison between the Council of Europe and the American Congress is concerned, or a better understanding, I think that is greatly to be desired. There is also a considerable amount of sentiment in my country for some kind of parliamentary meeting which will take in the neutrals as well as the NATO nations." (59)

More recently, the tenth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference meeting in Paris from November 16th to 21st, 1964, again pointed to the importance of establishing an Atlantic assembly in the near
future. The Conference adopted a recommendation, submitted to it by the Political Committee, which restated its conviction that the creation of such an assembly would be a desirable and productive step. It recommended "that discussions among parliamentarians be undertaken looking toward the creation of an Atlantic Consultative Assembly, or assemblies meeting concurrently, embracing to the greatest degree possible the membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development". (60)

The phrase "assemblies meeting concurrently" (authors' italics) is elaborated in the following section.

PART III
Analysis of Major Designs

While it is generally agreed that the creation of new international parliamentary organizations is to be avoided, there remains the problem of transforming existing assemblies to permit a more economic and efficient functioning with a broader, truly "Atlantic" competence. In addition, a solution will have to be found as to the organization of debate in a reorganized Western consultative assembly in view of the membership of neutral countries. Finally, the problem of the statutes establishing parliamentary bodies has to be tackled.

An Atlantic assembly would bring the non-NATO countries of OECD together with the NATO countries in a single parliamentary body concerned with the complete spectrum of the interests of the North Atlantic area. A prerequisite would be, of course, arrangements allowing the Neutrals to participate in such an assembly and yet avoid the onus of their involvement in military matters of the Atlantic alliance (for the will to accommodate the Neutrals in an Atlantic assembly now seems to exist in official circles). (61)

An Atlantic assembly would as well both elicit and reflect the necessary public support for Atlantic institutions by acting as the representative body of the people of the community. As such, the assembly could co-ordinate and review the work of Atlantic organizations by requesting and debating periodic reports from the executive bodies of those organizations. By thus supplementing and paralleling, on a parliamentary level, existing inter-governmental executive co-operation, the assembly could
advocate and effect the increasing interdependence and consequent strength of a wider Western community. If a purely consultative Atlantic assembly is to be effective, it would need to be an officially recognized institution, whose powers, though limited, were clearly defined in advance, namely to determine its agenda, to ask questions, to submit recommendations and votes of confidence which would serve as the basis for discussions in the executive Councils, and to receive reports from the latter. Only an assembly that is official could have the necessary impact on the Executives by reflecting public opinion in its recommendations and votes of confidence, and by having adequate access to policy information (through reports from the Executives) in order to educate that same public opinion.

To date there are two basic designs for an official consultative Atlantic assembly accommodating the member countries of both NATO and OECD. The first design, which originated with the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, is for an assembly with "split" plenary sessions and committee structure. Though there are several variations of this idea, the principle in each is the same: Parliamentarians from the NATO countries would meet in one plenary session to debate and review NATO affairs; Parliamentarians from the OECD countries would meet in a separate plenary session to debate and review OECD affairs. As envisaged by a number of its supporters, such an organization would meet annually; each delegate would have one vote; the size of the assembly would probably not be much in excess of one hundred delegates; national quotas would presumably be assigned on a sliding scale, although inconsistencies would have to be permitted. (62)

The committee structure of this assembly would reflect the combined concerns of NATO and OECD, without placing the representatives from neutral countries on any committee dealing with military matters. Economic and political implications of the Cold War could, however, be debated by committees which included neutral countries (as has been done for several years by representatives from four of the six non-NATO members—Austria, Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland—in the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe).

The second basic design for an Atlantic assembly originated outside the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. The above-described proposal for a single assembly with split plenary sessions and committee structure has raised objections primarily among the neutral members of OECD. They argue that such an
arrangement could complicate certain European relations with the new "unaligned" African countries. Because the Neutrals are not inclined to be involved in the military affairs of the Alliance, they would require an assembly whose formal structure not only guarantees this option, but does so in such a way that it cannot be misunderstood either at home or abroad.

In order to work out a solution more acceptable to the Neutrals, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe empowered a Delegation (chaired by M. Pierre Pflimlin) to open discussions with the Council's Committee of Ministers and the governments of its member states, and subsequently to establish contact with the American Congress and the Canadian Parliament.

There are at least three contributing factors to this initiative:

First, the 1962 proposals for an Atlantic assembly were anticipated by a one-time meeting in 1951 between members of the United States Congress and the Council of Europe Consultative Assembly.

Secondly, though the membership of the two organizations does not coincide completely, the Council of Europe already acts as a *de jure* European parliamentary forum for OECD—insofar as a Liaison Committee exists between the two organizations, and an Activities Report is submitted annually to the Consultative Assembly by the Chairman of the OECD Council. (63)

Thirdly, as there is an overlapping area between the functions of OECD and the non-military concerns of NATO, so, too, there is a gap in the competence of these two organizations, notably in the areas of Refugees and Migration, Cultural Affairs, Juridical Affairs and Human Rights—whereas the Council of Europe does take cognizance of these matters.

Given these contributing factors, what does the Council of Europe consider its rôle to be in the development of an Atlantic assembly? Included in current informal discussions are the following considerations:

1. Because there is a growing necessity for a European-American parliamentary forum, dealing not exclusively with OECD affairs, but with a wider range of non-military political and economic questions, two "Atlantic Assemblies" have been suggested: the first for economic and social affairs, sequential to, but juridically separate from, a second assembly for military affairs. "Atlantic Partnership" must be postponed so long as one partner remains a disjointed group of regional
entities, but it is felt in Strasbourg that the two Atlantic assemblies could together provide the needed pre-Partnership dialogue between the United States and a potentially coherent, organized and uniting Europe.

2. It is argued that the Atlantic Alliance could be strengthened by making the *ad hoc* NATO Parliamentarians' Conference the formal base of the first assembly, an "Atlantic Assembly for NATO". Equally, parliamentarians of the Council of Europe Consultative Assembly could form a substantial European element of the second assembly, an "Atlantic Assembly for Economic and Social Affairs". The two assemblies would meet sequentially, so that the NATO countries' representatives to one would attend the other as well, thus keeping to a minimum additional demands upon already overworked parliamentarians. The secretariat of the assemblies could be drawn jointly from NATO, OECD and Council of Europe secretariats, ensuring co-ordination while economizing on manpower and expense.

3. European nations would choose their own representatives to the assemblies, presumably without U.S. objection should these representatives partly coincide with those already delegated to the Council of Europe. The Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe could devote two of its annual sessions to European regional problems, while debating Atlantic affairs in its third annual session.

4. M. Pflimlin's Delegation, as empowered by the Consultative Assembly, intends to open further talks this year with American and Canadian representatives to discuss the above points, as the "two-assembly" proposal has received support from most European governments and parliamentarians. Should the North Americans agree, the Atlantic assemblies could be brought into being by the passing of identical resolutions at the ministerial levels of both NATO and OECD, thus avoiding the more complicated problem of either a new treaty or a protocol to the NATO Treaty.

**PART IV**

**Conclusions**

Two juridically separate Atlantic assemblies, meeting back to back, as separate entities and in different sessions might well be
more acceptable to the Neutrals than the design for a single assembly with its implicit involvement of Neutrals in the politico-military affairs of NATO. However, the formula for two assemblies will meet with opposition elsewhere, for American and European legislators, who now participate in a total of 11 international parliamentary meetings, have often expressed their reluctance to further proliferation. Furthermore, there is strong objection in some quarters to the idea of including certain member countries of OECD in a democratic body of Atlantic parliamentarians.

Moreover, it is argued that only two interparliamentary bodies should be eventually needed, namely, a European Parliament and an Atlantic assembly. Today, however, six international parliamentary bodies exist by treaty or tradition in Western Europe. Their rationalization cannot, in most cases, be achieved by promoting their dissolution, but rather by providing a single competence broad enough to include both OECD and NATO affairs, plus the social and juridical areas of interest included in neither organization. The mere fact of physical coexistence of the staffs would automatically overcome many of the organizational difficulties and greatly contribute to the solution of the problem of attendance. A common assembly would enjoy the necessary degree of influence and prestige currently lacking in the various assemblies of Western Europe.

In time the Neutrals may become willing to combine the two Atlantic assemblies which might now be created, thus meeting in a single assembly with separate plenary sessions as envisaged in the original proposal. Moreover, some parliamentarians argue that a premature pattern of unity in the form of a single Atlantic assembly cannot be pressed today upon a Europe which is still at Sixes and Sevens, and which includes nations still desirous of protecting their traditional neutral posture.

Europeans and North Americans, the Neutrals and NATO do generally agree that an Atlantic parliamentary forum would be both desirable and practicable. What appears to be needed, therefore, is a compromise which accommodates Europe's status quo without permanently institutionalizing it, thus providing a vehicle for further European integration and eventual Atlantic partnership. Such a compromise will have to be worked out jointly by Europeans and Americans in view of the long-term importance of an Atlantic assembly. In the words of Senator Fulbright: "Its value for the foreseeable future would be as an
organ of counsel and consultation, a forum for the practice of community on the Atlantic level, and an institutional symbol of our interdependence". (64)

Indeed, an Atlantic assembly would serve as a forum and catalyst for the emergence of a European as well as a trans-Atlantic consensus, and consequently facilitate the creation of an Atlantic partnership.
# APPENDIX I

## CHRONOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Resolution of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (concerning a meeting of European and North American legislators).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Agreement between the Council of Europe and the OEEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Resolution of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (concerning a meeting of European and North American legislators).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Resolution in both Houses of Congress on an “Atlantic” conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Article on Atlantic Assembly by Livingston Hartley (Freedom and Union).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Strasbourg Conference of European and American legislators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Speech by Senator G. M. Gillette in Charlotte, North Carolina (concerning an Atlantic Assembly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>“Eden Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Procedure for Co-operation between the Council of Europe and the OEEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Article on Atlantic Assembly by Richard Desmond (European and Atlantic Digest).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Article by Livingston Hartley on Atlantic Assembly, Part I (Freedom and Union).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Article by Livingston Hartley on Atlantic Assembly, Part II (Freedom and Union).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Second International Study Conference on the Atlantic Community (Copenhagen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Additional Arrangements for Establishing Closer Links between the Council of Europe and OEEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Recommendation by Lord Ismay to the NATO Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Speech by Sir Geoffrey de Freitas at House of Commons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>“Declaration of Atlantic Unity.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 July</td>
<td>“Resolution Relating to the Calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention.” (Concurrent Resolution 12, U.S. Congress.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>NATO Is Not Enough by Mr. Donald McLachlan and Sir Geoffrey de Freitas (pamphlet).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957 September</td>
<td>Conference on the Atlantic Community (Bruges, Belgium).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959 June</td>
<td>Atlantic Congress (London).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 January</td>
<td>Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate on S. Con. Res. 17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Recommendation for a “U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO” (Public Law 86-719).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>President Kennedy’s “Declaration of Interdependence”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Council of Europe: Recommendation (Doc. 1479) concerning the “Declaration of Interdependence”. (Report by M. Pierre Pflimlin.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963 January</td>
<td>Article by Christian A. Herter on Atlantic Assembly (Foreign Affairs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Clayton Lectures by Senator W. J. Fulbright with recommendation for. a consultative Atlantic Assembly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Speech by Professor Heckscher on OECD Assembly before the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Suggestions by various scholars for the creation of an Atlantic assembly (Kurt Birrenbach, Robert Strausz-Hupé et al., Pierre Uri).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1964
October
Report by Joseph Harned, circulated privately to parliamentarians and government officials by the Atlantic Institute, Paris.

November
Speeches by U.S. Representative Wayne Hays and Mr. Struye before the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe on an Atlantic assembly.
## APPENDIX II

### WESTERN INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>Consultative Assembly (**)</td>
<td>Parliamentary Assembly</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Austria</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belgium</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finland</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greece</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iceland</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Japan)</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luxembourg</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Netherlands</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portugal</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spain</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweden</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switzerland</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turkey</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) *de jure* affiliation with the Council of Europe Consultative Assembly. 

(**) *plus Cyprus.* 

(2) Associate Member.
APPENDIX III

DRAFT ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL
TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

BY ARTHUR CONTE

The Governments of the Kingdom of Belgium, Canada, the Kingdom of Denmark, the French Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Kingdom of Greece, the Republic of Iceland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of Portugal, the Republic of Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty signed at Washington on 4th April 1949 and to the Protocol thereto signed at Paris on 23rd October 1954,

Being desirous of associating their national parliaments more closely with the work of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to ensure collective defence and the preservation of peace and security,

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

The Council of Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization shall communicate an Annual Report on the state of Western defence and security to an Assembly composed of Representatives appointed by the national parliaments of the Member States.

Article II

Member States shall be entitled to the numbers of Representatives which follow: Belgium ......; Canada ......; Denmark ......; France ......; Federal Republic of Germany ......; Greece ......; Iceland ......; Italy ......; Luxembourg ......; Netherlands ......; Norway ......; Portugal ......; Turkey ......; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ......; United States of America ......

Substitutes may also be appointed in like proportion.

Article III

The Assembly of the Atlantic Alliance shall be competent to deliberate concerning the state of Western defence and security.
Article IV
Composition of the Assembly
(a) The Assembly shall be composed of Representatives appointed by the parliaments of the Member States.
(b) Substitutes may sit, speak and vote in the place of Representatives prevented from attending a sitting of the Assembly.

Article V
Sessions of the Assembly
(a) The Assembly shall meet in ordinary session on the second Tuesday of March and September in each year.
(b) The Assembly may be convened in extra-ordinary session by the President, either on his own initiative or following a request by not less than a quarter of the Representatives or by one or more of the Governments signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty.

Article VI
Seat of the Assembly
The September Session of the Assembly shall be held in Paris, unless the Bureau of the Assembly decides otherwise.
The March Session shall be held in Quebec or Washington, unless the Bureau of the Assembly decides otherwise.

Article VII
Powers of the Assembly
(a) The Assembly may make Recommendations or transmit Opinions to the North Atlantic Council. Resolutions may be adopted in cases where this form is considered more appropriate. When so directed by the Assembly, the President shall transmit such Resolutions to international organizations, governments and national parliaments.
(b) The Assembly shall consider reports transmitted to it by the North Atlantic Council.
(c) The Chairman of the North Atlantic Council shall make an oral presentation to the Assembly of the reports referred to in paragraph (b).
(d) Representatives may put questions in writing to the North Atlantic Council, on subjects within the competence of the Assembly.
The President shall rule whether such questions are in order.

Article VIII
Presence of Ministers in the Assembly
Ministers who are members of the North Atlantic Council and other Ministers of Member States may be present at all sittings
of the Assembly. They shall be heard by the Assembly at their own or the Assembly’s request.

Article IX
Committees of the Assembly
(a) The Assembly shall appoint Committees and determine their competence.
(b) The Assembly may appoint Committees of investigation in order to enable the Assembly to obtain information on any specific aspect of the report of the North Atlantic Council.

Article X
Budgetary questions
(a) The draft Budget of the Assembly shall be prepared by the Committee on Budgetary Affairs and Administration in consultation with the Presidential Committee, and submitted to the North Atlantic Council before its final approval by the Assembly.

Budgetary disputes between the Council and the Assembly shall be settled by agreement between the Chairman of the Council and the President of the Assembly.
(b) The President of the Assembly shall be responsible for authorizing expenditure on behalf of the Assembly within the limits of the credits specified in this Budget.
(c) The Assembly shall express its views in the form of an Opinion or Recommendation on the Annual Budget of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Article XI
Sittings of the Assembly with restricted composition
The Representatives of the Assembly from the Member States of Western European Union may constitute a restricted session of the Assembly in order to deliberate on defence matters of essentially European interest. They shall meet immediately following or preceding the Sessions of the full Assembly, in particular to consider the Annual Report submitted to them by the Council of Western European Union concerning its activities as defined in Article IX of the Brussels Treaty.

Article XII
Publicity of Assembly debates
Debates of the Assembly shall be held in public unless the Assembly decides otherwise.

Article XIII
The present protocol shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification deposited with the Government of the United States of America.
It shall enter into force following deposit of the instrument of ratification of the last Member State to complete this procedure. The Government of the United States of America shall inform the other Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of ratification.

Article XIV

The present Protocol, in a single copy in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authoritative, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, which shall transmit a certified copy to each of the other signatory States.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Protocol.
FOOTNOTES


(2) OEDC—21 members: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States.

(3) NATO—15 members: the OEDC countries except Austria, Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland (in view of their neutral status); Spain and Japan (for other reasons).

(4) Council of Europe—17 members: the OEDC countries plus Cyprus, and except Canada, Japan, Portugal, Spain and the United States.

For a chart indicating the membership of Western institutions see Appendix II.

(5) Council of Europe: Official Record of Debates (Conference of Strasbourg), Strasbourg, November, 19-23, 1951, p.3. In March, 1951, an “Agreement for Mutual Co-operation” was approved by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and the Council of OEEC. This agreement was followed by the adoption of a common “Procedure for Co-operation between the Council of Europe and the OEEC” in July, 1952, and by “Additional Arrangements for Establishing Closer Links between the Council of Europe and OEEC” in November, 1953. For the details of these agreements see: Agreement between the Council of Europe and the OEEC (with additional texts) Council of Europe, Strasbourg, August, 1954, pp.2-19. In January (respectively February), 1962, the Council of OEDC and the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe approved a new Arrangement between the Council of Europe and the OEDC.

(6) Council of Europe: Official Record of Debates, op. cit., p.3. Other pertinent resolutions adopted by the Consultative Assembly were passed on January 21st, 1960 (Res. 172), on April 29th, 1960 (Res. 245), on March 3rd, 1961 (Res. 273), on September 25th, 1962 (Res. 336) and on January 17th, 1963 (Res. 241).


(8) For the text of the Resolution see: Council of Europe, Official Record of Debates, op. cit., p.3. For the list of American and European delegates see: ibid., p.4.

(9) For the text of the statements by Mr. Spaak and other participants of the meeting, such as M. Paul Reynaud (who had submitted the motion to the Consultative Assembly advocating the Strasbourg meeting in winter, 1951) see: ibid., pp.5-247.


Article II of the North Atlantic Treaty reads: "The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them".


Livingston Hartley, op. cit., p.19.

Livingston Hartley, op. cit., p.20.

ibid., pp.23-25.

Idem.


ibid., p.25. Emphasis has been placed upon Mr. Hartley's suggestions concerning the guiding principles for the eventual creation of an Atlantic consultative assembly; his detailed suggestions have been neglected as they date from 1953. In his latest book Mr. Hartley repeated his call for an Atlantic Consultative Assembly; see: Livingston Hartley, Atlantic Challenge, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, 1965, p.90.


Declaration of Atlantic Unity (pamphlet), p.12. Among the sponsors were Messrs Will L. Clayton, William H. Draper, Jr., Walden Moore, Lithgow Osborne, Philip D. Reed, (U.S.A.); Patrick Nicholson (Canada); P. Noel Miskin (U.K.); Firmin Roz (France); Admiral Helfrich (Netherlands); Arthur Gilson (Belgium); Finn Moe (Norway); Niels Matthiessen (Denmark); Alberto Pirelli (Italy).


(33) Conférence sur la Communauté Atlantique; Résumé des Conclusions, Bruges, 1957, (pamphlet), p.11.


(42) U.S. Citizens’ Commission on NATO: Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, op. cit., p.11.

A detailed draft of an additional Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, proposed by President Arthur Conte, for an Atlantic Assembly is appended (Appendix III).

(43) ibid., p.9.

(44) Council of Europe, Consultative Assembly, Report on the General Policy of the Council of Europe (September 14th, 1962), Doc. 1479, Strasbourg, pp.3-5. On this occasion the rapporteur,
Mr. Pflimlin, stated that Europe "should as soon as possible, begin to study the problems raised by the offer of interdependence. The Council of Europe should take part in this study within the limits and its possibilities. We could, for instance, use the occasion of a joint meeting with American and Canadian parliamentarians, called for the purpose of discussion the affairs of the OECD, to have an exchange of views on the problem of interdependence". ibid., p.29.


(47) Council of Europe, Consultative Assembly, Official Report, Fourteenth ordinary session (January 17th, 1963), Strasbourg (Doc. AS/14/CR 24), pp.19-20. The resolution (241) furthermore suggests "to establish later, if necessary, direct contacts with the American Congress and the Canadian Parliament with a view to contributing to the conclusions of an agreement and to its practical application". (Doc. 1546.) Similar proposals along this line were made by the Consultative Assembly on January 21st, 1960 (Rec. 172), on April 29th, 1960 (Rec. 245), on March 3rd, 1961 (Rec. 273), and on September 25th, 1962 (Rec. 336).

(48) Council of Europe, Consultative Assembly, Official Report, op. cit., pp.25-26. M. Habib-Deloncle made reference to a June, 1962, proposal of Mr. Kristensen, Secretary General of OECD, in which the latter suggested the setting up of a special parliamentary assembly for OECD.


(50) Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership II, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Staff Study, 88th Congress, Doc. 21 (June 17th, 1963), p.49.


(55) Council of Europe, Official Report of Debates, Tenth Joint Meeting of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and
the European Parliament (September 17th and 18th, 1963), Strasbourg, 1963, p.77.


(57) ibid., pp.15-17. At this Session the Political Committee recommended also "that the Conference shall meet twice a year: once in the autumn as at present, and once at the time of Committee meetings in the spring. The meetings of the Conference shall take place preferably alternately in Europe and North America as from January 1st, 1965". ibid., p.71.


(59) ibid., pp.53-55. For the background to this renewed trans-Atlantic initiative on the part of the Assembly, in inviting a speaker from the U.S. Congress, see "Atlantic Assembly—A Genesis" by Joseph Harned, distributed privately in early October, 1964, by the Atlantic Institute, Paris, to selected parliamentarians and government officials; published in February, 1965, by the "Journal of Common Market Studies", Oxford. The article concludes in recommending, as the next step in the parliamentary dialogue between Europe and America, that a delegation from both Houses of the American Congress meet with the Consultative Assembly early in 1965. It was subsequently agreed in November that members of the U.S. Congress would go to Strasbourg in May, 1965.

(60) NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, 1964, Paris: The Secretariat, Doc. G.183 (Rec. 2). In its report the Political Committee (rapporteur, Rep. John V. Lindsay, U.S.A.) re-stated "its conviction that the creation of an Atlantic Parliamentary Assembly would be a desirable productive step. Furthermore, with few opportunities for strengthening Atlantic solidarity currently open to us, now would seem to be the right moment for setting in motion the preparations for such an institution. Parliamentarians have been discussing this proposal for at least two years and are fully familiar with its rationale. They know that despite the variety of multi-national parliamentary meetings, European and North American legislators are not sufficiently involved in trans-Atlantic affairs. They know further that the growing number of questions of joint concern to European and North American societies exercise an expanding influence on the national life and national policies of these societies. Inevitably, the growing complexity and scope of trans-Atlantic affairs has meant that they are grasped and understood for the most part only by the bureaucracies, also increasing in size, which deal with them. The people of these societies should have a reliable link with the trans-Atlantic business through their elected representatives. Indeed, the problem of holding the bureaucrats in this field accountable to parliamentary bodies should be a matter of concern not just to elected officials, but
to academicians, political journalists, and responsible citizens in all the Western democracies”. ibid., Doc. G.115 (Rev. 1).

(61) It is the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Congress, who suggested that arrangements be made in this sense when he wrote: “To accommodate those countries who are members of OECD, but not of NATO, procedures might be devised for separate consideration of OECD and NATO matters so that the Neutrals would be able to abstain entirely from all questions of the military alliance.” (William J. Fulbright, op. cit., p.65.)

For a similar statement by a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Mr. Wayne Hays, see supra Part II.

(62) For example, the U.S. might have 20 delegates; Britain, France, Germany and Italy, 8 each; Canada, Spain, Turkey, 4 each; Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland, 3 each; and Iceland and Luxembourg, 2 each. That would amount to 98 delegates. (Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership II, op. cit., pp.48-49.) However, there must be a moratorium for the time being on the details of such matters as voting structure, place and time of meetings, organization of the secretariat, etc., until an agreement is reached on the principle of creating an Atlantic assembly.

(63) The Consultative Assembly recently devoted a full-day session to the debate of OECD activities. It should be noted, however, that one day was sufficient, in that highly technical aspects of OECD do not lend themselves readily to more extensive parliamentary examination. This practical experience strengthens the theoretical argument against the creation of an assembly concerned solely with OECD affairs.

(64) William J. Fulbright, op. cit., p.66.