

ORGANISATION DU TRAITE DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Place du Maréchal
de Lattre de Tassigny
(Porte Dauphine)
PARIS-XVI

Tél. : KLEber 50-20

Adresse télégraphique :
OTAN PARIS ou
NATO PARIS

ORIGINAL: FRENCH/ENGLISH
17th March, 1964

NATO CONFIDENTIAL
PO/64/103

To : Permanent Representatives
From: Secretary General

NINTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

In a letter dated 6th December, 1963, a copy of which is attached at Annex, the President of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference drew my attention to a number of recommendations adopted by the NATO Parliamentarians at their Ninth Annual Conference held from 4th to 9th November, 1963, and requested me to submit these to the Council(1).

Attached at Annex B is the interim reply I sent to Dr. Kliesing on 17th December.

2. Under the procedure approved by the Council on 13th April, 1962(2), I myself, or senior members of my staff, get into touch with the President of the Conference and the Chairmen of the various Committees in order to give them an off-the-record briefing on the action taken or likely to be taken by the Alliance on the recommendations made by the Conference. Alternatively under the procedure followed in November 1962 and in November 1963 on the occasion of the Seventh and Eighth Annual Conferences of NATO Parliamentarians, the latter would be informed of the views of the Alliance on the recommendations adopted at the previous session, in the course of my customary opening address to the new session.

3. Annex C contains, in broad outline, the comments proposed for the NATO Parliamentarians, whichever procedure is finally adopted. You will observe that these comments are, on the whole, fairly general in scope, although an effort has been made this year to treat them at greater length than on previous occasions and to align them as closely as possible with the text of the recommendations.

(1) Following the usual practice each year, the text of the recommendations was sent direct to the Governments of the member countries.

(2) See C-R(62)16, Item II

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE



NATO CONFIDENTIAL

-2-

PO/64/103

Since the present paper is to be placed on the Agenda for discussion at a forthcoming meeting of the Council, I should be grateful for any remarks or views you may wish to express on the contents of Annex C.

4. I should also like to take this opportunity to draw your attention to a special aspect of the problem posed by the communication dated 6th December from the President of the Conference of Parliamentarians in connection with the means to be employed by the International Staff to enable it to meet the wish of the Parliamentarians to be informed of the action taken or likely to be taken in respect of the recommendations adopted by their Conferences.

Although the Parliamentarians can, with good reason, hope to be given the views of the Council on these recommendations, it is nevertheless a fact that compliance with their wishes must necessarily impose a heavier work load on the International Staff. As Dr. Kliesing himself acknowledges in his letter of 6th December, a large number of the recommendations adopted by the Ninth Conference directly concern NATO. This was equally true last year. Now, each of the recommendations pertaining to NATO must be carefully examined by the competent Divisions of the International Staff in order that appropriate comments may be prepared. The situation may become even more difficult next year if, as contemplated, the Parliamentarians decide to meet not once but twice a year, and if they establish a post of permanent rapporteur.

In order to keep to a minimum the extra load to be borne by the Divisions, it strikes me that it might be a good move to engage an officer to keep under review more particularly matters affecting the NATO Parliamentarians and, to a certain extent also, the WEU Parliamentarians. The presence of such an officer on the International Staff would permit very effective liaison to be established and maintained between parliamentary circles in the NATO member countries and our Organization, the desirability of which was recognised by the Council on 6th March, 1964.

I should like to hear your views on this question during discussion of the present paper.

5. I feel I should also draw the Council's attention to the fact that when the Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs recently contacted the Executive Secretary of the Conference he learnt that the Parliamentarians are considering several schemes to which there are certain objections. The International Staff was informed that the Standing Committee of the Conference plans to meet in Athens on 6th April, 1964, and that it would be suggested in the course of the meeting that the Parliamentarians should visit Cyprus. The Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs made the most express reservation regarding such a move.

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

-2-

6. Furthermore, the Political Committee of the Conference of Parliamentarians having made known its intention of meeting at the NATO Headquarters on 11th May, while the Ministerial Meeting is in progress at The Hague, the Executive Secretary of the Conference was told that, for practical reasons, the Committee would be unable at that time to count on the assistance it normally receives from the International Staff.

7. Lastly, to a question by the Executive Secretary of the Conference as to whether the International Staff would be able, at the above-mentioned meeting, to provide the Parliamentarians' Political Committee with a document on the links between NATO and the other regional defence Organizations, it was replied that no information of this kind could be given without the prior authorisation of the Council.

8. To sum up, the Council is invited to decide:

- (a) whether it regards the draft comments prepared by the International Staff on the recommendations of the Ninth Conference of NATO Parliamentarians as appropriate;
- (b) whether it considers it desirable that, under the procedure approved by the Council on 13th April, 1962(1), I myself or senior members of my staff should contact the President and the Chairman of the various committees of the Conference to inform them unofficially of the action taken or likely to be taken by NATO on their recommendations;
- (c) or whether it considers it preferable that, in accordance with the procedure followed in November 1962 and November 1963, I should merely inform the Parliamentarians of the views of the Alliance on the recommendations submitted for its consideration in the course of my customary opening address to the Conference;
- (d) whether it approves the position adopted by the International Staff on the plans referred to in paragraphs 5 to 7 above.

(Signed) D. U. STIKKER

(1) C-R(62)16, Item II.

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

CONFERENCE DE PARLEMENTAIRES DE L'OTAN

6th December, 1963

My dear Secretary General,

At their ninth annual session, the NATO Parliamentarians adopted 22 recommendations in all, some of which are specifically addressed to the North Atlantic Council.

I submit for your consideration especially:

Political Committee

Recommendation II, which concerns strengthening the North Atlantic Council.

Recommendation IV reiterates the importance of maintaining the fundamental rights and obligations of the Powers responsible, for the international agreement on the status of Berlin.

Cultural Affairs and Information Committee

Recommendation I requests the NATO Committee on Information and Cultural Affairs to study action designed to promote the creation of a centre in West Berlin to collect and distribute objective information about the Free World as compared with Eastern Europe, and where conferences would be held periodically.

Recommendation II concerns a proposed increase of some 50% in the budget of the NATO Information Service.

Recommendation III concerns the proposed Youth Festival to be held next year in Naples. I, personally, think that such a project, although meriting support from the NATO countries, has been undertaken without sufficient preparation and I would prefer to see it put off until 1965.

Economic Committee

Recommendation II refers back to Recommendation I of the Economic Committee adopted last year, concerning trade with the Soviet bloc and requests the NATO Council to advise the Conference as to the measures taken towards implementation of this recommendation.

ANNEX A to
PO/64/103

Recommendation III requests member countries and the Council to consider how-best to reduce non-tariff barriers to trade.

Recommendation IV urges the North Atlantic Council to give further consideration to balance of payments problems.

Military Committee

Recommendation I concerns the decisions taken at this year's Ministerial Meeting in Ottawa and suggests that these be further developed and also urges that the nuclear resources at the disposal of SACEUR be increased.

Recommendation II urges to increase still further co-ordination of research, development and production within the Alliance and the organization of an integrated logistics system.

Recommendation III requests that a higher degree of priority be given to civil emergency measures by the national authorities concerned.

Scientific and Technical Committee

Recommendation I concerns the development of saline water conversion facilities.

Recommendation II again takes up the question of the International Institute of Science and Technology and recommends that the NATO Council take action in the matter.

Recommendation IV concerns air and water pollution and requests co-ordination of measures to control such pollution.

Recommendation V urges continued support for oceanographic research.

All these Recommendations were adopted unanimously in the plenary session of 8th November, with the exception of the following:

Political Committee

Recommendation II : 1 abstention from Denmark

Economic Committee

Recommendation II : 5 abstentions from Denmark.

Military Committee

Recommendation I : 1 against from Denmark
4 abstentions from Denmark.

Scientific and Technical Committee

Recommendation II : 5 abstentions from Denmark
2 abstentions from the
United Kingdom.

Recommendation III: 1 abstention from the
United Kingdom.

I quite realise that the great number of recommendations adopted each year reduces their impact, but, on the other hand, the activities of NATO now cover such a wide field that it is difficult to restrict the five Conference Committees and to prevent them from expressing opinions on questions which they consider important in the framework of our Alliance.

I hope that the NATO Council will consider these recommendations on their merits and, where possible, take action towards their implementation.

Yours sincerely,

Georg Kliesing,
President.

Mr. D. U. Stikker,
Secretary General,
North Atlantic Treaty Organization,
Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny,
Paris 16ème

17th December, 1963

My dear President,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 6th December drawing my attention to certain recommendations adopted by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference at their Ninth Session.

I shall not fail to bring these to the notice of the North Atlantic Council.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) D.U. Stikker

Mr. Georg Kliesing,
President,
NATO Parliamentarians' Conference,
Paris (16^e)

COMMENTS ON THE PROBLEMS RAISED BY THE
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF
NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Recommendation I: Institutionalisation

The Assembly of Parliamentarians has acted wisely in abandoning, at least for the moment, the idea of giving the Conference an official character and in confining itself to seeking to improve its functioning within the context of its present status. As stated by the Secretary General in his address to the Conference at its Ninth Session, the fact that contacts between NATO and the Parliamentarians are unofficial makes it far easier for the International Staff to keep the latter informed of developments.

The procedure followed hitherto, under which the Secretary General or members of his Staff have informal talks with the President of the Conference and the Chairman of each of the Committees, has proved satisfactory. It is unlikely that the appointment of a general rapporteur for the Conference would improve the mutually trustful relationship already established between NATO and the Parliamentarians.

The decision to increase the number of plenary meetings of the Conference is liable to pose certain problems insofar as the Parliamentarians would make more frequent calls than hitherto on the facilities placed at their disposal by the Organization.

Recommendation II: Unified Strategic Planning

This recommendation reflects the reservations expressed by many Parliamentarians with regard to the political advantages of a multilateral force. It constitutes an effort to formulate an alternative arrangement. Paragraph (1) of the recommendation betokens a certain haziness regarding the concepts to which it refers.

On the one hand, the Parliamentarians recommend that there be developed a "unified strategic planning system", which would appear to imply a delegation of sovereignty which does not at present exist within NATO. On the other hand, it is stated that such a unified system would be aimed at "the development of a full strategic concensus among the members of the Alliance in order to establish an effective basis for discussions regarding the use of nuclear forces". The latter point constitutes a far less ambitious aim which is already fulfilled by the studies carried out by the Defence Planning Committee.

In this connection, it should be noted that the Council has already taken a number of measures directed at developing a common policy with regard to control of the use of nuclear weapons and to NATO strategy. In point of fact, guide-lines for the use of nuclear weapons were agreed by the Ministers in Athens in May 1962. Furthermore, at Ottawa, the Permanent Council was instructed to carry out studies on the problems of strategic force requirements and the reserves available for meeting them. The "force planning exercise" studies, which were intended to serve as a basis for discussions and multilateral decisions concerning, inter alia, common NATO strategy, under the guidance of the Defence Planning Committee, were the outcome of this decision.

The recommendation advocates (paragraph (3)) world-wide strategic planning extending beyond the framework of the area of application of the North Atlantic Treaty. This is an admirable notion, the immediate implementation of which would probably be beset with numerous difficulties. Nevertheless, the attention of the Parliamentarians might be drawn to the fact that, as the result of developments in the international situation since the signing of the Treaty, NATO has considerably broadened the field of its activities and that of political consultation.

With regard to the right method of studying all these problems, the idea of a "revised NATO Council" has been expressed (paragraph (2)) and unanimously approved by the Conference. Insofar as it was called upon to discuss strategic problems, the Council would resolve itself into a body composed of representatives drawn from higher levels of government than the present Permanent Representatives. This idea goes back some way, having previously been couched in somewhat different form by the Convention of Citizens which, early in 1961, recommended that the Council be converted into a North Atlantic "High-Council", whose members would be national representatives with the rank of minister.

It is difficult to see in what manner such a body would exercise greater authority than the present Council, whose members act on direct instructions from their respective governments.

Recommendation III: Control of the Use of Nuclear Weapons

This recommendation is not specifically addressed to NATO.

MILITARY COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

This recommendation raises very similar problems to those dealt with by the Political Committee. It is based on the conclusions of the report by the Military Committee that:

"From a military point of view, a numerical increase in the nuclear resources is superfluous, so that the formation of a multilateral nuclear force must be regarded as a waste.

"From a military point of view, the formation of a multi-national nuclear force from the existing resources is unnecessary.

"If the formation of this multi-national nuclear force can lead to a better command structure, but particularly if the Allies can in that way be involved intensively in the operational preparations, then such an organization should be instituted as soon as possible."

The comments made above in connection with the recommendation of the Political Committee also apply here. It should perhaps be pointed out, in response to the wishes expressed by the Parliamentarians, that the nuclear resources at the disposal of SACEUR will probably be increased during 1964 by the introduction of more modern aircraft and that steps have been taken to extend participation by NATO countries in atomic military staffs, either in SACEUR or at Omaha.

Recommendation II

NATO fully endorses the need to increase co-ordination in the fields referred to by the Military Committee. At the present juncture, however, it is difficult for the International Staff to take any significant measures to implement this recommendation. The current prospects of action in this respect are as follows:

(a) Research, Development and Production

The positions adopted by the countries and by the Secretary General clearly indicate that the nations of the Alliance should today pursue their efforts within the framework they adopted and in accordance with the time-phasing they decided upon in 1963.

(b) Logistics

The Council has recently actualised its agreement to the principle of entrusting to the NMSSS certain centralising functions for the logistic support of various weapon systems. Studies have been initiated in connection with the proposal of the NATO Military Authorities that a SHAPE co-ordinating logistics centre be set up.

ANNEX C to
PO/64/103

Recommendation III

NATO Civil Emergency Planning would appear to be considered satisfactory. This recommendation is addressed primarily to national parliamentarians.

This recommendation we regard as being of the greatest help to those involved in Civil Emergency Planning, both nationally and internationally. The International Staff are very grateful for the helpful interest shown by the Parliamentarians as evinced by their request for a briefing on this matter.

The recommendation clearly urges that action by national authorities in this field should be further advanced and help from Parliamentarians to this end would be of the greatest importance.

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

Although the recommendation is not addressed to NATO, it is useful in reminding the NATO Council and appropriate bodies of the organization of the seriousness of the social and economic problems in Latin America. NATO cannot do more than assist in strengthening the political will to tackle these problems with increased energy and facilitate the co-operation of European countries with the American ones for this purpose. Obviously, in this field, NATO cannot become an executive agency.

Recommendation II

The Parliamentarians seem to complain that the 1962 recommendation has not been adequately implemented by the Alliance. As a matter of fact, this is a problem which has already been abundantly discussed in NATO: in the Council, in the Atlantic Policy Advisory Group (APAG) and in the Committee of Economic Advisers. Some decisions have been taken on specific aspects of the problem: COCOM strategic goods, Soviet oil, large diameter pipes. Most members have expressed their readiness to exercise caution on imports of Soviet chrome. Statistics are being periodically established on East-West trade and information exchanged on a continuing basis on trade negotiations with communist countries. However, in general it has not yet been possible to harmonize trade policies. Attempts made at such harmonization as regards export credits have not so far been successful, but the question is still under examination. The Committee of Economic Advisers has attempted also to study the possibility of establishing closer economic relations with the European Satellites.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

The recommendation of the Parliamentarians' Conference covers indeed a wide field. It is certainly most useful in helping to create the will to co-operate amongst NATO countries on this very important problem of the economic relations with the communist countries. Some harmonization of policies appears all the more necessary since with the present signs of "détente", East-West trade may be expanded. It would be damaging to the cohesion of the Alliance if such expansion gave rise to undue competition between NATO members and offered unjustified economic advantages to the communist countries.

As to some specific items mentioned in the 1963 recommendation the following points can be made:

(1) Harmonization of trade policies on credit terms

The Committee of Economic Advisers continues its efforts to arrive at a common policy, notably with the aim of limiting the guaranteeing of credits to a maximum of 5 years.

(2) Harmonization of trade policies on patents and copyrights

The Committee of Economic Advisers has decided to discuss this subject and the French Delegation promised some time ago to furnish a note on the subject.

(3) Harmonization of trade policies on status of traders

The intention is probably to facilitate Western traders' access to markets inside the Soviet bloc. The Committee of Economic Advisers has envisaged calling a new meeting of experts on East/West trade and this question may be raised at such a meeting.

(4) Harmonization of trade policies on arbitration of disputes and trade practices

The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe has elaborated a European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration, which has been signed by eighteen countries(1), amongst which there are six NATO members. This convention has entered into force on 7th January, 1964. It is open for accession by members of the Economic Commission for Europe. All European NATO countries and the United States could thus adhere if they so wished but not Canada. But this would have far-reaching implications which should be thoroughly discussed by the Council.

(1) Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, Byelorussia, USSR and Yugoslavia.

NATO CONFIDENTIAL
ANNEX C to
PO/64/103

-16-

Recommendation III

Admittedly the West's main asset in countering the Soviet economic offensive in the non-committed world is the economic dependence of these countries on Western Markets. Removal of barriers to trade with the developing countries, therefore, should have high - if not the highest - priority among measures to counter Communist economic penetration there. The main function of NATO in this field is to help to create the political will to carry to a successful outcome negotiations in other international organizations designed to improve trade and aid relations between the Western countries themselves and between the industrial and the underdeveloped countries.

Recommendation IV

NATO cannot do more than encourage such efforts by making clear that any progress in smoothing the working of the international payments machinery and in assisting the United States in their own indispensable efforts towards the orderly re-establishment of a better balance of foreign payments serves the interest of the Alliance, i.e. strengthens the security of each of its member countries.

Recommendation V

In this field again, NATO cannot turn itself into an executive agency but it can certainly continue to give the necessary impulse for the speeding up of the economic development of the less-favoured member countries. This has been done for Greece and Turkey. In particular, NATO efforts led to the creation of the Consortia for Greece and Turkey under the aegis of the OECD. Various recommendations were also adopted by the NATO Council to favour the economic development of Iceland and facilitate the exports of this country towards the free world with a view to providing her from becoming excessively dependent on trade with the Soviet bloc. However, NATO cannot do more than create favourable conditions for the carrying out of the work of special agencies such as OECD, the IBRD and the IIF and also encourage bilateral financial assistance in favour of less-developed member countries. This also applies to Portugal whose economy needs financial support from abroad, given in particular the burden she has to bear for military operations overseas.

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

-16-

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

Concerns saline water conversion and is addressed to the member countries of NATO. It does not call for any action by the Council or the Science Committee (which has shown little interest in the subject in the past).

Recommendation II

Concerns the International Institute of Science and Technology. While addressed mainly to member countries, it also urges the NATO Council to reconsider the Killian Report. The Council has requested to be kept informed of developments with the project. Since there seems little likelihood of any progress in the near future, a report will be submitted to the Council in the early part of 1964 for it to take note of the situation.

Recommendation III

Concerning toxic drugs is clearly not the concern of NATO.

Recommendation IV

It seems that NATO cannot take any action on this resolution concerning air and water pollution. OECD is actively concerned with water pollution and has several committees studying its various aspects. The resolution urges NATO to co-operate with OECD in this matter, but this seems superfluous. Though neither air pollution nor water pollution seem to be subjects which are particularly appropriate to NATO, it may be that certain aspects do not receive adequate attention, in which case, the most appropriate action would be for the Science Committee to recommend some other organization to take it up. In that the Science Committee is not particularly conversant with this subject. It is not likely that any immediate action will result.

Recommendation V

Concerns oceanography. NATO has been active in this field for several years and the Science Committee continually follows the progress of the activities of its Sub-Committee on Oceanographic Research. NATO has supported a substantial amount of research now, and if it helps relations with the Parliamentarians, a report could be submitted to the Council. This might be a worthwhile action in any case.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS AND INFORMATION COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The NATO Committee for Information and Cultural Relations has not yet received a written proposal on this matter, which according to the German Delegation is at present under discussion in the German Foreign Office and the West Berlin Senate. It could be discussed by the Committee at an appropriate time after the German proposal has been received.

Recommendation II

The Parliamentarians were informed on the Cultural and Information Committee that, as all of us welcome this recommendation, it could only have a practical financial consequence in the budget of 1965. At the time of the adoption of this recommendation, the NATO Committee for Information and Cultural Relations had already requested a 10% increase of credits for the 1964 Information programme. Ultimately, the NATO Budget Committee at their meeting of the 18th November, 1963 agreed to a 7.5% overall increase of our credits for this programme.

Recommendation III

The NATO Committee for Information and Cultural Relations has repeatedly discussed the project for an International Youth Festival which is planned to be held in NAPLES in commemoration of the 10th Anniversary of the Atlantic Treaty Association, in August 1964. This project was put forward by the "Association Diffusion Culturelle Atlantique" (Belgium) under the auspices of the Atlantic Treaty Association. The Committee discussed the idea but was doubtful as to the possibility of successfully carrying out such a vast and ambitious project. Since it was impossible to obtain precise answers to a number of questions, mostly of a financial character, the NATO Information and Cultural Relations Committee agreed that it was for the National Atlantic Committees to take the requested decisions. The Information Service has remained in contact with the Belgian promoters.

The German Government has decided not to participate in this project, whilst the United Kingdom Government is unlikely to participate partly for budgetary reasons, but also because their 1964 artistic activities will be centred on the Shakespeare Centenary. The Festival will be discussed at the Atlantic Treaty Association board meeting to be held at NATO on the 6th February, 1964. For the moment the chances of the project materialising seem remote.