

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10904) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the Proxmire amendment to H.R. 10904, the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

**HOLDING BY INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE THAT ASSESSMENTS VOTED BY UNITED NATIONS FOR CONGO AND MIDDLE EAST OPERATIONS ARE BINDING**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the International Court of Justice has today affirmed that the assessments voted by the General Assembly of the United Nations to finance peacekeeping operations of the organization in the Congo and the Middle East are legally binding on the member states. This historic opinion is of fundamental importance to international law and to the present and future capacity of the United Nations to maintain peace.

The U.S. Government consistently has been of the view that the assessments in question are "expenses of the organization" within the meaning of the United Nations Charter, and thus binding upon the members. The Legal Adviser of the Department of State so argued before the International Court of Justice during its consideration of this issue.

The Court's opinion will strengthen the effort of the Secretary General to collect arrearages on assessments to finance the U.N. peacekeeping missions in the Congo and the Middle East. Some members have not paid these assessments, claiming that they were not legally binding. In view of the Court's opinion, this claim is plainly not tenable.

Collection of outstanding arrearages on these two accounts would help the United Nations to pay accumulated bills for these two missions through the period ending June 30 of this year. Financing the Congo and Middle East operations beyond June 30, however, depends upon the success of the United Nations proposal to borrow \$200 million. No assessments have been voted for these operations after June 30. Expenses for the Congo and Middle East missions are now running at approximately \$11.5 million per month. Forty-four nations have purchased or pledged \$72.4 million toward the \$200 million so far. The U.S. Senate has passed a bill authorizing the President to lend up to \$100 million to the United Nations, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee is currently holding hearings on this legislation.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. CARLSON] without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 minute.

**ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO THE UNITED NATIONS**

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a general convention of the Churches of God—Holiness—which met in annual business session recently in Overland Park, Kans., the convention unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

As we are considering the adoption of the conference report on foreign aid authorization, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved*, That we continue to oppose the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, thus upholding international morality and keeping faith with the thousands of American youths who gave their lives fighting Communist aggression in Korea. To seat Communist China which defies, by word and deed, the principles of the United Nations Charter would be to betray the letter, violate the spirit, and subvert the purposes of the charter. We further continue to oppose U.S. diplomatic recognition or any other steps which would build the power and prestige of the Chinese Communist regime, to the detriment of our friends and allies in Asia and of our national security. Any such action would break faith with our dead and the unfortunate Americans still wrongfully imprisoned by Communist China, and would dishearten our friends and allies in Asia whose continued will to resist Communist China's pressures and blandishments is so vital to our own security interests in that part of the world.

**GREAT EXAMPLE AT WEST POINT**

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in 1961 it was my pleasure to appoint the first Negro boy from Kansas to ever enter the Military Academy at West Point. His name is Joseph B. Anderson, Jr., of Topeka. Joe Anderson is on the dean's list for the second term at West Point. He is in the upper 30 percent of his class. Personally I am proud of the record he is making. I would like to call attention to the fine editorial that recently appeared in the Wellington Daily News of Wellington, Kans. So I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**GREAT EXAMPLE AT WEST POINT**

Joseph B. Anderson, Jr., of Topeka, may not know it, but he has personally kicked the dickens out of reported malicious rumors that Kansas is a State loaded with race prejudice and discrimination.

The young West Point [U.S. Military Academy] cadet had help, of course, but his splendid achievements were gained for the most part through his own ability and hard work.

Joe Anderson is on the dean's list for the second term at West Point. He is in the upper 30 percent of his class, a member of the cadet choir and glee club at the academy and has been a soloist in several programs of the choir and glee club.

Joe, incidentally, is a Negro.

"We hope this knowledge will serve as an incentive to other young persons that there is recognition for ability and perseverance, there is a payoff for hard work in study, in wholesome living," the Kansas Commission on Civil Rights said. "Of course, not everyone can go to West Point, but there are now other career goals for which the human ingredients of ability, self-improvement through persevering hard work and study, and character reflecting wholesome living are the only qualifications."

The commission added, "Maybe this information may serve to squelch the persistent, stereotyped rumor that Kansas is a State loaded with prejudice and discrimination. For whoever the Kansas Congressman was who appointed Joe Anderson to West Point, he merely reflected the predominant attitude of Kansas citizens who would find this wholly acceptable."

Kansas has made an admirable example for other States to follow. Joe Anderson has done the same for young boys from all walks of life.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 1 minute.

**REPORT OF THE U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO**

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO recently made a very provocative report to Congress on the recommendations of the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations. This Convention recommended that we must form a "true Atlantic Community" within the next decade, and made specific recommendations as to how that might be achieved.

These recommendations included: the creation of a Permanent High Council to prepare and concert policies on political, economic, cultural, and military matters; the development of a consultative Atlantic Assembly to review and debate questions of concern to the Atlantic community; and the establishment of a high court of justice to settle legal differences.

To facilitate the suggested reforms, the appointment of a special governmental commission was recommended. Its purpose would be to study the organization of the Atlantic community and to propose such reforms and simplifications of existing institutions and such new institutions as may be deemed necessary.

The report of the Commission has aroused widespread editorial comment throughout the United States. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place a series of these editorials, which have come to my attention from various parts of the Nation, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal,  
June 20, 1962]

#### NOTICE TO FRANCE ON ATOMIC ARMS

Secretary Rusk has departed on the NATO circuit, hopeful that he can strengthen the Atlantic compact, that he can convince all members of the expediency of unity on nuclear arms, and particularly that France can be kept in line. A few factors are encouraging: Mr. Khrushchev at the moment says war over Berlin is not necessary, and saber rattling generally is at the ebb.

The attitude of the intransigent President de Gaulle ranks all the other impediments. He simultaneously is the staunchest of the Western leaders and the most worrisome. His emerging success in Africa will have exalted his hold upon his country and given him fresh boldness in demanding atomic status.

The general's career, when even briefly recalled, accounts for the forthrightness of Secretary of Defense McNamara in cautioning the West to keep its nuclear potential gathered under NATO on the Continent. That, of course, does not foreclose the independent and constantly related management of their own atomic weapons by the United States and Great Britain.

NATO has fabricated a pattern for arms control that should not be breached, which probably would happen if President de Gaulle took his country out of that compact. A single nation conceivably might be more willing to unleash atomic warheads than would a council of heads of state.

Secretary McNamara also presented a code for the retaliatory fire if nuclear war began. That expressed the official opinion of Washington—and probably London—and was devised to lessen the prospect that another country might fire first. Our targets would be military objectives; attack on civilian centers would be only in return for similar tactics by the aggressor.

The effect of this policy could be deteriorated if France—or Spain—were free to make war at will. The iron-willed De Gaulle would put his own opinion foremost.

Almost simultaneously—perhaps by design and perhaps by happenstance—the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO called for more unity within the Atlantic community, in economics, in arms, and in aid to other nations.

These utterances, which Secretary Rusk will repeat to President de Gaulle, should be sufficient notice that Washington does not propose NATO should be disrupted. NATO bears too much importance to the United States, as well as its members and their neighbors on the Continent, to be invalidated by any rash of extreme nationalism.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal and Courier]

#### STRENGTHENING THE WEST

Anything which concerns the security of the free world holds universal interest. The report to Congress by the bipartisan U.S. Citizen's Commission on NATO has additional and special local interest because Burr S. Swezey, Lafayette banker, is a member of this distinguished group.

The Commission participated last January at Paris in the Atlantic Convention, an unprecedented gathering of 90 outstanding citizens appointed by the legislative bodies of the NATO countries. It is noteworthy that the conferees had no instructions of any kind from their respective countries and took part as individuals.

In its report, the U.S. Commission stressed the urgency of early steps to make the Atlantic Community a reality and to strengthen the ties which bind it together. Stressing

the strength of union, the report challenged the Atlantic countries to "gird ourselves and find ways to create a unity more intimate and enduring than we have known before."

The point also was cited that the economies of the Atlantic nations and their common heritage in ideas make expansion within this great neighborhood singularly appropriate.

Great significance must be attached to the conclusions in view of the fact that they were arrived at after free discussion, removed from government interference or dictation, by leading citizens of the West. It must be evident that the conferees brought to their task a keen awareness and understanding of the problems involved. Everything considered, their recommendations must carry special weight, deserving the most serious consideration on the part of all nations involved. Greater Lafayette and the Hoosier State are signally honored to have furnished a member of the Commission.

The U.S. Commission earned poses in another respect, returning to the Treasury nearly \$100,000 of the \$250,000 appropriated for it. In these days when figures in the millions and billions have become commonplace for government, this was a modest appropriation. To have nearly half of it returned will surely lead to the Commission being read out of the spenders' union. But, its fine work completed, it is about to be disbanded anyway.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1962]

#### FOR AN ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

At the start of his swing around five European capitals, Secretary Rusk declared that, while the West was united on common goals and commitments, it was nevertheless entering upon a new chapter, and that the question he would discuss with European statesmen was, "where do we go from here?"

The new chapter is dictated by the history of our times—times that have seen not only the rise of the Communist challenge but also a complete transformation of the world, including the fall of empires and their realignment in new power blocs, the emergence of a multitude of new nations and an incredible advance in science and technology that promises a more abundant life but also threatens total annihilation. Taking all this into account, one of the best and boldest replies to the Secretary's query is that supplied in a report to Congress by the congressionally appointed Commission of 20 prominent Americans who attended the Atlantic Convention in Paris last January.

This Commission fully endorses the Declaration of Paris, which proclaims 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." To this end the Commission urges Congress to take steps, and take them soon, to make such a community a reality, even if they involve delegation of a measure of national sovereignty to the community. It proposes a permanent high council as a joint executive to concert political, military, economic, and cultural policies; a consultative Atlantic assembly, governed by a weighted majority vote, to represent the Atlantic peoples; and a high court of justice to settle legal differences. It endorses President Kennedy's proposed trade partnership with the European Economic Community as the nucleus of an Atlantic economic community open to all qualified nations.

The political, emotional, and practical difficulties of this plan are self-evident. It involves the progressive unification of a score of free nations on a voluntary basis—a unification in which the United States can lead but cannot coerce. History is demonstrably moving in this direction. That fact should provide Mr. Rusk with a ready answer to President de Gaulle's idea of an independent

Europe as a third force. It should spur Congress to action not only on the recommended appointment of a special governmental commission to study the details of the plan but also on the trade expansion bill, which, with its most-favored-nation provision, offers the opportunity for both the Commonwealth and all free countries to join in its benefits. This would be the most effective reply to Premier Khrushchev's now ritualistic boast that the Red flag will fly over the United States tomorrow.

[From the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune,  
June 19, 1962]

#### AN ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Coming as it does from the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, the case for establishment soon of an operating Atlantic community assumes new significance. The integration of policies and programs beyond the military unity, which now exists, conceivably would call for yielding of some sovereignty, and this recognition by leading American citizens constitutes a step toward building a community structure.

A working Atlantic community would have none of the pitfalls of the old "one world" federation which envisioned all nations, including those under communism, working together as good neighbors. The Atlantic nations are bound by common traditions and principles and they are in full accord on cold war goals. It would be unrealistic, however, to ignore existing differences, based mostly on national interests.

But the tempo for unity appears to be quickening. The iron, steel, and coal community of a few years ago has blossomed into the European Economic Community and has brought European political unity nearer. The United States aims at trade cooperation with EEC. A unified political structure linking the United States and Western Europe would appear to be the next logical move.

The New York Times sees the differences of "European realities" not as barriers to unity but as "building stones for the future." An Atlantic community, united in methods as well as in aims, not only would form an impregnable bulwark against communism but also would further the well-being of its people.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, June 23,  
1962]

#### FORM AN ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Compelling advice has been given to the U.S. Congress by the Citizens Commission on NATO. The Commission has warned U.S. political and economic leaders in a special report, to which Hugh Moore, Lower Nazareth Township, is a cosigner, that the Atlantic community must be organized soon if democracies are to be a match for dictatorships.

Mr. Moore and his fellow signers of the report were members of the delegation that represented the United States last January in the history-making Atlantic convention. A massive document of recommendations was compiled from the deliberations of the 90 NATO state delegates to this meeting. But their representations to the various NATO governments boils down to this: We must yield up a substantial degree of national sovereignty in order to create a military, cultural, economic, and political alliance of unprecedented vitality capable of securing the cause of Western ideals and freedom against aggression or erosion.

The fear with which the Communist world regards the possibility of such a Western federation has been made evident in many ways by Sino-Soviet and satellite political leadership. Soviet Chairman Khrushchev's assault on the Common Market, which in itself will create a commercial superstate in Europe—to the serious economic disadvan-

tage of the United States if we fail to become part of the trade complex—reflects communism's deep concern with soaring Western prosperity in the face of continuing and increasing economic distress for the Marxist-Leninist ideal.

American citizens who want to gain broader understanding of the principles involved in the Atlantic community concept might examine a State Department pamphlet published this week, covering remarks made by President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk at the Conference on Trade Policy in Washington on May 17.

"I am confident," said the President, "that Atlantic unity represents the true course of history—that Europe and the United States have not joined forces for more than a decade to be divided now by limited visions and suspicions. The direction of our destiny is toward community and confidence, and the United States is determined to fulfill that destiny."

Each generation indeed must build a road for the next.

[From the Carroll (Iowa) Times-Herald, June 20, 1962]

#### FOREIGN POLICY FOCUS

The focus of U.S. foreign policy tends to veer from one part of the world to another. For some years after World War II, the focus was primarily on European nations struggling to come back from the brink of disaster. Later there was pressure for more attention to the Middle East and the Far East.

Even more recently, much has been said about the need to offer more help to Latin America and strengthen our ties with those countries. Now there is growing talk of the importance of creating a much stronger Atlantic community, talk given further impetus by the recent report of the bipartisan Citizen's Commission on NATO.

This Commission, set up by Congress in March 1961, has concluded its study by supporting the idea of a U.S. trade alignment with the Common Market countries, and essentially endorsing the recommendations made in Paris last January by the Atlantic convention. These include the creation of a permanent high council to formulate policy on economic, political, military, and cultural matters, establishment of a high court of justice to settle disputes arising among Atlantic community nations, and development of an assembly for discussion of questions involving these nations.

Adherence to these recommendations would develop a strong Atlantic community; there is little doubt of that. And there are persuasive arguments in favor of such a political and economic entity. As we move toward that, however, it would be well to bear in mind that other parts of the world must not be neglected. This will be high among the concerns of our friends in parts of the world far from the Atlantic. We, too, must be conscious that in building a stronger Atlantic community we should not turn away from other areas.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, June 27, 1962]

#### AN ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

"Steps must be taken to make the Atlantic community a reality and they must be taken soon," even if it involves some yielding of national sovereignty.

This recommendation does not come from a band of dewy eyed dreamers but from a commission of 22 outstanding Americans. The Commission was named by Congress more than a year ago to study how greater political and economic unity might be achieved among members of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization)—the United States and Canada in North America and the major nations of Western Europe on the

other side of the Atlantic. Christian Herter, former Secretary of State, and William L. Clayton, a former Under Secretary of State, directed the body.

The Commission urged creation of a high court of justice to "settle legal differences between members of the Atlantic community" and of a permanent high council to "prepare . . . policies on political, economic, cultural, and military matters and, in certain cases, decide them on a majority vote weighted to reflect population differences among the member countries."

The Commission voiced enthusiasm for President Kennedy's proposed trade partnership with the European Common Market. "The comparable economies of the Atlantic nations and their common heritage in ideas make expansion within this great neighborhood singularly appropriate," it said.

No tightly knit superstate is going to come into being tomorrow around the Atlantic basin. The American Congress and President are not going to hand over authority to an international body. Yet it seems inevitable and wholly desirable that there be increased unity and merging of interests in the Atlantic community. Time will tell whether this necessitates the surrender of some degree of sovereignty.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Bulletin, June 21, 1962]

#### THE TRADE BILL: A FIRST STEP TO ATLANTIC UNITY

A distinguished Citizens Commission on NATO has reported to Congress its conclusion that "steps must be taken to make the Atlantic community a reality and they must be taken soon"—even if this involves some yielding of national sovereignty.

There can be no denying the logic and the urgency of this recommendation. The fiasco over Berlin negotiations, the fast-changing military picture, the problems of decolonialization, the impact of the Common Market, and permeating these and other problems, continuing pressures from the Soviet bloc—all point to the inadequacy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as the source and instrument of allied policy.

De Gaulle, Adenauer, Macmillan and even Kennedy notwithstanding, the time has come when the leaders of the Western alliance must yield something of national pride and prerogative to some supra-authority, competent to speak and act for all.

It is easy to say, as many are saying, that the Western World is not ready for any such sacrifice of national autonomy, that a true Atlantic community must evolve slowly with the growth of the Common Market and the gradual evolution of NATO. But if we are not ready, unfortunately our opponents are. If we cannot achieve voluntarily the advantage of unity which the Kremlin already commands by compulsion, the free world is not likely to survive the next decade.

"Each new Communist thrust brings home again the lesson that democracies must unite to be a match for dictatorship," the Citizens Commission declared. "But, as history has also taught us, democracies united and aroused are a formidable force. We must then gird ourselves and find ways to create a unity more intimate and enduring than we have known before."

As practical first steps toward this end, the Commission recommends creation of a permanent high council and a high court of justice for the nations of NATO. It also expresses the hope that President Kennedy's plan for trade relations between the United States and the European Economic Community will be realized and will become the nucleus of an Atlantic economic community "open to all qualified nations."

It is encouraging that the commission was created by Congress, where we are likely to hear the most vociferous objections to any yielding of national sovereignty, and that it

had respected, bipartisan leadership. Co-chairmen were former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, a Republican, and former Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton, a Democrat.

While the list of 20 members is one to instill confidence, it is surprising and regrettable that only one of the group comes from west of the Mississippi. While an Atlantic alliance may naturally generate more immediate enthusiasm in the East, the sacrifices that will be called for require a national commitment.

The Citizens Commission has performed a useful service. As the commission urged, we should act promptly to make its recommendations for the Atlantic community a reality. A practical first step would be speedy enactment of the new trade bill.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, June 19, 1962]

#### ATLANTIC UNITY

The recommendation submitted to Congress by the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO that a permanent high council and court be created for the NATO nations and enough sovereignty be ceded to them by the members to make them operative deserves serious, but careful, study. The Commission, headed by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton, was appointed by Congress in March 1961, to study means of achieving greater political and economic unity within the Atlantic community.

The logic behind the trend of current Western development toward formation of larger political units and integration of these into strong alliances makes such a suggestion natural. The mere mention of cessation of national sovereignty is usually enough to provoke popular opposition, but the elastic 10-year (more or less) timetable for implementing the plan shows that it is not intended to be either thrown together in haste or forced onto reluctant member states.

Should it prove impossible it will be because the facts of political life are not as easily agreed upon as those of economic life. The unity of Europe (and its possible extension to the Atlantic community) would no doubt still be a statesman's recurring daydream if experiments in economic integration had not been so spectacularly successful. The success of the limited European Coal and Steel Community led to the bolder try at the European Economic Community, and its rapid success produced the current momentum toward full political integration. Similarly, the prerequisite for a supranational Atlantic organization may be a successful economic accommodation between the United States and the Common Market.

In the case of the Atlantic Community, the decision on whether even limited political integration must be considered an inevitable development from economic union will be a difficult one to make. The final shape assumed by the Common Market and the concrete changes its presence works in the structure of the West as a whole will be crucial factors, and while they can be hypothesized, they are not yet evident, much less compelling. As things now stand, a supranational Atlantic community organization is only one of many possible means of strengthening the West.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 20, 1962]

#### A BOLD IDEA FOR UNION OF WEST

The idea of an Atlantic community with common economic as well as defense policies has attracted the interest and support of many influential people on both sides of the Atlantic—not the least of them being, it is suspected, John F. Kennedy.

Powerful backing for the Atlantic community concept has now come from the

Citizens Commission on NATO, a bipartisan group headed by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and by William L. Clayton, a former Under Secretary of State.

Herter and Clayton had much to do with building support in Congress and the country for the Trade Expansion Act, which apparently will pass Congress and carry the United States into an open partnership, as President Kennedy has called it, with the European Common Market countries.

The current Herter-Clayton report goes much farther; it would create nothing less than a free world union. Member nations would yield a measure of their sovereignty to an Atlantic high council charged with laying down policy on political, economic, cultural, and military matters of common interest. This bold idea was originally given voice by delegates from 14 of the 15 NATO governments who met last January in Paris. It has the potent theme that democracies when united can match the power of dictators.

The proposition for a delegation of sovereignty was accepted by all 92 delegates who met at Paris. It is significant that 20 Americans, chosen on a bipartisan basis, would join in support of such a proposition and put their influence behind a recommendation to Congress that a measure of delegated sovereignty should be transferred to an Atlantic community.

An unofficial report of this landmark meeting says: "The delegates were well aware of the fact that they were proposing institutions that most of them would never have accepted before the advent of the nuclear age and the rise of world communism \* \* \* They concluded that since the day had come when none of their governments could guarantee the security of themselves, their fellow citizens, and their descendants, another step had become inevitable—the creation of a formal Atlantic community—if freemen were to survive anywhere on earth."

The basic plan is to build the new Atlantic community structure on the NATO base. There are, however, some disadvantages to this that cannot be overlooked. An Atlantic community resting on NATO would exclude some nations that ought to be in it but could not join because its NATO character would conflict with their neutralist commitments. Austria, Finland, Sweden, and Switzerland, are among these. The Council of Europe, which is non-NATO, could well be a sounder base.

[From the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger & Inquirer, July 2, 1962]

#### HIGH COURT

The U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO urged Congress to approve the creation of a high court of justice, a permanent high council, and a trade partnership of the Atlantic community, open to all qualified nations, even if it meant giving up some national sovereignty. It stressed a mass trading area required for the efficient use of modern technology that would allow for the common military defense and common planning of assistance to developing nations, with an appropriate division of the costs. It would be a step toward political and economic unity of the Atlantic community, which is increasingly necessary to develop and defend the free world.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, June 24, 1962]

#### ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

How far should the United States go toward merging itself with the European bloc of free nations?

Congress will be confronted with that question in the report of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. Under authority of

a congressional act signed by President Eisenhower and in amended form by President Kennedy, a group of distinguished U.S. citizens met with similar groups of 13 other NATO countries in Paris in January.

This Atlantic Citizens Convention recommended, on the basis of its security and economic findings, that this Nation and its Western allies go all the way.

The key proposal is the formation of an Atlantic community governed by a permanent high council at the highest political level which would not only plan but decide policy. This means, of course, the forfeiture of a degree of sovereignty by the nations joining the Atlantic community. The vote for these proposals was unanimous. Additional proposals:

Establishment of an Atlantic High Court of Justice to decide specified legal controversies.

Development of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference into a consultative assembly.

Formation of a trade partnership between the United States and the European Economic Community (Common Market) as the basis of an Atlantic Economic Community open to other nations of the free world.

Cooperation of Atlantic nations in guiding and assisting developing nations.

Immediate measures to meet the population problem as reflected by hundreds of millions of hungry people now and the expected increase of 3 billion people in the next generation.

Participating in this Atlantic Citizens Convention and report were such distinguished Americans as Christian A. Herter, former Secretary of State; William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State; Eric Johnston, ex-president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Hugh Moore, industrialist, and others of high standing in business and the professions. These are no crackpot internationalists, but men of solid means and views.

The imperative motivation for an Atlantic community, they found, was the inadequacy of the NATO structure from a policy and decisionmaking standpoint and the realization that no single member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is powerful enough to stand alone.

Although Atlantic military power is as great or greater than that of the Communist bloc, the West is crippled in an emergency. While a dictator may act instantaneously, the West must obtain time-consuming unanimity among 15 governments. But, the conferees reported:

"The convention found that the opportunities were bright if the West exercised the resolution to take advantage of them. Total annual gross product of the Alliance was more than twice that of the Soviet bloc—its share in world trade five times as large.

"The new European Common Market, including Britain and other countries which have applied for membership, will represent in population, resources, and military potential a force rivaling that of the United States. A trade partnership between the Common Market and the United States as recommended by President Kennedy would create an economic colossus which would dwarf the Soviet bloc. Unification of the foreign policy and defense facilities of the Allies vis-a-vis the Soviet bloc would create such an assertion of spirit and power that the cold war could subside."

NATO was formed as a military alliance to restrain the Communist empire from aggression. The proposed Atlantic community would go far beyond the NATO concept in the grouping of economic with military power and the assignment of policy and command functions to a high council. Are the free nations ready for this movement

into part-world government? We do not know. But certainly the report merits reasoned debate rather than demagogic speeches in Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think it is significant that these editorials have grasped the importance and timeliness of the vital issue to which the bipartisan groups of Americans, headed by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and former Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton, addressed themselves. We cannot fail to recognize their contribution of challenging concepts and a meaningful call to action for closer cooperation among the free nations.

This report represents the culmination of a thoroughgoing search for solutions to one of the major problems of our time. As such it deserves the thoughtful attention not only of the Congress and executive branches of our Government, but also of Americans everywhere.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me 1 minute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

#### TRIBUTE TO LAURIS NORSTAD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the news that Lauris Norstad has resigned as the Supreme Commander of the NATO Forces, in SHAPE, and is seeking retirement will be greeted with the greatest of regret I think by all mankind, in view of the fact that NATO is so critically an important element of the peace-keeping machinery for all mankind.

Though I join with the President and others in deeply deprecating the fact that he is leaving this high office, graced by such outstanding American proconsuls as General Eisenhower, General Vandenberg, General Gruenther, and now General Norstad himself, a man who has given all he has given certainly is entitled to his own life and his own future.

We would be remiss in our duty if we did not pay a tribute to this noble American, this great soldier, this outstanding statesman who has rendered such unusual service, far beyond the line of duty, to the United States—but also, Mr. President, to all mankind and to the interests of peace.

I hope very much in the days ahead that his example may be emulated by American youth, to demonstrate to the world the courage, the skill, the patriotism, and the dedication which reside in the young people of our country.

I thank my colleague very much for yielding.