

## NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL DEPUTIES

~~SECRET~~

SUMMARY RECORD

D-R(51)11

OR. ENG.

21st February, 1951.

NATO UNCLASSIFIED  
and  
PUBLIC DISCLOSED

Summary Record of a meeting of the Council  
Deputies held at 13, Belgrave Square, London,  
S.W.1 on Monday, 19th February, 1951 at 3.0. p.m.

### PRESENT:

Chairman - Mr. C.M. Spofford (United States)

Vicomte Obert de Thieusies (Belgium)      Mr. L.D. Wilgress (Canada)

Count Eduard Reventlow (Denmark)      M. H. Alphand (France)

M. E. Benedikz (Iceland)      Signor A. Rossi Longhi (Italy)

M. G. Heisbourg (Luxembourg)      Jonkheer A.W.L. Tjarda van  
Starkenborgh-Stachouwer  
(Netherlands)

M. D. Bryn (Norway)      Dr. R.E. Ulrich (Portugal)

Sir Frederick Hoyer Millar (United Kingdom)

### SECRETARIAT:

Mr. T.A.G. Charlton

### CONTENTS:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
I	Agreement on the Status of the Armed Forces of the North Atlantic Treaty	1.
II	Appointment of Supreme Commander Atlantic	2.
III	Establishment of an International Staff and International Budget for NATO.	4.
IV	NATO reorganization.	7.
V	Questionnaire on National Military Service Mobilization and Training.	7.
VI	Suggested Political Topics for future discussion.	9.
VII	Conference on the Establishment of an European Army	9.
VIII	Collection of Basic Data.	10.
IX	Date of Next Meeting.	10.

I. AGREEMENT ON THE STATUS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

1. MR. LAMBERT, Chairman of the Working Group on the Status of the Armed Forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Countries, gave a report on the progress so far made by the Working Group.

2. He explained that before embarking on their study of the problem the Working Group had had to take into account a number of factors, the most important of which were as follows:

(a) Whereas the agreement on the status of members of the Armed Forces of the Brussels Treaty Powers was limited to peacetime only, the Working Group had felt that it would be unrealistic in present circumstances to ignore the position which would obtain on the outbreak of hostilities. They had accordingly decided to prepare in the first place an agreement which would be applicable in peace, and then to consider whether the terms could without great difficulty be made applicable after the outbreak of hostilities. The Working Group had felt that to have an agreement which automatically terminated on the outbreak of hostilities would cause the maximum of inconvenience at a time of great pressure. It would be most desirable that countries should not be faced with the task of negotiating a fresh agreement at a time when it was imperative to have agreed arrangements in operation. It was the hope of the Working Group that the draft on which they would reach agreement would be of such a kind that it could continue in operation after the outbreak of hostilities and until such time as it proved necessary to re-examine the various provisions in the light of the experience gained of its operation.

(b) The arrangements with regard to languages used in the various forms and documents had to be altered from those envisaged under the Brussels Treaty Agreement, and it was hoped that final agreement would be reached on the use of the language of the sending State plus either French or English.

(c) It was felt that the use of the word "foreign" was unsuitable in the NAT context and it had accordingly been eliminated.

(d) Some difficulty had been experienced with regard to the precise definition of "war". Recent experience had shown that there were a number of forms of armed conflict not amounting to war and it had accordingly been decided to adopt some more general terms such as "hostilities".

(e) Special provisions were being made to cover the civilian component of the Armed Forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Powers, whereas these had been omitted from the Brussels Treaty Agreement.

3. In general, he hoped that the articles as finally agreed would be more positive than those of the Brussels Treaty Agreement.

4. So far Articles I - VI had reached an advanced state of agreement. Article VI (Jurisdiction) had proved to be difficult and there had had to be a certain degree of give and take. Article VII (Claims) was also proving difficult but in the light

/of.

of recent discussions it was hoped that a compromise solution would be reached by the middle of the week. The remaining Articles, apart from Article IX on income tax and other matters relating to direct taxation, had also reached an advanced state of agreement and it was hoped that they would be cleared by the end of the week.

5. In view of the progress which had already been made it would be reasonable to hope that there would be an agreed Working Group draft for submission to the Deputies in the course of the following week.

6. Mr. Lambert wished to place on record his thanks for the help and co-operation which he had received from all representatives on the Working Group. It had, however, been clearly understood that in agreeing to the text of any Article or Articles, representatives were in no way committing their governments. He hoped, however, that by the time the draft had been agreed there would be no points which were totally unacceptable to governments. He wished to make it clear that certain provisions in the draft agreement would certainly require legislation on the part of a number of countries, and it was possible that this legislation might prove to be controversial. In drafting the agreement the Working Group had attempted to keep a reasonable balance between the interests of a sending State and those of a receiving State. Certain countries, however, particularly Iceland, were likely to be primarily a receiving or a sending State and this might create difficulties in accepting the agreement as a whole.

7. THE CANADIAN DEPUTY enquired what procedure would be followed when the Working Group had submitted their agreed draft.

8. THE CHAIRMAN said that it was his intention to place the draft agreement on the Council Deputies agenda if it appeared evident that some advantage might be derived from a discussion around the table. Ultimately, however, governments would have to decide whether or not they were prepared to accept the draft. Discussion by the Deputies might serve to narrow the possible field of disagreement and in any case he hoped that the Deputies would be in a position to recommend the acceptance of the agreement as a whole to their respective governments.

9. There was general agreement on the procedure suggested, several Deputies stressing that Ministers would have to be consulted.

10. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

- (1) Thanked Mr. Lambert for his statement.
- (2) Agreed to discuss the draft agreement when complete, with a view to recommending its acceptance to governments.

11. APPOINTMENT OF SUPREME COMMANDER ATLANTIC  
(Previous reference: Summary Record: D-R(51)10, Item I).

11. The Council Deputies resumed their consideration of

/the

the memorandum by the Chairman (Document D-D(51)37).

12. THE BELGIAN DEPUTY stated that the Chairman of the Defence Committee had not yet received replies from all members of the Defence Committee. The Portuguese Government, in agreeing to the appointment, had suggested that the Defence Committee should take the initiative in the matter and that the Defence Ministers of the various countries should be invited to submit a formal letter containing their governments approval of the appointment, as was done in the case of the appointment of General Eisenhower, Supreme Commander Europe.

13. THE FRENCH DEPUTY said that in agreeing to the appointment of Admiral Fechteler his government had suggested that a similar procedure should be followed in the case of all higher command appointments under NATO and that an appropriate resolution should be signed by the Council Deputies, in the name of the Council, as was done on the appointment of General Eisenhower. If this proposal was accepted, once Defence Ministers had notified their agreement, the procedure would be the adoption and signing of the resolution by the Council Deputies, to be followed by a formal letter addressed to the Chairman of the North Atlantic Council by the respective Governments.

14. THE UNITED KINGDOM DEPUTY stated that his government's reply had now been sent to the Chairman of the Defence Committee. In agreeing to the appointment, the United Kingdom Government had however reserved its position on the terms of reference of the Supreme Commander Atlantic pending the outcome of current discussions in the Standing Group.

15. The Council Deputies then considered the text of a draft press communiqué which was circulated at the meeting, (reproduced as the Appendix to this record). In the course of discussion the following points were made:

(a) THE BELGIAN DEPUTY said that the Chairman of the Defence Committee had requested that the following arrangements should be made for release.

(i) A simultaneous release in Washington, London and Brussels on a date and at a time to be fixed by agreement.

(ii) Agreement on a French translation of the text to be issued in Brussels by Colonel De Greef in his capacity as Chairman of the Defence Committee.

(b) THE ITALIAN DEPUTY suggested that the third paragraph of the draft communiqué should be amended to make it clear that the area of command of the Supreme Commander Atlantic did not cover the Mediterranean.

(c) THE UNITED KINGDOM DEPUTY said that he wished to reserve his position on the terms of the draft communiqué in order to clear the text with the British Admiralty.

/(d)

(d) Reference was made to certain reports which had appeared in the press relating to the proposed appointment of Admiral Fechteler. The Information Service had been instructed to say that while the matter was being discussed no final decision had yet been reached.

(e) Some doubt was expressed whether the terms of reference of the Supreme Commander Atlantic had in fact been formally approved by the North Atlantic Council at its meeting held in Brussels in December, 1950. Document C6-D/2 which had been considered by the Council contained a reference to the proposed appointment but the detailed terms of reference did not appear.

16. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

- (1) Agreed to the ultimate release of a press communiqué on the lines requested by the Belgian Deputy, at (a) above.
- (2) Agreed that the second sentence of the third paragraph should be deleted.
- (3) Invited the Chairman to circulate a revised draft communiqué in the light of the points raised in discussion.

III. ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL STAFF AND INTERNATIONAL BUDGET FOR NATO.

(Previous reference: Summary Record: D-R(51)10, Item II).

17. THE CHAIRMAN said that the Working Group on the establishment of an International Budget had held its first meeting that morning, and had already made some progress. Arrangements had also been made for the meetings of the other Working Groups which were considering the various aspects of the establishment of an International Staff and International Budget for NATO.

18. THE CANADIAN DEPUTY suggested that it would be more convenient if the Working Group on the establishment of an International Budget for NATO were also asked to examine the desirability of creating an integrated Secretariat. There was general agreement with this suggestion.

19. THE FRENCH DEPUTY said that the establishment of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe, in Paris, gave rise to a number of financial questions to which the French Government considered it necessary to draw the attention of the Deputies:

(a) Preliminary estimates of expenditure for the installation of the Supreme Headquarters amounted to several million dollars. In view of the magnitude of this sum, the French Government considered it necessary to secure an agreement in principle by the Council Deputies in advance before embarking on the establishment of the Supreme Headquarters.

(b) The French Government also considered it necessary for the Council Deputies to confirm that all expenditure already incurred or about to be

/incurred

incurred on the establishment of the Supreme Headquarters would rank as expenditure which would be ultimately shared between the NATO member countries on a basis to be determined.

(c) The Standing Group in Document S.G.98 had laid down that the three members would be invited to make advances towards the cost of establishing the Supreme Headquarters and would examine the question at an early meeting. In this same document the Standing Group had invited all member countries to contribute forthwith to the expenditure on the Supreme Headquarters. A preliminary contribution from all the member countries which would be taken into account in the final reckoning should be envisaged. This contribution should be fixed on a proportionate basis by the Council Deputies after consultation with the interested authorities, but would not prejudice the ultimate sharing of the expenditure.

(d) The international ad hoc budget committee established by the Standing Group had, in its report dated 7th February, 1951, proposed rules for the establishment of an international budget and control of expenditure in respect of the Supreme Headquarters.

He suggested that the above points should in the first instance be remitted to the Working Group on the International Budget.

20. THE CHAIRMAN said that it had not proved possible to circulate a revised draft resolution in time for this meeting, but one would be available for consideration at the next meeting. In the meantime he thought it would be helpful if he clarified the proposals which he had made in Document D-D(51)30 with regard to "special assistants". He did not attach any great importance to the title of these "special assistants", but in view of the criticisms which had been made he suggested that for the time being they should be called "staff". With regard to numbers, his intention was that they should be limited to three or four as a start, with provision for subsequent expansion should the need arise. While he intended that the nucleus of this "staff" should be international officials, he felt that at the outset it might prove to be necessary to recruit extra individuals on a contributory basis to cover special assignments. It was his intention that all the NATO staff should be selected on the basis of their capabilities and qualifications, and it was important that the Chairman should have personal confidence in them. For this reason he was not in favour of any preconceived distribution of staff on a national basis, although he agreed that other things being equal the staff should be fully representative of the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

It was inherent in his proposal that the Chairman should retain the ultimate responsibility for directing and co-ordinating the work of the Organization as a whole. He realised, however, that for practical reasons he could not hope to exercise this control personally in all respects and would require a Chief of the Staff to assist him. This did not mean, that he intended to delegate entire responsibility to the Chief of Staff but that the Chief of Staff should exercise,

/responsibility

responsibility under his direction. In the absence of the Chairman the Chief of the Staff would report to and take directions from the Vice Chairman. In his view the Chief of the Staff should not be of the same nationality as the Chairman.

The function of the "staff" would be:

- (a) To recommend in advance a programme of matters for consideration of the Deputies.
- (b) To supervise the preparation of the necessary material for effective Council consideration.
- (c) To assist the Council Deputies as a whole by taking certain types of follow up action with Governments, and with other NATO bodies. In the case of the former the approach to the Governments would be through or with the consent of the Deputies concerned.

In the revised resolution he intended to include a series of principles, e.g. (a) the establishment of a NATO staff, recruited on an international basis, under the direction of the Chairman, (b) the establishment of common terms of service and administration for the permanent organisation as a whole, irrespective of whether they were working under the operational control of the Council Deputies, the Defence Production Board or any other NATO Agency.

The major requirement was to create one single organization which would assist in pulling together all the NATO Agencies. It was important, however, in setting up such an organization to avoid any suggestion of over-staffing by keeping the numbers down to the minimum required for the tasks in hand. He suggested that the resolution should invite the Chairman to report to the Deputies from time to time what progress had been made in bringing the proposed organization into being.

21. In discussion general agreement was expressed on the statement made by the Chairman. The point was made that there should be no difference between the "staff" and the other sections of the proposed organization, e.g. the Secretariat, Information Service and the Statistical Service.

## 22. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

- (1) Invited the Chairman to circulate a revised resolution on the lines indicated by him.
- (2) Agreed to reverse the decision taken at their previous meeting (Summary Record: D-R(51)10, Item II, Conclusion (1)) by instructing the Working Group on the establishment of an International Budget for NATO to examine the desirability of integrating the secretariats of the various NATO bodies in London.
- (3) Agreed that the statement by the French Deputy should

/be

referred to the Working Group on the establishment of an International Budget for NATO, for examination.

IV. NATO REORGANIZATION.

(Previous reference: Summary Record: D-R(51)8, Item IV).

23. The Council Deputies had before them a note by the Secretary covering a new draft of paragraph 7 of the Canadian draft annexed to Summary Record D-R(51)5 on the subject of the composition of the proposed Council of Governments. (D-D(51)49)

24. A number of editorial amendments were agreed. It was also agreed that the changes in the text did not call for any consequential amendments to Appendix B of Document D-D(51)20.

25. THE CHAIRMAN and THE BELGIAN DEPUTY said that they were still without instructions from their respective governments on the Canadian Memorandum as a whole, (D-D(51)4) but hoped that they would be received at an early date.

26. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

Agreed to continue their discussion of Document D-D(51)4 at a subsequent meeting.

V. QUESTIONNAIRE ON NATIONAL MILITARY SERVICE MOBILIZATION AND TRAINING.

27. The Council Deputies had before them a memorandum by the Chairman (Document: D-D(51)48).

28. THE CHAIRMAN said that individual countries replies to the questionnaire on National Military Service, Mobilization and Training, which had been issued under reference NACD/16, had now been received and circulated. He reminded Deputies that the questionnaire had originally been sent out in response to a request from the Defence Committee for the Council Deputies to use their good offices with their respective governments to secure acceptance of certain principles governing National Military Service, Mobilization and Training. In order to assist consideration of the replies by the Council Deputies he had circulated Document D-D(51)48, which consisted of (a) a tabulated summary of the replies submitted, (b) a brief factual analysis. He did not wish the memorandum to be discussed at this meeting, but suggested that it would be preferable to hold a discussion in say two weeks' time at which a representative of the Standing Group and possibly also a representative of the Supreme Commander Europe should be present. The invitation to the latter would be extended through the Standing Group. As a result of this discussion it was possible that he would be invited by the Deputies to make representations to governments or take other appropriate action on certain aspects of the replies.

In/

SECRET  
D-R(51)11

In the meantime he would be grateful if Deputies could correct any errors of interpretation which had been made in either the tabulated summary or the factual analysis. He realised that this particular subject raised issues of a delicate nature in the political field, but he hoped that each Deputy would contribute to the discussion not only in support of his own country's reply but also in relation to the discussion of other countries' replies.

29. THE FRENCH DEPUTY suggested that a column should be added to the tabulated summary stating to what extent there were exemptions from National Military Service in the various countries. It was agreed that in lieu of sending out a supplementary questionnaire this information could be given orally when the memorandum was discussed in detail.

30. THE CANADIAN DEPUTY drew attention to the reply sent in by his Government which had been circulated as Document D-D(51)17. The Canadian Government had expressed the view on receipt of the original questionnaire that, since it applied to a National Service system replies from the Canadian Government did not appear to be required. He recalled that this particular point had already been discussed by the Defence Committee in October, 1950. In the course of this discussion an amendment to Defence Committee document DC-25 had been made at the request of the Canadian Minister of Defence, which took the form of the addition of the words "Or an adequate organized volunteer reserve in conformity with national requirements" to the paragraph which had set out what National forces were required. His colleagues would be aware that the conscription issue was an extremely delicate one for the Canadian Government.

The only question which Deputies might feel should be answered by the Canadian Government was question II(2) relating to National Mobilization machinery. If requested, he would ask the Canadian Government to submit a reply to this particular question.

31. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

(1) Agreed to continue their discussion of Document D-D(51)48 on 5th March, 1951.

(2) Invited the Chairman to extend an invitation to the Standing Group to send a representative to the meeting who might, if the Standing Group so desired, be accompanied by a representative of the Supreme Commander Europe.

(3) Agreed that countries should state orally what exemptions from National Military Service existed in their respective countries.

(4) Took note of the statement by the Canadian Deputy.

VI./

SECRET  
D-R(51)11

VI. SUGGESTED POLITICAL TOPICS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION.

32. THE CHAIRMAN said that he had received the following suggestions which, at first sight, would appear to provide profitable topics for discussion:

- (a) Conditions in satellite countries.
- (b) Conditions in Eastern Germany.
- (c) Conditions in the Baltic area.
- (d) the Middle East.
- (e) U.S.S.R.

33. There was general agreement that a discussion on conditions in the USSR, in various satellite countries and in Eastern Germany would be the most profitable. It would, however, be necessary to divide the subject matter for ease of handling. The following programme was agreed after discussion:

- (i) March 5th. Military, political and economic conditions in Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria and Albania.
- (ii) March 12th. Military, political and economic conditions in Eastern Germany.
- (iii) At a future date. Military, political and economic conditions in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

34. It was also agreed that the same procedure would be adopted as in the case of the exchange of views on Yugoslavia, e.g. the preparation of an "agreed minute" which would set out the concensus of agreement reached after discussion. This procedure could of course be varied if in fact the outcome of any particular discussion did not lend itself to incorporation in an agreed minute.

VII. CONFERENCE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EUROPEAN ARMY.

35. THE FRENCH DEPUTY made a brief statement on the progress of the Paris conference on the establishment of a European Army. Two sessions had been held the previous week. At the first session, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs had made an opening statement. At the second session he himself had made a statement outlining in detail the various points contained in a French memorandum which had been circulated to the conference. This memorandum was in fact an elaboration of the original plan proposed by Monsieur Plevén. The French proposals envisaged the establishment of a European Army by stages, but stressed the concept of a European Army taking its appropriate place within the NATO framework. It also stressed that the European Army, if set up, should be as efficient as possible. Delegations represented at the conference had been asked to refer the French memorandum to their governments and to reconvene the following Thursday, 22nd February, 1951.

SECRET  
D-R(51)11

36. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

Thanked the French Deputy for his statement and requested him to report any progress from time to time at subsequent meetings.

VIII. COLLECTION OF BASIC DATA.

37. THE CHAIRMAN recalled that at their meeting held on 24th January, 1951, the Council Deputies had passed a resolution requesting the Standing Group to supply certain statistical information by 14th February (Document D-D(51)26). The Standing Group had reported by cable on 14th February (STAND 53) that only one country had replied and that reply was incomplete. He reminded the Deputies that they had agreed to impress upon their respective governments the urgent need to supply this information, and in view of the unsatisfactory position disclosed by the Standing Group's report he felt that it was incumbent upon Deputies to make further urgent representations to their governments.

38. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

Took note of the Chairman's statement.

IX. DATE OF NEXT MEETING.

39. THE CHAIRMAN said that while he was most anxious to arrange a time-table of meetings which would permit the French Deputy to attend, he felt that in this particular instance the state of the agenda was such that it would be most inconvenient for the Deputies to meet on the following day Tuesday, 20th February. He hoped, however, that in subsequent weeks while the Conference on the European Army was in progress it would be possible to arrange matters so that the important items were considered on Monday or Tuesday of each week.

40. THE COUNCIL DEPUTIES:

Agreed that the next meeting should be held on Wednesday, 21st February, 1951 at 3 p.m.

13, Belgrave Square,  
 LONDON, S.W.1.

SECRET  
D-R(51)11

APPENDIX

APPOINTMENT OF SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER ATLANTIC  
ATLANTIC

DRAFT PRESS COMMUNIQUE

Admiral William M. Fechteler of the United States Navy has been named Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, the North Atlantic Council announced today.

The North Atlantic Council, acting on recommendations adopted by the Defence Committee at its September meeting in Washington and its meeting in Brussels last December, requested the United States to designate an officer to fill the post of Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic. The President of the United States subsequently designated Admiral Fechteler, whose nomination has now been unanimously approved by the North Atlantic Treaty Defence Ministers and the North Atlantic Council Deputies.

Admiral Fechteler will be supported by an integrated international staff drawn from countries belonging to the North Atlantic Ocean Regional Planning Group. The Supreme Allied Command Atlantic is a naval counterpart in the overall North Atlantic Treaty Organization command structure of General Eisenhower's Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe and the two commands will support each other. Their coordination will be the responsibility of the Standing Group in Washington.

13, Belgrave Square,  
London, S.W.1.