

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD  
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

EXEMPLAIRE N° 220  
COPY

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH  
3rd June, 1952

SECRET  
SUMMARY RECORD  
AC/18-R/1

WORKING GROUP TO EXAMINE THE QUESTION OF  
A PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS FOR NATO

Summary Record of a Meeting held at the Palais  
de Chaillot, Paris, on Friday, 30th May, 1952  
at 3.30 p.m.

PRESENT

Chairman: Mr. H.F.L.K. van Vredenburg (Deputy Secretary  
General)

Mr. A. de Staerke (Belgium) Mr. S.C. Sommerfelt (Norway)  
Mr. E. Burin des Rozières (France) Dr. H.C. Queiroz (Portugal)

Mr. J.L. Loughran (United States)

INTERNATIONAL STAFF

Dr. H.D. Pierson (Acting Director of Budget and Accounts)  
Miss L. Peart (Secretary)

ALSO PRESENT

Mr. P. Chatenet } (France)  
Mr. Richard }

CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
I	French Representative's Report on French Government's enquiries into possible sites for permanent Headquarters for NATO	1
II	Discussion arising out of French Representative's Report.	2

1. FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ON THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT'S ENQUIRY INTO POSSIBLE SITES FOR PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS FOR NATO.

THE CHAIRMAN referred to the decision taken by the North Atlantic Council at the first meeting in Paris, whereby the French Government was invited to submit proposals for examination by the present Working Group regarding possible sites for the permanent headquarters of NATO.

2. The FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE stated that the Committee appointed to study this question would not be ready to give a full report on their enquiries until the middle of the following week. At the present meeting, however, he could provide the Working Group with an outline of the three possibilities which had been under consideration, indicating the main advantages and disadvantages of each.

3. The first possibility was to use existing buildings. It had been found that the only practicable building available for NATO purposes was the "Petites Ecuries" of the Château de Versailles. The French Government intended in any case to carry out restoration work on the Château de Versailles and its annexes; this would cost 700 million francs, which would be met by the French Government. One additional building would also have to be constructed for the use of NATO; this would cost a further 700 million francs, to be shared among NATO member countries.

4. Apart from the distance from Paris, the chief disadvantage of this plan would be that the work would require at least 14 months to complete, and this time-limit was not by any means certain, as the renovation of historical buildings involved consultation and negotiations with the Ministère de l'Education et des Beaux Arts.

5. The second possibility which had been examined by the French Government was to build a temporary building for NATO on the SHAPE model; it would be more lasting than the temporary UNO buildings at the Palais de Chaillot, but would nevertheless not be built in permanent materials. The cost would be 1 $\frac{1}{2}$  billion francs, 500 millions of which would be the purchase price of the land.

6. It was estimated that the construction work could be carried out in nine or ten months, but the preliminary negotiations would last some time, since there would be difficulty in acquiring a suitable building site. The only piece of land which had been found so far was on the Boulevard Lannes; it was at present owned by the City of Paris and would not be easily purchased owing to restrictions on building in that area for aesthetic reasons.

7. The third alternative was to construct a permanent building for NATO in stone. This possibility had so far been examined in the light of the existing facilities offered by the OEEC buildings and land. It was proposed to make use of one of the existing OEEC annexes, which could be made available to NATO owing to the reductions now being made in the numbers of OEEC staff, and, in addition, to put up a building on a piece of land which the OEEC had originally planned to buy as a part of a scheme to create a Centre for International Organisations in Paris. A provisional estimate of the cost involved was 1,400,000,000 francs.

8. The building time required was estimated to be ten months from the date on which the decision was taken. There need be no great delay before taking this decision as the OEEC had already entered into preliminary negotiations to acquire the land; the site had been already freed of all building restrictions and the contracts had already been prepared under the original OEEC plan. Contrary to some expectations, it appeared that no serious political objections were likely to be raised by the OEEC against installing NATO in the vicinity of their own offices. In effect, all that remained to be done was for the Steering Committee of the OEEC to authorise the purchase of land by the OEEC for resale to NATO as soon as the North Atlantic Council had taken the necessary decision.

9. This plan offered the advantage of being more convenient geographically for NATO purposes than the other two possibilities reviewed, since the OEEC offices were situated near the residential and diplomatic quarters of Paris. The only disadvantage was that the quarter of La Muette in question was already heavily built-up and very little space was available for car parking or for any future expansion of NATO building which might become necessary.

## II. DISCUSSION ARISING OUT OF THE FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT.

10. The discussion which followed the French Representative's statement centred chiefly on the following points:

- (1) the provision of adequate office accommodation for national NATO delegations in the immediate vicinity of the offices of the International Staff if the plan to make use of the OEEC facilities was adopted.

- (2) the possibility of erecting a lasting stone building for NATO in some other less built-up area than La Muette.

11. In connection with the first of these points, the French Representative stated that his information was that 120 offices were at present available in the existing OEEC Annex which could be taken over by NATO, and it was anticipated that a further 350 offices could be provided in the additional building to be put up on the OEEC building site.

12. With reference to the second main point raised in the discussion, the French Representative said that his Government would have difficulty in purchasing the necessary land. In reply to the suggestion that one solution open to the Government might be to expropriate a site, he said that, although this had been done in the case of the OEEC, it was considered difficult to adopt that procedure now.

13. THE WORKING GROUP AGREED:

- (1) the plan which was the most acceptable to all the delegations represented was the construction of a permanent stone building, making use of the facilities offered by OEEC;
- (2) the French Representative should be requested to provide the Working Group at its next meeting with fuller details on the above-mentioned plan with special reference to the possibilities which it held out of providing National Delegations with office accommodation in the same block of buildings as the International Staff and conference rooms;
- (3) a brief interim report by the Chairman on the Working Group's discussion should be submitted to the North Atlantic Council at its meeting on Wednesday, 4th June, 1952;
- (4) a final report for submission to the North Atlantic Council should be drawn up as a result of next meeting of the Working Group;
- (5) in accordance with the French Representative's proposal, the views expressed in the discussion on the subject of the future permanent headquarters for NATO should be treated as confidential, in order to obviate any danger of prejudicing the results of the tentative negotiations with the OEEC now in progress.

14. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Working Group would be held on Thursday, 5th June, 1952 at 3.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.