

UNCLO-Working Papers - Commissions + Technical Committees - Committee 1/2 Meeting (1-29)

2 June 1945  
21 June 1945

Clear

UN ARCHIVES

SERIES	1018
BOX	04
FILE	04
ACC.	

I/r 21<sup>st</sup> June 12



SUMMARY REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2.

Veterans Building, Room 503, June 12, 1945, 3:45 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by <sup>then</sup> ~~the~~ Chairman at 3:45. The Secretary-General of the Conference introduced to Committee I/2 Mr. Creamuno, Costa Rica, who had been selected by his delegation to replace Mr. Bonilla Lara, <sup>as</sup> chairman of Committee I/2.

1. Reconsideration of Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 3, concerning Expulsion.

Mr. Rolin of Belgium <sup>moved to delete</sup> ~~proposed that~~ paragraph 4 of the suggested draft on expulsion, which reads as follows:

"The Organization may expel from the Organization any member which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter"

be ~~omitted from the Charter.~~

The Delegate from Mexico seconded the motion and the Delegate from Belgium then requested that there be a roll call vote.



In response to inquiries concerning the interpretation of the vote which would be taken on this question, the Chairman explained that a <sup>two-thirds</sup> ~~2/3~~ majority of those present and voting would be required to support the motion of Mr. Rolin. If the motion carried by this required majority, then the Committee <sup>would</sup> ~~will~~ recommend to the Commission that reference to expulsion <sup>from</sup> in the Charter be omitted. If Mr. Rolin's motion failed to receive the requisite majority, the Committee then later ~~xx~~ at some future meeting would take up the question of expulsion. A two thirds majority of those present and voting would be required to sustain the provision for expulsion in the Dumbarton Oaks <sup>P</sup>proposal. If a <sup>two-thirds</sup> ~~2/3~~ majority is not obtained, the matter would then go to Commission I and, according to the procedures of the Conference, to the Steering Committee which <sup>might</sup> ~~would~~ make recommendations to Commission I.

The Delegate from Ecuador pointed out that the Steering Committee <sup>did</sup> ~~would~~ not include instructions or



<sup>to Committee I/2</sup>  
recommendations and, it seemed to him, ~~that~~ the Committee  
was being asked to change its point of view on the matter.

He proceeded to explain the relationship between the question of expulsion and that of withdrawal and announced that, if the right of withdrawal should be recognized, Ecuador would change its point of view <sup>on universality</sup> and might vote to include right of expulsion.

He favored postponing the vote on expulsion until the question of withdrawal had been reported to the Committee by Subcommittee I/2/E.

The Delegate of Uruguay suggested that a vote be taken on a motion to reconsider the previous decision of the Committee on expulsion. If the majority of the Committee voted to reconsider the decision, then the Committee might proceed to a vote on the proposal <sup>itself</sup>.

The Chairman reported to the Committee that the action of the Steering Committee in referring the question back to Committee I/2 was tantamount to a vote in favor



of reconsidering the previous decision in view of the fact that the Steering Committee consisted of chiefs of delegations. The Delegate of Belgium explained that his motion was to <sup>facilitate</sup> ~~violate~~ the Committee's reaching a decision. With regard to the question of withdrawal, he felt that Subcommittee I/2/E was <sup>only</sup> ~~merely~~ dealing with withdrawal as it related ~~only~~ to the question of ratification of amendments.

The Norwegian Delegate ~~took the floor to explain~~ <sup>ed</sup> why the Norwegian delegation favored the deletion of reference to expulsion in the Charter. His Delegation believed that, in the exercise of the right of expulsion, there was <sup>equitable balance</sup> no ~~concordance~~ between the guilt and sanction. The former <sup>rested with</sup> ~~belonged to~~ the government in power, while the latter fell upon the nation as a whole. If reference to expulsion were to be made in the Charter, it would have to be based <sup>more</sup> ~~on such a concordance.~~ <sup>an equitable relationship of responsibility to punishment</sup> ~~Norway would support such a motion~~



*He stated that*  
~~even though it thought it unwise.~~ Norway would support the

proposal of Belgium. The Delegate of Egypt noted the inter-

*TP* relation of the questions of withdrawal, expulsion and amendment. Egypt favored universality, but would have to reconsider its position if the right of expulsion were included in the Charter. If compulsory expulsion were included, ~~then~~ the dignity of states would require the right of voluntary withdrawal.

The Brazilian Delegate inquired of the Chairman whether the decision of the Steering Committee to refer this matter back to Committee I/2 was unanimous. *The Chairman assured the delegate that the decision was unanimous.*

The Delegate of the United States supported the interpretation of the voting procedure by the Chairman, as well as the views of Belgium and Greece on the procedural matter. He took cognizance of the relationship of withdrawal, <sup>a</sup>expulsion and amendment. He stressed the proposition that the character of the Organization which was based <sup>both</sup> on the cooperation of peace-loving states <sup>on</sup> and the unity of the



major powers, required that states <sup>the actions of which</sup> ~~which detracted~~ from  
the character of the Organization must be <sup>either</sup> excluded or ex-  
pelled. He continued that the Organization depended upon  
the desire <sup>of the members</sup> ~~to maintain~~ <sup>it</sup> and to remain a part of it. He ack-  
nowledged that the questions related to expulsion might have  
to be settled one by one. In conclusion, he stated the United  
States <sup>desired</sup> ~~wanted~~ an Organization of the character which he had  
<sup>outlined</sup> ~~discussed~~ and which <sup>would have</sup> ~~had~~ the support of as many peace-loving  
states as would join.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa requested  
the Chairman to ~~expell~~ explain the purposes of the Steer-  
ing Committee in referring the matter of expulsion back to  
Committee I/2.

The Chairman explained that the Steering Committee wished  
Committee I/2 to ~~clarify~~ its previous vote on the question.

The United Kingdom Delegate supported the procedure  
for reconsidering the question. He urged that a vote be



taken on the amendment by the delegate of Belgium.

The Delegate of Canada stated his view that, if the Dumbarton Oaks proposal on expulsion <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ not sustained by a <sup>two-thirds</sup> ~~the 2/3~~ majority, <sup>then</sup> ~~but~~ no reference to expulsion <sup>would</sup> ~~will~~ be included in the Charter. On the matter of substance, he explained that the difference of opinion in the Committee <sup>did</sup> ~~would~~ not <sup>constitute a</sup> ~~indicate~~ challenge to the principle of unity among the major powers, but related to the application of the rule of unanimity to every amendment before the conference. He announced that Canada <sup>opposed</sup> ~~was against~~ the provision for expulsion. <sup>He</sup> ~~and~~ offered his opinion that the unity of the major powers <sup>did</sup> ~~would~~ not rest on <sup>the</sup> ~~this~~ question, of expulsion.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union urged that reference to expulsion be included in the Charter in order that persistent violators of the principles of the Charter might be expelled from the Organization. In view of the highly political nature of the question, he supported the



reconsideration of the previous decision of Committee I/2, on

the matter. <sup>the</sup> The Delegation of Greece reiterated his state-

TP ments on expulsion, which he had made in the previous sessions of this Committee. He stressed the fact that unlimited suspension was tantamount to expulsion. In the course of his speech, he referred to his previous proposal that a compromise be reached before the question be submitted to the Committee. He stated that none of the nations participating in the Conference would run the risk of expulsion ~~xxxxxx~~ and that such a provision was related to the admission of new states which had records of aggression.

He concluded by asking the Sponsoring Powers to clarify their position--whether the absence of the right of expulsion in the Charter would preclude their participation in the Organization. He felt that, if it did so, the Conference must include the right of expulsion in the Charter.



The Delegate of Belgium arose to explain that his failure to speak on his motion in the beginning of the meeting did not indicate that he was not fully behind it. He believed that the Sponsoring Powers would accept the majority view expressed in the Committee. He stated that even persistent aggressors, having reformed and being <sup>willing</sup> ~~loathe~~ to assume the obligations and accept the principles of the Organization, could return to the Organization under the provision <sup>for</sup> ~~of~~ suspension.

The Delegate of Egypt requested information concerning the <sup>progress</sup> ~~program~~ of Subcommittee I/2/E. The Delegate of Belgium informed him that the Subcommittee would meet this evening and report to the Committee tomorrow. The Delegate of Egypt announced that until he could learn of the <sup>recommendation</sup> ~~decision~~ on withdrawal, his ~~delegation~~ would abstain from voting on the question of expulsion.

At this point of the discussion, the Chairman ascertained that the Committee was prepared to vote on the motion



of the Delegate of Belgium. The Delegate of Uruguay then suggested that the Committee vote first on the draft paragraph of May 25; if that <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ not sustained, then on the text of May

23. If the majority in the latter case was insufficient to <sup>Support</sup> ~~carry~~ the text, then <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ Subcommittee of the Sponsoring Powers

and five other members should be constituted to reconcile the

different views of the Committee. [He pointed out that the

Mexican delegation at a previous meeting, had asked whether

the right of expulsion could be applied to permanent members

of the Security Council. ] The Chairman stated that the Com-

mittee was ready to vote on the Belgian motion and that he

could not comply with the suggestion of Uruguay. The Dele-

gate of Ecuador proposed that the vote be postponed until

after the Subcommittee had reported on withdrawal; Cuba,

Egypt and Chile seconded this proposal. The Delegate of

<sup>Ecuador</sup> ~~Uruguay~~ withdrew his proposal after he learned that, if the



<sup>did</sup>  
Belgian motion would not carry, further decisions on expulsion would have to be taken by the Committee.

The Delegate of New Zealand informed the Chairman that the Delegate of Norway had requested him to vote for Norway on the motion before the Committee.

Decision: The Committee rejected by a vote of 16 to  
21 the <sup>up</sup>Belgian proposal to <sup>omit</sup>exclude reference  
to expulsion from the Charter of the Organization.

<sup>The</sup> Meeting was adjourned at 6:30.



SUMMARY REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2,  
Veterans Building, Room 303, June 12, 1945, 3:45 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 3:45. The Secretary-General of the Conference introduced to Committee I/2 Mr. Oreamuno, Costa Rica, who had been selected by his delegation to replace Mr. Bonilla Lara.

1. Reconsideration of Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 3, concerning Expulsion.

Mr. Rolin of Belgium proposed that paragraph 4 of the suggested draft on expulsion, which reads as follows:

"The Organization may expel from the Organization any member which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter"

be omitted from the Charter.

The Delegate from Mexico seconded the motion and the Delegate from Belgium then requested that there be a roll call vote.



In response to inquiries concerning the interpretation of the vote which would be taken on this question, the Chairman explained that a 2/3 majority of those present and voting would be required to support the motion of Mr. Rolin. If the motion carries by this required majority, then the Committee will recommend to the Commission that reference to expulsion in the Charter be omitted. If Mr. Rolin's motion failed to receive the requisite majority, the Committee then later on at some future meeting would take up the question of expulsion. A two thirds majority of those present and voting would be required to sustain the provision for expulsion in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. If a 2/3 majority is not obtained, the matter would then go to Commission I and according to the procedures of the Conference, to the Steering Committee which would make recommendations to Commission I.

The Delegate from Ecuador pointed out that the Steering Committee would not include instructions or



recommendations and, it seemed to him, that the Committee was being asked to change its point of view on the matter.

He proceeded to explain the relationship between the question of expulsion and that of withdrawal and announced that if the right of withdrawal should be recognized Ecuador would change its point of view and might vote to include right of expulsion.

He favored postponing the vote on expulsion until the question of withdrawal had been reported to the Committee by Subcommittee I/2/E.

The Delegate of Uruguay suggested that a vote be taken on a motion to reconsider the previous decision of the Committee on expulsion. If the majority of the Committee voted to reconsider the decision, then the Committee might proceed to a vote on the proposal.

The Chairman reported to the Committee that the action of the Steering Committee in referring the question back to Committee I/2 was tantamount to a vote in favor



of reconsidering the previous decision in view of the fact that the Steering Committee consists of chiefs of delegations. The Delegate of Belgium explained that his motion was to violate the Committee's reaching a decision. With regard to the question of withdrawal, he felt that Subcommittee I/2/E was merely dealing with withdrawal as it related only to the question of ratification of amendments.

The Norwegian Delegate took the floor to explain why the Norwegian delegation favored the deletion of reference to expulsion in the Charter. His Delegation believed that in the exercise of the right of expulsion, there was no concordance between the guilt and sanction. The former belonged to the government in power, while the latter fell upon the nation as a whole. If reference to expulsion were to be made in the Charter, it would have to be based on such a concordance. Norway would support such a motion



even though it thought it unwise. Norway would support the proposal of Belgium. The Delegate of Egypt noted the interrelation of the questions of withdrawal, expulsion and amendment. Egypt favored universality, but would have to reconsider its position if the right of expulsion were included in the Charter. If compulsory expulsion were included, then the dignity of states would require the right of voluntary withdrawal.

The Brazilian Delegate inquired of the Chairman whether the decision of the Steering Committee to refer this matter back to Committee I/2 was unanimous.

The Delegate of the United States supported the interpretation of the voting procedure by the Chairman, as well as the views of Belgium and Greece on the procedural matter. He took cognizance of the relationship of withdrawal, expulsion and amendment. He stressed the proposition that the character of the Organization which was based on the cooperation of peace-loving states and the unity of the



major powers, required that states which detracted from the character of the Organization must be excluded or expelled. He continued that the Organization depended upon the desire to maintain and to remain a part of it. He acknowledged that the questions related to expulsion might have to be settled one by one. In conclusion, he stated the United States wanted an Organization of the character which he had discussed and which had the support of as many peace-loving states as would join.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa requested the Chairman to ~~expell~~ explain the purposes of the Steering Committee in referring the matter of expulsion back to Committee I/2.

The Chairman explained that the Steering Committee wished Committee I/2 to clarify its previous vote on the question.

The United Kingdom Delegate supported the procedure for reconsidering the question. He urged that a vote be



taken on the amendment by the delegate of Belgium.

The Delegate of Canada stated his view that if the Dumbarton Oaks proposal on expulsion is not sustained by the 2/3 majority, <sup>then</sup> ~~but~~ no reference to expulsion will be included in the Charter. On the matter of substance, he explained that the difference of opinion in the Committee <sup>did</sup> ~~would~~ not indicate challenge to the principle of unity among the major powers, but related to the application of the rule of unanimity to every amendment before the conference. He announced that Canada was against the provision for expulsion and offered his opinion that the unity of the major powers would not rest on this question.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union urged that reference to expulsion be included in the Charter in order that persistent violators of the principles of the Charter might be expelled from the Organization. In view of the highly political nature of the question, he supported the



reconsideration of the previous decision of Committee I/2, on the matter. The Delegation of Greece reiterated his statements on expulsion, which he had made in the previous sessions of this Committee. He stressed the fact that unlimited suspension was tantamount to expulsion. In the course of his speech, he referred to his previous proposal that a compromise be reached before the question be submitted to the Committee. He stated that none of the nations participating in the Conference would run the risk of expulsion ~~whexhad~~ and that such a provision was related to the admission of new states which had records of aggression.

He concluded by asking the Sponsoring Powers to clarify their position--whether the absence of the right of expulsion in the Charter would preclude their participation in the Organization. He felt that if it did so, the Conference must include the right of expulsion in the Charter.



The Delegate of Belgium arose to explain that his failure to speak on his motion in the beginning of the meeting did not indicate that he was not fully behind it. He believed that the Sponsoring Powers would accept the majority view expressed in the Committee. He stated that even persistent aggressors, having reformed and being loathe to assume the obligations and accept the principles of the Organization, could return to the Organization under the provision of suspension.

The Delegate of Egypt requested information concerning the program of Subcommittee I/2/E. The Delegate of Belgium informed him that the Subcommittee would meet this evening and report to the Committee tomorrow. The Delegate of Egypt announced that until he could learn of the decision on withdrawal, his Delegation would abstain from voting on the question of expulsion.

At this point of the discussion, the Chairman ascertained that the Committee was prepared to vote on the motion.



of the Delegate of Belgium. The Delegate of Uruguay then suggested that the Committee vote first on the draft paragraph of May 25; if that was not sustained, then on the text of May 23. If the majority in the latter case was insufficient to carry the text, then the Subcommittee of the Sponsoring Powers and five other members should be constituted to reconcile the different views of the Committee. He pointed out that the Mexican delegation at a previous meeting, had asked whether the right of expulsion could be applied to permanent members of the Security Council. The Chairman stated that the Committee was ready to vote on the Belgium motion and that he could not comply with the suggestion of Uruguay. The Delegate of Ecuador proposed that the vote be postponed until after the Subcommittee had reported on withdrawal; Cuba, Egypt and Chile recorded this proposal. The Delegate of Uruguay withdrew his proposal after he learned that if the



Belgium motion would not carry, further decisions on expulsion would have to be taken by the Committee.

The Delegate of New Zealand informed the Chairman that the Delegate of Norway had requested him to vote for Norway on the motion before the Committee.

Decision: The Committee rejected by a vote of 16 to  
21 the Belgium proposal to exclude reference  
to expulsion from the Charter of the Organization.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30.



SUMMARY REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2.  
Veterans Building, Room 303, June 12, 1945, 3:45 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 3:45. The Secretary-General of the Conference introduced to Committee I/2 Mr. Oreamuno, Costa Rica, who had been selected by his delegation to replace Mr. Bonilla Lara.

1. Reconsideration of Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 3, concerning Expulsion.

Mr. Rolin of Belgium proposed that paragraph 4 of the suggested draft on expulsion, which reads as follows:

"The Organization may expel from the Organization any member which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter"

be omitted from the Charter.

The Delegate from Mexico seconded the motion and the Delegate from Belgium then requested that there be a roll call vote.



In response to inquiries concerning the interpretation of the vote which would be taken on this question, the Chairman explained that a 2/3 majority of those present and voting would be required to support the motion of Mr. Rolin. If the motion carries by this required majority, then the Committee will recommend to the Commission that reference to expulsion in the Charter be omitted. If Mr. Rolin's motion failed to receive the requisite majority, the Committee then later on at some future meeting would take up the question of expulsion. A two thirds majority of those present and voting would be required to sustain the provision for expulsion in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. If a 2/3 majority is not obtained, the matter would then go to Commission I and according to the procedures of the Conference, to the Steering Committee which would make recommendations to Commission I.

The Delegate from Ecuador pointed out that the Steering Committee would not include instructions or



recommendations and, it seemed to him, that the Committee was being asked to change its point of view on the matter.

He proceeded to explain the relationship between the question of expulsion and that of withdrawal and announced that if the right of withdrawal should be recognized Ecuador would change its point of view and might vote to include right of expulsion.

He favored postponing the vote on expulsion until the question of withdrawal had been reported to the Committee by Subcommittee I/2/E.

The Delegate of Uruguay suggested that a vote be taken on a motion to reconsider the previous decision of the Committee on expulsion. If the majority of the Committee voted to reconsider the decision, then the Committee might proceed to a vote on the proposal.

The Chairman reported to the Committee that the action of the Steering Committee in referring the question back to Committee I/2 was tantamount to a vote in favor



of reconsidering the previous decision in view of the fact that the Steering Committee consists of chiefs of delegations. The Delegate of Belgium explained that his motion was to violate the Committee's reaching a decision. With regard to the question of withdrawal, he felt that Subcommittee I/2/E was merely dealing with withdrawal as it related only to the question of ratification of amendments.

The Norwegian Delegate took the floor to explain why the Norwegian delegation favored the deletion of reference to expulsion in the Charter. His Delegation believed that in the exercise of the right of expulsion, there was no concordance between the guilt and sanction. The former belonged to the government in power, while the latter fell upon the nation as a whole. If reference to expulsion were to be made in the Charter, it would have to be based on such a concordance. Norway would support such a motion



even though it thought it unwise. Norway would support the proposal of Belgium. The Delegate of Egypt noted the interrelation of the questions of withdrawal, expulsion and amendment. Egypt favored universality, but would have to reconsider its position if the right of expulsion were included in the Charter. If compulsory expulsion were included, then the dignity of states would require the right of voluntary withdrawal.

The Brazilian Delegate inquired of the Chairman whether the decision of the Steering Committee to refer this matter back to Committee I/2 was unanimous.

The Delegate of the United States supported the interpretation of the voting procedure by the Chairman, as well as the views of Belgium and Greece on the procedural matter. He took cognizance of the relationship of withdrawal, expulsion and amendment. He stressed the proposition that the character of the Organization which was based on the cooperation of peace-loving states and the unity of the



major powers, required that states which detracted from the character of the Organization must be excluded or expelled. He continued that the Organization depended upon the desire to maintain and to remain a part of it. He acknowledged that the questions related to expulsion might have to be settled one by one. In conclusion, he stated the United States wanted an Organization of the character which he had discussed and which had the support of as many peace-loving states as would join.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa requested the Chairman to ~~expell~~ explain the purposes of the Steering Committee in referring the matter of expulsion back to Committee I/2.

The Chairman explained that the Steering Committee wished Committee I/2 to clarify its previous vote on the question.

The United Kingdom Delegate supported the procedure for reconsidering the question. He urged that a vote be



taken on the amendment by the delegate of Belgium.

The Delegate of Canada stated his view that if the Dumbarton Oaks proposal on expulsion is not sustained by the 2/3 majority, <sup>then</sup> ~~but~~ no reference to expulsion will be included in the Charter. On the matter of substance, he explained that the difference of opinion in the Committee <sup>did</sup> ~~would~~ not indicate challenge to the principle of unity among the major powers, but related to the application of the rule of unanimity to every amendment before the conference. He announced that Canada was against the provision for expulsion and offered his opinion that the unity of the major powers would not rest on this question.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union urged that reference to expulsion be included in the Charter in order that persistent violators of the principles of the Charter might be expelled from the Organization. In view of the highly political nature of the question, he supported the



reconsideration of the previous decision of Committee I/2, on the matter. The Delegation of Greece reiterated his statements on expulsion, which he had made in the previous sessions of this Committee. He stressed the fact that unlimited suspension was tantamount to expulsion. In the course of his speech, he referred to his previous proposal that a compromise be reached before the question be submitted to the Committee. He stated that none of the nations participating in the Conference would run the risk of expulsion ~~xxxxxx~~ and that such a provision was related to the admission of new states which had records of aggression.

He concluded by asking the Sponsoring Powers to clarify their position--whether the absence of the right of expulsion in the Charter would preclude their participation in the Organization. He felt that if it did so, the Conference must include the right of expulsion in the Charter.



The Delegate of Belgium arose to explain that his failure to speak on his motion in the beginning of the meeting did not indicate that he was not fully behind it. He believed that the Sponsoring Powers would accept the majority view expressed in the Committee. He stated that even persistent aggressors, having reformed and being loathe to assume the obligations and accept the principles of the Organization, could return to the Organization under the provision of suspension.

The Delegate of Egypt requested information concerning the program of Subcommittee I/2/E. The Delegate of Belgium informed him that the Subcommittee would meet this evening and report to the Committee tomorrow. The Delegate of Egypt announced that until he could learn of the decision on withdrawal, his Delegation would abstain from voting on the question of expulsion.

At this point of the discussion, the Chairman ascertained that the Committee was prepared to vote on the motion



of the Delegate of Belgium. The Delegate of Uruguay then suggested that the Committee vote first on the draft paragraph of May 25; if that was not sustained, then on the text of May 23. If the majority in the latter case was insufficient to carry the text, then the Subcommittee of the Sponsoring Powers and five other members should be constituted to reconcile the different views of the Committee. He pointed out that the Mexican delegation at a previous meeting, had asked whether the right of expulsion could be applied to permanent members of the Security Council. The Chairman stated that the Committee was ready to vote on the Belgium motion and that he could not comply with the suggestion of Uruguay. The Delegate of Ecuador proposed that the vote be postponed until after the Subcommittee had reported on withdrawal; Cuba, Egypt and Chile recorded this proposal. The Delegate of Uruguay withdrew his proposal after he learned that if the



Belgium motion would not carry, further decisions on expulsion would have to be taken by the Committee.

The Delegate of New Zealand informed the Chairman that the Delegate of Norway had requested him to vote for Norway on the motion before the Committee.

Decision: The Committee rejected by a vote of 16 to 21 the Belgium proposal to exclude reference to expulsion from the Charter of the Organization.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30.



SUMMARY REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2.  
Veterans Building, Room 303, June 12, 1945, 3:45 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 3:45. The Secretary-General of the Conference introduced to Committee I/2 Mr. Oresmunc, Costa Rica, who had been selected by his delegation to replace Mr. Bonilla Lara.

1. Reconsideration of Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 3, concerning Expulsion.

Mr. Rolin of Belgium proposed that paragraph 4 of the suggested draft on expulsion, which reads as follows:

"The Organization may expel from the Organization any member which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter"

be omitted from the Charter.

The Delegate from Mexico seconded the motion and the Delegate from Belgium then requested that there be a roll call vote.



In response to inquiries concerning the interpretation of the vote which would be taken on this question, the Chairman explained that a 2/3 majority of those present and voting would be required to support the motion of Mr. Rolin. If the motion carries by this required majority, then the Committee will recommend to the Commission that reference to expulsion in the Charter be omitted. If Mr. Rolin's motion failed to receive the requisite majority, the Committee then later on at some future meeting would take up the question of expulsion. A two thirds majority of those present and voting would be required to sustain the provision for expulsion in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. If a 2/3 majority is not obtained, the matter would then go to Commission I and according to the procedures of the Conference, to the Steering Committee which would make recommendations to Commission I.

The Delegate from Ecuador pointed out that the Steering Committee would not include instructions or



recommendations and, it seemed to him, that the Committee was being asked to change its point of view on the matter. He proceeded to explain the relationship between the question of expulsion and that of withdrawal and announced that if the right of withdrawal should be recognized Ecuador would change its point of view and might vote to include right of expulsion.

He favored postponing the vote on expulsion until the question of withdrawal had been reported to the Committee by Subcommittee I/2/E.

The Delegate of Uruguay suggested that a vote be taken on a motion to reconsider the previous decision of the Committee on expulsion. If the majority of the Committee voted to reconsider the decision, then the Committee might proceed to a vote on the proposal.

The Chairman reported to the Committee that the action of the Steering Committee in referring the question back to Committee I/2 was tantamount to a vote in favor



of reconsidering the previous decision in view of the fact that the Steering Committee consists of chiefs of delegations. The Delegate of Belgium explained that his motion was to violate the Committee's reaching a decision. With regard to the question of withdrawal, he felt that Subcommittee I/2/E was merely dealing with withdrawal as it related only to the question of ratification of amendments.

The Norwegian Delegate took the floor to explain why the Norwegian delegation favored the deletion of reference to expulsion in the Charter. His Delegation believed that in the exercise of the right of expulsion, there was no concordance between the guilt and sanction. The former belonged to the government in power, while the latter fell upon the nation as a whole. If reference to expulsion were to be made in the Charter, it would have to be based on such a concordance. Norway would support such a motion



even though it thought it unwise. Norway would support the proposal of Belgium. The Delegate of Egypt noted the interrelation of the questions of withdrawal, expulsion and amendment. Egypt favored universality, but would have to reconsider its position if the right of expulsion were included in the Charter. If compulsory expulsion were included, then the dignity of states would require the right of voluntary withdrawal.

The Brazilian Delegate inquired of the Chairman whether the decision of the Steering Committee to refer this matter back to Committee I/2 was unanimous.

The Delegate of the United States supported the interpretation of the voting procedure by the Chairman, as well as the views of Belgium and Greece on the procedural matter. He took cognizance of the relationship of withdrawal, expulsion and amendment. He stressed the proposition that the character of the Organization which was based on the cooperation of peace-loving states and the unity of the



major powers, required that states which detracted from the character of the Organization must be excluded or expelled. He continued that the Organization depended upon the desire to maintain and to remain a part of it. He acknowledged that the questions related to expulsion might have to be settled one by one. In conclusion, he stated the United States wanted an Organization of the character which he had discussed and which had the support of as many peace-loving states as would join.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa requested the Chairman to ~~expell~~ explain the purposes of the Steering Committee in referring the matter of expulsion back to Committee I/2.

The Chairman explained that the Steering Committee wished Committee I/2 to clarify its previous vote on the question.

The United Kingdom Delegate supported the procedure for reconsidering the question. He urged that a vote be



taken on the amendment by the delegate of Belgium.

The Delegate of Canada stated his view that if the Dumbarton Oaks proposal on expulsion is not sustained by the 8/3 majority, <sup>then</sup> ~~but~~ no reference to expulsion will be included in the Charter. On the matter of substance, he explained that the difference of opinion in the Committee <sup>did</sup> ~~would~~ not indicate challenge to the principle of unity among the major powers, but related to the application of the rule of unanimity to every amendment before the conference. He announced that Canada was against the provision for expulsion and offered his opinion that the unity of the major powers would not rest on this question.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union urged that reference to expulsion be included in the Charter in order that persistent violators of the principles of the Charter might be expelled from the Organization. In view of the highly political nature of the question, he supported the



reconsideration of the previous decision of Committee I/2, on the matter. The Delegation of Greece reiterated his statements on expulsion, which he had made in the previous sessions of this Committee. He stressed the fact that unlimited suspension was tantamount to expulsion. In the course of his speech, he referred to his previous proposal that a compromise be reached before the question be submitted to the Committee. He stated that none of the nations participating in the Conference would run the risk of expulsion ~~xxxxxx~~ and that such a provision was related to the admission of new states which had records of aggression.

He concluded by asking the Sponsoring Powers to clarify their position--whether the absence of the right of expulsion in the Charter would preclude their participation in the Organization. He felt that if it did so, the Conference must include the right of expulsion in the Charter.



The Delegate of Belgium arose to explain that his failure to speak on his motion in the beginning of the meeting did not indicate that he was not fully behind it. He believed that the Sponsoring Powers would accept the majority view expressed in the Committee. He stated that even persistent aggressors, having reformed and being loathe to assume the obligations and accept the principles of the Organization, could return to the Organization under the provision of suspension.

The Delegate of Egypt requested information concerning the program of Subcommittee I/E/E. The Delegate of Belgium informed him that the Subcommittee would meet this evening and report to the Committee tomorrow. The Delegate of Egypt announced that until he could learn of the decision on withdrawal, his Delegation would abstain from voting on the question of expulsion.

At this point of the discussion, the Chairman ascertained that the Committee was prepared to vote on the motion



of the Delegate of Belgium. The Delegate of Uruguay then suggested that the Committee vote first on the draft paragraph of May 26; if that was not sustained, then on the text of May 23. If the majority in the latter case was insufficient to carry the text, then the Subcommittee of the Sponsoring Powers and five other members should be constituted to reconcile the different views of the Committee. He pointed out that the Mexican delegation at a previous meeting, had asked whether the right of expulsion could be applied to permanent members of the Security Council. The Chairman stated that the Committee was ready to vote on the Belgium motion and that he could not comply with the suggestion of Uruguay. The Delegate of Ecuador proposed that the vote be postponed until after the Subcommittee had reported on withdrawal; Cuba, Egypt and Chile recorded this proposal. The Delegate of Uruguay withdrew his proposal after he learned that if the



Belgium motion would not carry, further decisions on expulsion would have to be taken by the Committee.

The Delegate of New Zealand informed the Chairman that the Delegate of Norway had requested him to vote for Norway on the motion before the Committee.

Decision: The Committee rejected by a vote of 16 to 21 the Belgium proposal to exclude reference to expulsion from the Charter of the Organization.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30.



## PROGRESS REPORT

COMMITTEE I/2, June 12, 1945

**Decisions:** The Committee rejected by a vote of 16 to 21 a Belgian proposal to omit from the Charter provision for expulsion of members from the Organization, as stipulated in paragraph 4 of the Working Paper of Subcommittee I/2/A, May 22 and 23, 1945

### Developments:

Committee I/2 devoted this meeting solely to the reconsideration, at the request of the Steering Committee, of its vote of May 23 to omit from the Charter provision for expulsion.

As had been agreed in advance, Belgian delegate proposed that Committee I/2 reject the above mentioned paragraph 4 on expulsion (and thereby omit provision for expulsion of members from the Organization).

Chairman ruled that a two-thirds' vote would be necessary to carry the Belgian proposal. If it were rejected, the Committee would take up at a future meeting a proposal to provide for expulsion. This proposal would also require a two-thirds' for approval. If it failed to carry, then the question could be referred to Commission I and to the Steering Committee, which might make recommendations to Commission I.

Delegates from Ecuador and Egypt stressed the interrelationship between expulsion and withdrawal. Ecuadoran delegate announced that, if right of withdrawal were established in the Charter, Ecuador would abandon its current position on universality and vote in favor of provision for expulsion. Egyptian delegate<sup>later</sup> announced he would abstain from voting pending report on amendment.

Norwegian delegate explained that his delegation felt that, with regard to right of expulsion, there was no concordance between guilt and sanction. Former was responsibility of the government, while latter involved penalty against the nation as a whole.

Uruguayan delegate argued that the Committee should first vote to decide whether it wants to reconsider its previous decision. The Chairman announced that the vote of the Steering Committee to ~~reconsider~~ recommend reconsideration was sufficient for the committee to proceed.



Delegates of United States, Canada, Soviet Union, Greece, and Belgium spoke on the substance of the question. U. S. delegate stressed making charter acceptable to the U. S. and major powers. Canadian delegate doubted that unity of major powers rested on this question of expulsion. Soviet ~~Union~~ Delegate reiterated remarks of previous meetings that character of Organization necessitated expulsion of persistent violators of its principles. Greek delegate argued that unlimited suspension was tantamount to expulsion, that initial members of Organization didn't run risk of expulsion, that this was precautionary for ex-aggressors which might be admitted to Organization. Belgian delegate defended his concept of suspension as sufficient to meet problems which might otherwise involve expulsion.

Uruguayan delegate proposed that the vote be taken on the text of May 25; if this is defeated, then on text of May 23. If this doesn't carry, then a subcommittee should be set up to reconcile different viewpoints. He proposed that subcommittee include sponsoring powers and five other members. Chairman refused to entertain Uruguayan proposal.

Delegate of Ecuador proposed that vote be postponed until the subcommittee on amendment had reported to the committee on withdrawal, as it is related to amendment. He later withdrew this proposal.

Vote on Belgian motion result in its defeat 16 to 21.

The new Chairman, Oreamuno, conducted the meeting with skill and had full control during the entire session. He answered questions on procedure convincingly; his decisions were not disputed.