

UNEO - Working Papers - Commissions & Technical Committees  
- Commission II & Committee II - 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

13 June 1945

13 June 1945

clear - NK

10/65

S-1018

Box - 8

File - 29

(PAGE 12.2.3)



SUMMARY REPORT OF TWENTY-SECOND MEETING OF COMMITTEE II/2  
Veterans Building, Room 202, June 13, 1945, 10:39 a.m.

The Chairman opened the meeting at 10:39 a.m.

1. Consideration of Paragraph 8, Section B, Chapter V,  
referred back to Committee II/2 by the Steering Committee.

*Cap/*  
The Chairman explained that ~~paragraph 8, as adopted by~~  
~~Committee II/2, had been the subject of criticism by the~~  
~~Executive Committee in respect of its wording; and that the~~  
Steering Committee, acting on a recommendation by the  
Executive Committee, had referred ~~the~~ <sup>8</sup> ~~Paragraph~~ <sup>to Committee II/2</sup> ~~back~~ for a  
reconsideration of its wording, in consultation with

Committee III/1 and, if necessary, with Committee III/3.  
A joint ~~meeting~~ <sup>subcommittee</sup>, consisting of Subcommittees II/2/B and  
III/1/C, had ~~therefore been convened to consider~~ <sup>ed</sup> the matter,  
and ~~had prepared the~~ <sup>resulting</sup> joint report <sup>was</sup> now before the Committee  
(Doc. 920, II/2/B/12). ~~see also Summary Report by Doc. 921, II/2/B/13~~

*said*  
The Chairman expressed regret that he had been unable to  
~~be present at the whole session of yesterday's joint meeting~~  
~~He had to attend the Commission meeting, but had later joined~~  
~~the joint meeting of the two subcommittees and had heard the~~  
~~discussion there on procedure.~~ <sup>that a</sup> difficulty had arisen on  
the method of voting <sup>and an account of the discussion of</sup>  
~~this matter could be found in the Summary Report of the~~  
~~Joint Meeting (Doc. 921, II/2/B/13).~~ Three countries, namely  
three of the sponsoring powers, were represented on each sub-  
committee, and it was suggested that they should have two  
votes in the joint session. The solution <sup>adopted</sup> ~~was exceedingly~~



simple, but to <sup>his</sup> my mind ~~there~~ <sup>very</sup> it is <sup>and</sup> strange, unique in ~~my~~ <sup>his</sup> his experience; and <sup>he could not</sup> I cannot reconcile it with <sup>his</sup> my conscience not to state this. ~~It was solemnly agreed that~~ <sup>T</sup> The Subcommittees ~~should vote separately by roll call,~~ but the results were added together, so in fact the same result would have been achieved by a simple show of hands of all 16 representatives at the joint meeting. ~~If my mathematics do not fail me,~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~however,~~ <sup>did</sup> ~~the sponsoring powers would have had a majority for~~ <sup>Rosen</sup> their amendment even if the vote had been taken on the basis of one vote <sup>for each</sup> ~~present country,~~ <sup>he thought</sup> as I think should have been done. We have now before us the joint meeting's report, which, ~~much as I wish~~ <sup>he</sup> ~~to help our work,~~ <sup>ed</sup> ~~I did not feel that~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~I could~~ <sup>be</sup> sign. <sup>the report of the joint meeting</sup> ~~Nevertheless, I feel we should now put personal feelings~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~should~~ <sup>now be put on one side</sup> ~~and finish our task.~~ <sup>in order to</sup> ~~of the Conference~~ <sup>the</sup>

The Delegate of Belgium moved <sup>the</sup> his amendment to the text of Paragraph 8 ~~under reference,~~ which he had proposed in the joint meeting; namely, that <sup>sub</sup> ~~his~~ paragraphs (a) and (b) and ~~their~~ <sup>their</sup> introductory words should be replaced by the following:

"Subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of the present Section, the General Assembly should have the right to make such observations or recommendations concerning reports of the Security Council as are, in its opinion, required by the purposes and principles of the Charter."

He recalled the history of the paragraph, ~~and the~~ ~~emphatic majorities by which Committee II/2 had affirmed~~ ~~the questions embodied in the redraft.~~ ~~He was not impressed~~ ~~by the arguments used by the Delegates of Australia and the~~



~~United Kingdom at the eighth session of the Executive Committee~~  
(Dec. 860, Ex/22). The effect of the vote in the joint meeting <sup>had been</sup>  
~~was to mutilate the text adopted by Committee II/2.~~ <sup>previously</sup> <sup>emphatic majorities in</sup>  
It was not the first time that this kind of thing had happened.  
The essential power of the Assembly to make recommendations  
had disappeared from the text, and he thought the <sup>two</sup> ~~joint~~ Sub-  
committees had exceeded their powers.

The Delegate of Canada seconded the <sup>e Belgian</sup> ~~motion~~ <sup>to amend</sup>.

The Delegate of France recalled that his Government had  
~~proposed, in its amendments submitted prior to the Conference,~~  
~~that the General Assembly should have the right to draw the~~  
~~attention of the Security Council to any question which might~~  
~~endanger peace, which showed that France, while desiring to~~  
~~preserve the Security Council's capacity for prompt action,~~  
~~had constantly supported the rights of the Assembly.~~ He felt ~~that~~  
the  
that at/present stage too much importance was being attached to  
the word "recommendation". He believed that the Assembly's  
rights of discussion of all matters at any time was the essential  
power. The Security Council must be left in full enjoyment of  
the powers given to it by the Charter; but it could not ignore  
the public discussions of the Assembly. He therefore supported  
the adoption of the <sup>text proposed by</sup> ~~report of~~ the joint meeting.

In the course of the discussion which followed, the Delegates  
of the United States and of the Soviet Union made it ~~fully~~ clear  
that, in their view, the text for paragraph 8 proposed in the  
joint report did not derogate in any way from the Assembly's



1946.

powers under Paragraph 5. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. added that nothing which might be written into Paragraph 8 could affect Paragraph 1 or Paragraph 6. ~~The Assembly~~ <sup>would have</sup> at all times the

right to discuss any questions arising from matters contained in the Security Council's reports and, subject to the accepted limitation contained in paragraph 1, to make recommendations thereon. ~~But he did not agree that the Assembly had the right~~ <sup>The Delegate of the Soviet Union added that in his opinion</sup>

to make recommendations on the reports themselves, as distinct from the matters reported, ~~to make recommendations on the reports themselves~~ <sup>this</sup> would amount to approving or disapproving these reports and would be contrary to the conception of the relative positions of the Assembly and the Security Council. For this reason he opposed the Belgian proposal. ~~The~~ <sup>since</sup> Chairman then put the Belgian proposal to the vote, the Delegate of Belgium stipulating that it should be by roll call.

should not have

Decision: There were 22 affirmative and 15 negative votes; motion rejected under two-thirds rule.

~~Voting in the affirmative was:~~ The vote by roll call was as follows: Argentina, Australia,

Not checked

Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Iran, Luxembourg, Mexico, ~~the~~ Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Uruguay, and

~~Voting in the negative was:~~ Byelorussian S.S.R., Venezuela, ~~voted in the affirmative.~~ China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, France, Haiti, India, Nicaragua, Turkey, Ukraine ~~and S.S.~~ Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslavia, ~~voted in the negative.~~

~~Abstaining:~~ <sup>absent:</sup> Lebanon and Syria, ~~abstained,~~ Costa Rica, Cuba, <sup>Denmark,</sup> Ecuador, Guatemala,



Honduras, Iraq, Liberia, Panama, Paraguay, and Saudi Arabia, ~~none~~  
~~absent~~

The Delegate of the Dominican Republic asked to go on record  
as stating that his <sup>negative</sup> vote ~~against the motion~~ <sup>Depended</sup> ~~turned~~ <sup>understanding</sup> on the ~~scope~~ <sup>the</sup>  
of paragraph 1, Section B, Chapter V <sup>was not to be limited by paragraph 8.</sup>

The Delegate of Venezuela proposed an amendment based on  
the Belgian proposal modified to read as follows:

"Subject to the ~~x~~provisions of paragraph 1 of  
the present Section, the General Assembly should  
have the right to make observations or to give opinions  
concerning reports of the Security Council <sup>as are, in</sup> such  
its opinion, required by the purposes and principles of  
the Charter."

The motion was seconded by the Delegate ~~of~~ of Colombia, ~~and~~  
~~Uruguay.~~

<sup>said</sup>  
The Delegate of Mexico ~~desired to make his Delegation's view~~  
~~clear by stating~~ that an amendment qualifying the Assembly's  
powers to discuss and recommend by such expressions as "to make  
observations and give opinions" was in danger of being interpreted  
as a limitation of the Assembly's powers under Paragraph 1.  
The Delegates of the United States and the Soviet Union had  
made it perfectly clear <sup>in their interpretations</sup> that nothing in Paragraph 8 could  
~~detract~~ detract from the Assembly's rights under Paragraph 1.  
He therefore opposed the Venezuela <sup>g</sup> proposal, on the ground that  
it might lead to a restricted interpretation, and proposed  
instead that the text in the joint report should be adopted  
with the deletion of the word "discuss", ~~which~~ which might give rise  
to similar doubts.

The Delegates of the Union of South Africa and the Soviet  
Union indicated readiness to accept the proposal of the Delegate



of Mexico; but I former enquired whether the matter did not also concern Committee III/1. The Chairman replied that Committee II/2 had full power to redraft Paragraph 8, which is within its jurisdiction. The Delegate of France pointed out that it must be made clear in the French text that "discuss" was <sup>encom- passed by</sup> "consider".

The Delegates of Colombia and Venezuela stated that they were ready to withdraw the Venezuelan proposal if the interpretation given ~~to the effect of Paragraph 1~~ by the Delegates of the United States and the Soviet Union was clearly understood by the Committee before its vote, and was recorded ~~by the inclusion~~ in the summary report of the meeting and in the Rapporteur's report to the Commission. If this interpretation were not clear there was a danger that the general powers given in paragraph 1 might be legally held to be qualified by paragraph 8, which dealt with the special cases of ~~reports~~ from the Security Council and other bodies. The Delegate of Venezuela added that he recalled with misgiving a previous case of an interpretation given by one of the sponsoring <sup>governments,</sup> ~~powers,~~ and which the other three had afterwards rejected.

The Delegate of Australia moved that, in order fully to apply the ~~case~~ argument of the Delegate of Mexico, the ~~last~~ nine words of paragraph 8 as recommended in the joint report should be deleted.

The Chairman ~~xxx~~ then called for a vote on the motion to delete the word "discuss".

Decision: The proposal was accepted without a dissenting <sup>ng</sup> ~~vote.~~

The Chairman then put the Australian amendment to the vote:

Decision: Approved without a dissenting <sup>ng vote</sup> ~~voice.~~

The Chairman then put the whole text of paragraph 8 as amended to the vote as follows:

"8. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; such reports should include an account of the measures which the Security Council has adopted or applied to maintain international peace and security.

"The General Assembly should receive and consider reports from the other bodies of the Organization."

Decision: The paragraph was approved without a  
dissenting voice.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the proposal to ~~xxxxxx~~ record in the Summary Report and the Rapporteur's Report the following interpretation, adding that its exact terms would come back to the Committee for its consideration when it discussed the Rapporteur's Report:

That paragraph 8 does not limit in any way the powers of the Assembly <sup>as</sup> set forth in paragraphs 1 and 6, including specifically its powers to discuss and to make recommendations as defined in paragraphs 1 and 6.

~~That~~ Paragraph 8 does not limit in any way the powers of the Assembly set forth in paragraphs 1 and 6, and <sup>consequently</sup> ~~particularly~~ when the General Assembly, ~~is~~ considering reports from the Security Council, ~~it~~ may exercise the power of discussion and recommendation stated in those paragraphs.

Decision: Accepted without dissent.



2. Request from the Coordination Committee for clarification of the language of Paragraph 1, Section B, Chapter V.

The Chairman reported that the Coordination Committee had asked Committee II/2 to clarify the last sentence of the text of Paragraph 1 <sup>c</sup>which it had adopted on May 29. The query concerned the word "immediately": how it should be interpreted if the Assembly were not in session when the Security Council ceased to deal with <sup>a</sup>the question.

The Delegate of Canada proposed that the last sentence should be amended to read:

The Secretary General should be required, with the consent of the Security Council, to notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace or security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and also to notify the General Assembly, or the members of the Organization if the Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.

The proposal was seconded by the Delegate of China.

Decision: Proposed accepted without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

(Typist. at end main text put)

Note: The <sup>text of the</sup> Statement of the Delegate of the Dominican Republic <sup>made</sup> at the Fourteenth meeting of Committee II/2 on the question of domestic jurisdiction has been deposited in the Archives of the Conference, and is also being circulated as Doc , II/2/ .

The text of the Statement of the Delegate of Ecuador made at the Twentieth meeting of Committee II/2 regarding his Delegation's proposal for the establishment of continental and regional commissions of conciliation has been deposited in the Archives of the Conference, and has also been circulated as Doc. 903, II/2/45(a).



RESTRICTED

Doc.

II/2/

June 13, 1945

SUMMARY REPORT OF TWENTY-SECOND MEETING OF COMMITTEE II/2

Veterans Building, Room 202, June 13, 1945, 10:39 a.m.

The Chairman opened the meeting at 10:39 a.m.

1. Consideration of Paragraph 8, Section B, Chapter V,  
referred back to Committee II/2 by the Steering Committee

The Chairman explained that the Steering Committee, acting on a recommendation by the Executive Committee, had referred Paragraph 8 back to Committee II/2 for a reconsideration of its wording, in consultation with Committee III/1 and, if necessary, with Committee III/3. A joint meeting, consisting of Subcommittees II/2/B and III/1/C, had considered the matter, and the resulting joint report was now before the Committee (Doc. 920, II/2/B/12).

The Chairman stated that a difficulty had arisen on the method of voting in the joint subcommittee meeting (see Summary Report of the Joint Meeting, Doc. 921, II/2/B/13). Three of the sponsoring governments were represented on both subcommittees. The subcommittees voted separately by roll-call, but the results were added together, so in effect the governments represented on both committees had two votes. The procedure was, in his view, very strange and he could not reconcile it with his conscience to let it pass unmentioned. As it happened, the sponsoring governments would have carried their proposal even if the vote had been taken on the basis of one vote for each country present, as he thought should have been done. He had not felt able to sign a report of the joint meeting but, he continued, personal feelings should now be put on one side in order to finish the task of the Conference.

The Delegate of Belgium moved the amendment to the text of Paragraph 8 which he had proposed in the joint meeting; namely, that subparagraphs (a) and (b) and their introductory words should be replaced by the following:

"Subject to the provisions of paragraph of the present Section, the General Assembly should have the right to make such observations or recommendations concerning reports of the Security Council as are, in its opinion, required by the purposes and principles of the Charter."



He recalled the history of the paragraph. The effect of the vote in the joint meeting had been to mutilate the text previously adopted by emphatic majorities in Committee II/2. It was not the first time that this kind of thing had happened. The essential power of the Assembly to make recommendations had disappeared from the text, and he thought the two Sub-committees had exceeded their powers.

The Delegate of Canada seconded the Belgian motion to amend.

The Delegate of France recalled that his Government had constantly supported the rights of the Assembly. He felt that at the present stage too much importance was being attached to the word "recommendation". He believed that the Assembly's right of discussion of all matters at any time was the essential power. The Security Council must be left in full enjoyment of the powers given to it by the Charter; but it could not ignore the public discussions of the Assembly. He therefore supported the adoption of the text proposed by the joint meeting.

In the course of the discussion which followed, the Delegates of the United States and of the Soviet Union made it clear that, in their view, the text for paragraph 8 proposed in the joint report did not derogate in any way from the Assembly's powers under Paragraphs 1 and 6.)

(The Assembly would have at all times the right to discuss any questions arising from matters contained in the Security Council's reports and, subject to the accepted limitation contained in paragraph 1, to make recommendations thereon. The Delegate of the Soviet Union added that in his opinion the Assembly should not have the right to make recommendations on the reports themselves, as distinct from the matters reported, since this would amount to approving or disapproving these reports and would be contrary to the conception of the relative positions of the Assembly and the Security Council. For this reason he opposed the Belgian proposal.

The Chairman then put the Belgian proposal to the vote, the Delegate of Belgium stipulating that it should be by roll call.

Decision: There were 22 affirmative and 15 negative votes; motion rejected under two-thirds rule.

Voting in the affirmative were: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Iran, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Voting in the negative were: Byelorussian S. S. R., China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, France, Haiti, India, Nicaragua, Turkey, Ukrainian S. S. R., Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Lebanon and Syria.

Absent: Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Iraq, Liberia, Panama, Paraguay, and Saudi Arabia.

*No space*



The Delegate of the Dominican Republic asked to go on record as stating that his negative vote depended on the understanding that the scope of paragraph 1, Section B, Chapter V was not to be limited by paragraph 8.

The Delegate of Venezuela proposed an amendment based on the Belgian proposal modified to read as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of the present Section, the General Assembly should have the right to make observations or to give opinions concerning reports of the Security Council as are, in its opinion, required by the purposes and principles of the Charter."

The motion was seconded by the Delegate of Colombia.

The Delegate of Mexico said that an amendment qualifying the Assembly's powers to discuss and recommend by such expressions as "to make observations and give opinions" was in danger of being interpreted as a limitation of the Assembly's powers under Paragraph 1. The Delegates of the United States and the Soviet Union had made it perfectly clear in their interpretations that nothing in Paragraph 8 could detract from the Assembly's rights under Paragraph 1. He therefore opposed the Venezuelan proposal, on the ground that it might lead to a restricted interpretation, and proposed instead that the text in the joint report should be adopted with the deletion of the word "discuss", which might give rise to similar doubts.

but/ The Delegates of the Union of South Africa and the Soviet Union indicated readiness to accept the proposal of the Delegate of Mexico; the former inquired whether the matter did not also concern Committee III/1. The Chairman replied that Committee II/2 had full power to redraft Paragraph 8, which is within its jurisdiction. The Delegate of France pointed out that it must be made clear in the French texts that "discuss" was encompassed by "consider"

The Delegates of Venezuela and Colombia stated that they were ready to withdraw the Venezuelan proposal if the interpretation given by the Delegates of the United States and the Soviet Union was clearly understood by the Committee before its vote, and was recorded in the summary report of the meeting and in the Rapporteur's report to the Commission. If this interpretation were not clear there was a danger that the general powers given in paragraph 1 might be legally held to be qualified by paragraph 8, which dealt with the special cases of reports from the Security Council and other bodies.



The Delegate of Venezuela added that he recalled with misgiving a previous case of an interpretation given by one of the sponsoring governments, which the other three had afterwards rejected.

The Delegate of Australia moved that, in order fully to apply the argument of the Delegate of Mexico, the last nine words of paragraph 8 as recommended in the joint report should be deleted.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion to delete the word "discuss".

Decision: The proposal was accepted without a dissenting vote.

The Chairman then put the Australian amendment to the vote:

Decision: Approved without a dissenting vote.

The Chairman then put the whole text of paragraph 8 as amended to the vote as follows:

"8. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; such reports should include an account of the measures which the Security Council has adopted or applied to maintain international peace and security.

"The General Assembly should receive and consider reports from the other bodies of the Organization."

Decision: The paragraph was approved without a dissenting vote.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the proposal to record in the Summary Report and the Rapporteur's Report the following interpretation, adding that its exact terms would come back to the Committee for its consideration when it discussed the Rapporteur's Report:

Paragraph 8 does not limit in any way the powers of the Assembly set forth in paragraphs 1 and 6, and ~~consequently~~ <sup>by</sup> the General Assembly, when considering reports from the Security Council, may exercise the power of discussion and recommendation stated in those paragraphs.

Decision: Accepted without dissent.



2. Request from the Coordination Committee for clarification of the language of Paragraph 1, Section B, Chapter V.

The Chairman reported that the Coordination Committee had asked Committee II/2 to clarify the last sentence of the text of Paragraph 1 which it had adopted on May 29. The query concerned the word "immediately": how it should be interpreted if the Assembly were not in session when the Security Council ceased to deal with a question.

The Delegate of Canada proposed that the last sentence should be amended to read:

The Secretary General should be required, with the consent of the Security Council, to notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace or security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and also to notify the General Assembly, or the members of the Organization if the Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.

The proposal was seconded by the Delegate of China.

Decision: Proposal accepted without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 pm.

-----

Note: The text of the Statement of the Delegate of the Dominican Republic made at the Fourteenth Meeting of Committee II/2 on the question of domestic jurisdiction has been deposited in the Archives of the Conference, and is also being circulated as Doc. 964, II/2/49.

The text of the Statement of the Delegate of Ecuador made at the Twentieth Meeting of Committee II/2 regarding his Delegation's proposal for the establishment of continental and regional commissions of conciliation has been deposited in the Archives of the Conference, and has also been circulated as Doc. 903, II/2/45(a).



28, 202, 10.40 June 13.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Ch Let us try to finish our work today.  
I regret I was not able to attend Jt. mtg 7/2/53  
& 7/11/53 on questions raised by Exec re § 8,  
as I had to attend Comm. But came to Jt  
towards end, heard procedure discuss. 2  
amend props; 1 Mex, 1 Soviet & Big Power.  
There had been long discuss proced, 1:3  
Big Ps on ea s-c, they wd ea have double  
vote. The solu<sup>n</sup> to my mind, was simple but  
strange, <sup>and unique in my experience</sup> for my conscience req, I shd say so.  
It was agreed s-c's vote separ, by roll, solemnly  
but after, results added tof, so = same  
as show of hands of all <sup>members</sup>. To  
reach this conclus, argum<sup>t</sup> 2 hrs. If my  
math mind not this time fail me, that  
even vote taken by comm<sup>s</sup> (as shd have  
been done) the Iron Ps wd have had  
way f. Then amend worse the less.

Anyw, we have here report here  
wh I did not feel, much as I want to  
help, cd rep. I hope we can thin  
an grounds of reconcil<sup>n</sup>, if we put  
~~personal feelings~~ <sup>personal feelings</sup> on one side, as we are  
all anxious to finish our wk.

Belf One again, perhaps the last, voice of Belf Del  
will def, not only cause of small ps, but that  
of democ internat. We have bef us text  
modif § 8. 3 times, 7/2 has passed on § 8  
or rather on gas relating, & 3 times, by vote  
may 5. Nonetheless, Exec Cttee, June 8, discussed  
found wd in unhappy (Evatt, 4/10/53) I am  
not v. impressed by their arguments, to a Parl,  
can appro; disappro. But I was willing to

Victor  
H. Wesa  
2nd  
clerking  
re appo  
dis appo



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Puis séance mixte, II/2/3, II/11/C, <sup>la</sup> 8 members  
Koo estimerait <sup>give 2 votes</sup> to come rep on  
both. I said <sup>double voting</sup> etc. was supp Fr. ....  
John<sup>n</sup> arrived at was a <sup>plurality</sup> vote.  
(Ch has explained). In these circumstances,  
arrived at text p. 7, 921. If you compare  
text with our prev decis, you can but  
agree that our decis have once again been  
mutilated, Text 88 mutilated. Not one word  
about appow, disappears, right recommend.  
I present once again text I pres in S.C. I also formally  
res Delap's point re proceedings in  
S.C. (Quotes his text), to come after  
§ 1 of draft, delete (a)(b), leave last  
intact. I think my text is more polite,  
is in acc w - Exec Cttee says we find  
more quiet words. It is our sense of our decis  
on 29<sup>th</sup> <sup>posed II/2</sup> When I come back to my com, I shall  
have to def chart - so will all  
all small coms. We shall say we have  
defended liberal clauses, but our def  
will not be easy. If we are not even to  
have these small <sup>sat</sup> ~~sat~~, it will not be  
easy to obtain ratif<sup>n</sup>.

The Cttee made decis, S.C. reversed  
it ultra vires. Compare the 2 texts!

France There is a little ~~inexact~~ in Ch speech - Fr  
did not have two votes. The text adopted  
w/ sup<sup>r</sup> ref some explan<sup>n</sup>. I am saying our text  
was not adopted (The GA should have right  
to draw attention to S.C. .... etc)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Thus France has constantly supp wide powers Ass,  
w. prompt action by S.C. At an earlier stage I  
wd have seconded Belg. I had " " "  
voted yes to gas, but I, for one, cert did  
consid I was voting on exact form of wds  
f. text. I ask, is matter so import?  
It is flattering Ass, import attached to  
r. word "rec". I think pub discuss  
in Ass was the thing of influence, hence  
terms of our amend. We did not want  
in any way to hamper S.C., nor did we  
give sense to "recs" that wd compel  
S.C. to act. S.C. must be master of its  
own powers in Charter. The pub discuss  
cd not be ignored by S.C.

Canada We have to look at what we actually  
did, several times over, as Belg  
said. 3rd time was redraft § 8 w  
its (a) (b). It's fun to say, when dft  
pres at wtp May 30, UK said while  
believing S-C had interp correctly  
II/2, it shd be recop Coord might  
have to edit. / 1st time felt thin  
me in resp (c) "to ensure" — made  
if not made — & might come back to  
us for editing, not substantive amend.  
P7 v2 Substance = recommenda as &

which not  
effect  
was state  
to r. appo  
disapp  
but



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

that is what has disapp in new text today.  
That rec<sup>n</sup> power has been recap &  
reaff repeatedly here, & we can if go  
back on it. I still think more polite  
was, & I think this done in Belg prop.

- something wh gives sense of our  
meeting <sup>proper essential matter</sup> 2 does it in suitable lang.

USP: 1. sugg, re voting proc, insist<sup>ce</sup> that voting  
shd be separ record, & this been done  
- proceed unan acceptance - gives  
of consensus.

But import matter now = content.  
Admitted prin § 1 shd remain un-  
paired by anything in § 8, & it is  
not our intention to limit in any sense  
applic of § 1. It is our intent re  
§ 8 that comes in § 1 apply. Shd  
there be an explic ref to same power  
in § 8, then wd seem necess in other  
§§ affg powers ass, lest <sup>it shd be said, if</sup> <sup>one or two, it is implied 'don't apply in other §§</sup> appear in  
§ 8 must clearly be interp in terms of  
lang of § 1, ass can clearly discuss  
reports, & may make recs (as set out  
in § 1) on any matters in them. We  
thus combine sugges in all amends  
sugg hereto w. present interpreta<sup>n</sup>  
relativ to title 1.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

WPK 1 prop S. af. is not derog to § 1 or § 6  
Ass has right to discuss all ques, &  
to make rec on all questions, arising  
from reports, at all times subj to  
§ 1.

2nd prop. But I don't agree Ass has  
power to make recs on report below  
This wd amount to apppro. disappro.  
reports  
2 wd enforce S.C. You can't  
make comp Parl - Exec - Ass - S.C.  
- more like Chamber - Senate  
situ<sup>n</sup>.

1. reject Belg. prop (wh. I  
consider changes ideas of on Org &  
places of Ass & S.C. in it) &  
support S. af text.

S.C. reduced  
to level  
EC - EC  
Council

Belg Ch Vote  
Asks roll-call. my amend sec  
Canada.

Ch apol. Had not remember sec Canada  
Vote first Belg - Can amend  
(Sec reads text, explaining its position  
in text)

$\frac{2}{3}$  not obtained

Ven Motion lost. "Rec" not to like up  
this cttee at pres. Want to change  
into "opinion" now. WPK said, some



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

discuss + rec on  
matters in rep,  
but not  
make  
rec on  
actual-ops

mtgs ago "opinion" OK  
(text)

Del USSR has been clear on § 1. But

I think Ass shd be allowed express op.

I... move my amend to Belg text.

Uruguay Colombia seconds

Donkeys on previous vote

The vote I made  
depends on ~~scope~~

of portée of § 1

hex

In view Venice prop, I want clarify  
my Delég view. I believe an amend  
stating that in rep reports Ass has  
right to make obs + give opin =  
limita<sup>n</sup> on § 1 rights. On § 1,  
USSR + U.S.D. have made § 1 portée  
clear re § 8. If we final re small  
matter like report by "obs" "opinion",  
it restricts § 1.

All muddle in S-C due addn  
USSR wd "discuss" + putting  
"suby to prvr § 1" to it. Hence  
hex amend. If USSR prep  
drop word discuss, wd be sat

"The GA shd rec + consid annual  
+ spec" etc

∴ § 1 wd then undoubtedly be.  
Venice prop unwise, as we wd have  
to go over whole Charter + make  
certain changes

7  
THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

I make motion of order The S. of  
= take out a b, & shd be emp  
leaves 2 useless lines  
Hence I think Ch shd submit  
para

Ch Clarify. Belf. amend reject  
After speeches, will ask vote  
Venez, then Mex exclude  
"discuss," then on § 8 as a  
whole.

USSR Prob best accept foll. I accept  
Mex, if I have got it right. But wd it  
not be better put in RR that nothing in S.C.  
limits § 1 or § 6, on S. of. prop.  
Venez - I think limits Ars power,  
I agree Mex. I thinkcd be accepted  
unan.

and that Ars has power make  
recs, (given § 1) on any point  
in refs to S.C. - not only int pos.

Mex Orderpt - in Doc 920, p. 2, top p.,  
= 2 paras. These are, except 1 wd,  
S. of. amend. I believe "discuss"  
introd USSR. I want vote on S. of  
amend f.e. p. 2 § 3) deleting  
"discuss".

S. Africa The Mex del. has clearly stated our  
intention. I shd put out S-C text do at



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

even S. of amend. "Discuss" added USSR

But we remind you that III / 1 is also concerned. Let us avoid more jg intgs. — ? Keep <sup>discuss</sup>

Ch § 8 is our jurisdiction, & we have full power to make the draft.

S. of I consider "and discuss" covered by " " , & accept Mex USSR accept completely.

Colombia I would withdraw (? Venezuela too) motion, so long as it is clearly in P.V. 2 RR that nothing in § 8 limits § 1 powers. — clearly understood in Ctee bef voting. Otherwise insist on ours

We doubt if opin re § 1 will be remembered : § 1 is a gen para, § 8 is a spec case, & in law spec cases have pref over gen — in interp. It might be said that jg intg reflected Ass rights, in respect of S.C. reports. Can I have this

Ch Summs up gen idea of Colombia.

Aust On behalf Del, Aust del has looked on this § 8 gen as a drafting gen only. Belf amend tried to this, failed. — now recop by Ctee of force. We fall back on USSR Mex. Mex = remove "and discuss".

But on § 2, we sugg "and may" "thereon" go out, to avoid any

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

limit of distinct betw repts for S.C. & others.  
Venez We have often had pt re collision in  
S.C. brought out, to limit powers Ass.  
When we voted Belf text, same thought im-  
plied, limit on power implied. Hence  
my amend. Now U.S.S.R. rescues us by  
interp including Ass powers as excep.  
Why, then, all this discuss, why stamp.  
We have a precedent "T. revision"  
— when 4 P's gave different views on  
U.S.A. interpret. So how can we have  
faith in interp? I agree Colombia  
re records going on records. Given  
that, we can w. draw ours

U.S.S.R. asks for a vote.

Ch I think we agreed

Fr Examines can be done in silence, so support  
Colombia Ven re putting in reports clearly

Haiti Ven said. When voting of Belf felt...

Not on view — we voted as if we  
believe 81 gen applic<sup>to all necessary powers</sup>. In case doubts  
I support Colombia-Venezuela re repts.

Ch Vote On next amend "receive + consider"

Haiti Can't we combine Austro amend

Ch Vote them separ

Ayes NOT  
counted

Noes X



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Vote exclusion wds in § 2 (Australia)

Ayes many  
Noes none

Vote whole draft as amended

Ayes many  
Noes None

Vote Reporting of interp <sup>to</sup> (comes back to us in R.R. for apprv)  
Ayes many  
Noes None

Ch Coord Cttee re § 1 - can I put it bef B.

Sec at C.C., last sent § 1, Sec. Gen. not <sup>to</sup>. meaning "immediately"

Canada Draft at once

Ch v. simple - immediately - what mean if ass not in session. No perm President diffi  
"or the members if the ass is not in session"

Vote

Canada § 6 - pt of English - put in (a) (b) and (c)

Ch Will

Commission II

Committee 2  
Comité

Attendance Record  
Bulletin de Presence

22nd Meeting  
10:30 AM. R. 202

Date 13 June 1945

Country  
Nation

Name of Representative Present  
Nom du Représentant Présent  
(Please Print)  
(en Majuscules, S.V.P.)

Argentina

Bollin Sherry

Australia

R. J. Doeland

Belgium

Fernand DEHOUSSE

Bolivia

o Andrade

Brazil

H. de Figueiredo

Byelorussian S. S. R.

R. Kiselev

Canada

Warwick Clipping

Chile

Senates - José Maza

China

Carson Chan

Colombia

Edmundo Alvarado

Costa Rica

Cuba

Czechoslovakia

Ernest Stucky



Denmark

Hansen, Trine

Dominican Republic

Frank

Ecuador

Egypt

Dr. M. Andrawi

El Salvador

C. Reina

Ethiopia

E. T. Medhen

France

A. J. Lion

Greece

Guatemala

Haiti

André Liandaud

Honduras

India

V. T. Krishnamochari

Iran

N. ENTEZAM

Iraq

Lebanon

A. YAFI

Liberia

Luxembourg

Mexico

Netherlands

A. H. G. S. [Signature]

New Zealand

AD Whitosh

Nicaragua

Alonso S. Perales

Norway

Jacob Wm = Miller

Panama

Paraguay

Peru

Dr. Cisneros

Philippine Commonwealth

J. T. Imperia

Saudi Arabia

Syria

M. Antaki

Turkey

A. S. Ezmer

Ukrainian S. S. R.

M. Petrovsky

Union of South Africa

J. R. Jordaan

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics

R. Schin

United Kingdom

B. T. Gage

United States of America

As Vandenberg

Uruguay

Francisco

Venezuela

A. Ernest Lopez

Yugoslavia

T. V. Curassier