

UNCLD - Working Papers - Commissions + Technical Committees - Committee '1/2 Correspondence
(2 Files)

15 May 1945
30 May 1945

Clear

UN ARCHIVES

SERIES	<u>1018</u>
BOX	<u>03</u>
FILE	<u>01</u>
ACC.	<u> </u>

intéressés, ainsi que du Conseil de Coordination. Or, ce texte de base qui a été établi par le Membre britannique du Comité I/2, contient deux paragraphes, l'un relatif à la suspension, l'autre relatif à l'expulsion, et il fut reconnu comme une nécessité pratique de statuer d'abord sur ce dernier paragraphe avant de fixer les termes de celui relatif à la suspension.

Il paraît dès lors inévitable que si un premier vote a lieu sur une motion d'omission de la proposition relative à l'exclusion, le deuxième vote ait lieu sur la proposition relative à l'exclusion et le troisième seulement sur la proposition relative à la suspension.

x
x x

En résumé, la Délégation belge est d'avis qu'il n'y a pas lieu d'élaborer de nouvelles règles de procédure, étant entendu que pour donner satisfaction aux critiques qui se sont fait jour, les présidents de comité auront à mettre les diverses propositions aux voix sous leur forme tant négative que positive, fût-ce au prix de certaines répétitions, mais sans qu'il soit porté atteinte au principe d'égalité reconnu entre les propositions de Dumbarton Oaks et toutes autres.

San Francisco, 9 juin 1945.

To: Miss Armstrong

From: JWM

Subject: Procedural question at conclusion
of meeting of Committee I/2, May 23/24

1. During the course of the discussion the delegate of New Zealand made the following motion:
"That the Charter contain no provisions regarding the number, method of election, or term of office or reelection of Deputy Secretaries-General.
2. At the conclusion of the discussion on this motion, the Chairman announced that three votes would be ~~xxx~~ taken by the Committee:
 - a. the motion of New Zealand
 - b. If it is decided that there shall be reference, the the Committee would vote on the USSR motion.
 - b. the motion of Greece
3. The Chairman then put the New Zealand motion; in doing so, he stated ~~xxxx~~ it in reverse form, however. The Committee voted, therefore, that there shall be reference to Deputies - the vote was 15 to 13.
4. When pressed by the delegate of Belgium, the Chairman ruled that this vote~~d~~ constituted an amendment to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, since it added something not in the original draft. (It is my belief, however, that this ruling passed unnoticed by the delegates in the confusion which followed.) The Chairman was incorrect in this ruling; ~~xxxx~~ the New Zealand motion, as stated by the delegate of New Zealand, was not in the form of an amendment - actually the Committee rejected the proposition that there should be no mention of Deputies.
5. After further debate it was agreed that at the next meeting on May 25 the Committee would vote on this matter without further debate.
6. It is suggested that at the May 25 meeting the Chairman put to a vote the first sentence of the Sponsoring Government's amendment, as revised by USSR, namely:

"There should be a Secretariat, comprising a Secretary-General and five Deputy Secretaries-General and such staff as may be required."

7. If this sentence is adopted, the Chairman should then proceed to the next portion, that dealing with the method of election of the Deputies. He should point out that Committee II/1 voted that the Secretary-General should be elected by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of a majority of seven members of the Security Council. Committee I/2 voted to close discussions on this.

~~The question is for the Committee to take
up the method of election of the Deputies and refer~~

Committee I/2 must decide whether it will: 1) close debate on the method of election of Deputies and refer the matter to Committee II/1, 2) discuss the matter and vote.

If Committee I/2 decides to discuss and vote, it ~~has two~~ ^{election} alternatives, 1) accept the method of ~~election~~ ^{election} given in the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers, i.e., by the Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council, or 2) accept the method of election decided upon by Committee II/1 for the Secretary-General, i.e., by the Assembly upon recommendation of a majority of seven members of the Security Council.

8. The Committee should then proceed to the next portion of the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers, that dealing with term of office and eligibility for re-election.
9. Lastly, proceed to last sentence of the amendment, stating that
"The Secretary-General should be the chief ~~and~~ administrative office of the Organization."

NOTE: an alternative to steps 7 and 8 above:

Put to a vote the remaining portions of the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers, as revised by the USSR, - - the whole thing at one time.

24 Mai 1945

Excellence;

Je me permets de vous envoyer aujourd'hui un ordre du Jour très détaillé. Nous avons eu la temerité de penser qu'un plan aussi détaillé pourra peut-être aider à persuader les délégués de tenir la discussion dans des limites de l'ordre et du progrès. J'espère que ce plan aidera surtout à Votre Excellence en guidant les esprits assez turbulents de nos délégués.

Je tiens à tirer l'attention de Votre Excellence au fait que nous avons mis le rapport du Rapporteur après la discussion des Chapitres X et XI. C'est fait parce que M. Rolin nous a indiqué qu'il est obligé de faire un rapport dans le Comité III/1 et qu'il est très désireux d'être également dans notre Comité quand on commence la discussion de l'expulsion et suspension, comme c'est lui qui a proposé les motions en question. M. Rolin vous prie, que quand il arrive, si Votre Excellence pourra demander au Comité, le moment donné, de ajourner la discussion sur le Chapitre X et XI pour le moment et de passer à la discussion du rapport du Rapporteur, afin que nous serions dans la position de finir avec les Chapitres III aussitôt possible.

Veuillez accepter, Excellence, l'expression de ma haute considération

Son Excellence
Alvaro Bonilla Lara

Elizabeth H. Armstrong
Secrétaire, Comité I/2

Miss Armstrong

May 24th 1945.

Mr. Stewart:

This morning I find your memorandum of yesterday's date, with respect to the feeling of Mr. Darlington's office that texts of provisions approved by Committees are not being sent in. I note that reference is made, among others, to "Chapter X, paragraph 1, approved by Committee II/1 on May 14 and referred to Committee I/2 for inclusion in Chapter X."

As I understand it, the situation is not as simple as is suggested by the above statement, but is about as follows:

(1) With respect to election of the Secretary General, Committee II/1 did not approve any provision of Chapter X, but did approve a provision (in relation to Chapter V. B.4) to the effect that the Secretary General should be elected by the General Assembly upon nomination of seven members of the Security Council.

On this matter Committee I/2 yesterday, but not until yesterday, took the following decision: "The Committee agreed that in view of the fact that the method of election of the Secretary General has been discussed and a decision taken in Committee II/1, this Committee did not, therefore, propose to enter into a further discussion of this matter." It was added, however, that "the approval of this resolution was understood by the Committee as not constituting approval of the substance of the decision of Committee II/1."

(Summary Report of the Eleventh Meeting of Committee I/2. Doc. 538, I/2/34, May 24, 1945.)

(2) With respect to Chapter X, paragraph 1, Committee II/1 approved only two sentences, providing for a three year term for the Secretary General and for eligibility for reelection.

These provisions were noted by Committee I/2 yesterday, but no decision was reached.

(3) This means that no text for Chapter X, paragraph 1, has yet been approved by either Committee II/1 or Committee I/2. One sentence has been approved by Committee II/1, and, by implication, by Committee I/2 (namely, that relating to the method of election of the Secretary General, and referred to in point 1 above), which may eventually be included in Chapter X.

(4) Even if this much should be reported as an approved text from Committee I/2, it could not possibly have been reported before the Memorandum of yesterday's date was sent, since the Committee I/2 did not act on the matter at all until yesterday.

Clarence A. Berdahl
Assistant Executive Officer
Commission I

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

24 Mai 1945

Excellence;

Je me permets de vous envoyer aujourd'hui un ordre du Jour très détaillé. Nous avons eu la témérité de penser qu'un plan aussi détaillé pourra peut-être aider à persuader les délégués de tenir la discussion dans des limites de l'ordre et du progrès. J'espère que ce plan aidera surtout à Votre Excellence en guidant les esprits assez turbulents de nos délégués.

Je tiens à tirer l'attention de Votre Excellence au fait que nous avons mis le rapport du Rapporteur après la discussion des Chapitres X et XI. C'est fait parce que M. Rolin nous a indiqué qu'il est obligé de faire un rapport dans le Comité III/1 et qu'il est très désireux d'être également dans notre Comité quand on commence la discussion de l'expulsion et suspension, comme c'est lui qui a proposé les motions en question. M. Rolin vous prie, que quand il arrive, si

Votre Excellence pourra demander au Comité, le moment donné, de *ajourner la discussion sur le Chapitre X et XI pour le moment et de* passer à la discussion du rapport du Rapporteur, afin que nous serions *passer* dans la position de finir avec les Chapitres III aussitôt possible.

Veuillez accepter, Excellence, l'expression de ma haute
considération

Elizabeth H. Armstrong
Secrétaire, Comité I/2

Son Excellence
Alvaro Bonilla Lara
Délégation de Costa Rica
Room 414 or 457
Hotel St. Francis.

May 23, 1946

TO: Mr. Charles F. Darlington
Coordination Committee

FROM: Elizabeth H. Armstrong
Secretary, Committee I/2

Reference is made to your memorandum of May 22, 1946, concerning the action of the Coordination Committee on Chapter III (Membership). Committee I/2 is still laboring under a heavy schedule. Further consideration of the subject may only lead to obstructing the progress of the Committee and the Conference. It is with the greatest reluctance that I should formally suggest to the Chairman of Committee I/2 to raise once again in the Committee the question of Chapter III. It is with this in mind that I desire to clarify the points raised in your memorandum.

The Committee, in adopting the draft text of Chapter III, intends to provide for the membership of nations participating in the Conference and of states which are to join subsequently. Paragraph 1 of the text refers, as the debate in the Committee and Subcommittee revealed, to the nations which will sign the Charter at the conclusion of this Conference. Paragraph 2 applies to other states which will seek admission and provides the formula on the basis of which the appropriate organs of the organization, charged with the power of admitting new members, will perform their assigned functions with regard to membership.

On page 2 of your memorandum, you pose four specific questions. I believe that the action of the Committee provides an adequate answer to each of them.

With reference to question one, although the distinction between the original members and subsequent members occurs in Chapter III on membership, it was the sense of the Committee that no stigma should be associated with this distinction. Consequently, there seems no need to stress the distinction.

With respect to question two, paragraph one of proposed Chapter III makes it clear that the signatories of the Charter, which ratify the Charter in accordance with

the procedure stipulated in Chapter XI, automatically become members of the organization. The method by which states which join subsequently become members is a matter for Commission II and possibly Commission III.

Referring to the third question, may I point out that paragraph two of the proposed Chapter III provides that "membership in the organization is open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the organization, are able and ready to accept and carry out the obligations contained in the Charter."

In view of the latitude which paragraph two of proposed Chapter III permits the Organization in deciding the admission of new members, the matter of reservation raised in the fourth question need not arise at this time. In view of the omission of such a reference in Chapter III, it may be assumed that the appropriate organs of the Organization which are empowered to admit new members will consider such reservations as they arise in each case.

The draft text for Chapter III on membership was adopted unanimously by the Committee, which included delegates of the four sponsoring powers. The records of the Committee reveal that the text for Chapter III is in accordance with the wishes of these delegates, as well as the other delegates who have participated in the meetings.

In view of the above explanation, if the Coordination Committee still wishes that Committee I/8 should reopen the discussion of membership, I shall do everything in my power to expedite the consideration of this subject.

May 23, 1945

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Executive Committee

FROM: Charles F. Darlington, Executive Officer
(Room 324 Veteran's Building; Telephone Int. 3300, Ex. 376-7)

The attached suggested amendment to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals and proposed amendments, has been submitted for the consideration of the Conference by the Delegation of Uruguay.

This communication is addressed to you in accordance with the Rules of Procedure which provide that, "Formal proposals received after Friday, May 4, can be accepted only upon authorization of the Executive Committee, before which body the Secretary-General will lay them."

Since Committee I/2, which would consider this matter, holds its next meeting on Thursday, May 24, 1945 at 3:30 p.m., it would be helpful to know as soon as possible whether you are agreeable to admittance of this proposed amendment. Unless objection is received by 11:30 a.m., Thursday, May 24, the attached proposed amendment of the Delegation of Uruguay will be referred for consideration by Committee I/2.

DELEGATION OF URUGUAY
TO THE
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

SAN FRANCISCO

May 19, 1945

Mr. Alger Hiss,
Secretary General
United Nations Conference
on International Organization

Mr. Secretary General:

I have the pleasure of submitting to you the text of the proposal of the Delegation of Uruguay--as well as the grounds therefor--by which there are introduced certain amendments to Chapter XI, Amendments, as it appears in the proposals of the sponsoring Nations.

With the request that you assign, for study, the above-mentioned text to the proper Commission--and that you inform me of this, --I offer you, Mr. Secretary General, the assurances of my high and distinguished consideration.

(signed) V. Mora Rodriguez,
Secretary General

May 23, 1945

TO: Mr. Charles F. Darlington
Coordination Committee

FROM: Elizabeth H. Armstrong
Secretary, Committee I/2

Reference is made to your memorandum of May 22, 1945, concerning the action of the Coordination Committee on Chapter III (Membership). Committee I/2 is still laboring under a heavy schedule. Further consideration of the subject may only lead to obstructing the progress of the Committee and the Conference. It is with the greatest reluctance that I should formally suggest to the Chairman of Committee I/2 to raise once again in the Committee the question of Chapter III. It is with this in mind that I desire to clarify the points raised in your memorandum.

The Committee, in adopting the draft text of Chapter III, intends to provide for the membership of nations participating in the Conference and of states which are to join subsequently. Paragraph 1 of the text refers, as the debate in the Committee and Subcommittee revealed, to the nations which will sign the Charter at the conclusion of this Conference. Paragraph 2 applies to other states which will seek admission and provides the formula on the basis of which the appropriate organs of the organization, charged with the power of admitting new members, will perform their assigned functions with regard to membership.

On page 2 of your memorandum, you pose four specific questions. I believe that the action of the Committee provides an adequate answer to each of them.

With reference to question one, although the distinction between the original members and subsequent members occurs in Chapter III on membership, it was the sense of the Committee that no stigma should be associated with this distinction. Consequently, there seems no need to stress the distinction.

With respect to question two, paragraph one of proposed Chapter III makes it clear that the signatories of the Charter, which ratify the Charter in accordance with

the procedure stipulated in Chapter XI, automatically become members of the organization. The method by which states which join subsequently become members is a matter for Commission II and possibly Commission III.

Referring to the third question, may I point out that paragraph two of the proposed Chapter III provides that "membership in the organization is open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the organization, are able and ready to accept and carry out the obligations contained in the Charter."

In view of the latitude which paragraph two of proposed Chapter III permits the Organization in deciding the admission of new members, the matter of reservation raised in the fourth question need not arise at this time. In view of the omission of such a reference in Chapter III, it may be assumed that the appropriate organs of the Organization which are empowered to admit new members will consider such reservations as they arise in each case.

The draft text for Chapter III on membership was adopted unanimously by the Committee, which included delegates of the four sponsoring powers. The records of the Committee reveal that the text for Chapter III is in accordance with the wishes of these delegates, as well as the other delegates who have participated in the meetings.

In view of the above explanation, if the Coordination Committee still wishes that Committee I/2 should reopen the discussion of membership, I shall do everything in my power to expedite the consideration of this subject.

Mr. Davis
Mr. Beahm

May 23, 1945

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Executive Committee
FROM: Charles F. Darlington, Executive Officer
(Room 324 Veteran's Building; Telephone Int. 3300, Ex. 376-7)

The attached suggested amendment to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals and proposed amendments, has been submitted for the consideration of the Conference by the Delegation of Uruguay.

This communication is addressed to you in accordance with the Rules of Procedure which provide that, "Formal proposals received after Friday, May 4, can be accepted only upon authorization of the Executive Committee, before which body the Secretary-General will lay them."

Since Committee I/2, which would consider this matter, holds its next meeting on Thursday, May 24, 1945 at 3:30 p.m., it would be helpful to know as soon as possible whether you are agreeable to admittance of this proposed amendment. Unless objection is received by 11:30 a.m., Thursday, May 24, the attached proposed amendment of the Delegation of Uruguay will be referred for consideration by Committee I/2.

DELEGATION OF URUGUAY
TO THE
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

SAN FRANCISCO

May 19, 1945

Mr. Alger Hiss,
Secretary General
United Nations Conference
on International Organization

Mr. Secretary General:

I have the pleasure of submitting to you the text of the proposal of the Delegation of Uruguay--as well as the grounds therefor--by which there are introduced certain amendments to Chapter XI, Amendments, as it appears in the proposals of the sponsoring Nations.

With the request that you assign, for study, the above-mentioned text to the proper Commission--and that you inform me of this,--I offer you, Mr. Secretary General, the assurances of my high and distinguished consideration.

(signed) V. Mora Rodriguez,
Secretary General

G R O U N D S

Uruguay accepts the international juridical charter for peace, security and justice, as we are building it, on the bases of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, as an exceptional system; as a compromise, during total war, for a period of transition. That is why the procedure destined to provide for amendments to this Charter is of fundamental importance to Uruguay.

The requirement of unanimity among the members with permanent seats on the Security Council carries with it implicitly the veto power. It means, plainly and categorically, that one of the members of the United Nations can victoriously oppose the will of the 48 remaining members. And this, which constitutes a threat that might paralyze the entire security system, if carried to the extreme of including it even for amendments to the Charter, is entirely unacceptable to Uruguay.

1. It is not reasonable to include rigid and inflexible rules which make revision practically impossible, rendering the Charter permanently in force. Instead of this, which would tend to mummify it, it is desirable, in its opinion, to liberalize the procedure for its amendment, in order to render possible its adaptation to changing world realities, and furthermore, as Canada has stated, to examine it in the light of past experience.

2. There is another reason for demanding flexible procedure for the first amendment. That is the belief that even within a

more or less brief term--the transition and post-war periods--transformations will occur which will compel a review of what has been done in order to adjust it to the new historical realities.

3. And lastly, a third reason: it is not the most appropriate time, in the last stages of the most cruel, widespread and terrible war in history, to establish a permanent international juridical order, free from disturbing influences, in which the dominating objective will be the determination to render possible the happiness of peoples in peace, liberty and justice.

For the reasons above set forth, and in accordance with what Foreign Minister Serrato stated in his speech made at a plenary session, Uruguay would accept making the structure we are here setting up effective for a maximum period of ten years. And by way of compromise, it would admit in a full spirit of cooperation that there be established the requirements for the amendments proposed by the sponsoring nations, limited to this period; but establishing expressly that upon the expiration of said term, there shall govern exclusively the two-thirds rule for the Assembly and the Security Council; without privileges of any kind for anybody, rendering honestly true in its entirety the principle of the juridical equality of the member Nations, without any clauses which not only are contrary to doctrine and legality but also against the essential principles of any democratic organization.

Uruguay proposes, furthermore, the elimination of the requirement of unanimity even for the mere calling of a conference for the purpose of revising the Charter, within the ten-year period. In its opinion, this constitutes another inadmissible excess even for

the period of transition. How can one nation be granted the power to prevent the other 48 from exercising even the elemental right of assembly for deliberative purposes?

This is how the pertinent proposal of the sponsoring nations would be worded, in accordance with the amendments proposed by Uruguay:

CHAPTER XI

Amendments

2. A General Conference of the members of the United Nations shall be called, to meet on the date and at the place determined by the majority of the members of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. Each member shall have one vote in the Conference.

Any amendment to the Charter, recommended by a two-thirds vote of the Conference, shall enter into force upon ratification--in accordance with their respective constitutional processes--by the members of the Organization which hold permanent seats on the Security Council and by the majority of the other members of the Organization.

The foregoing provision shall be applicable to amendments proposed during the first ten years that this Charter is in force. Thereafter, amendments shall be made by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

AMENDMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS RELATING TO
SUSPENSION AND EXPULSION
for Committee I/2

I. Expulsion

a. Basis for expulsion

Australia, Doc. 2, G/14 (1), p. 3.

The last sentence in paragraph (3) (of V,B) to be amended as follows:

"The General Assembly may expel from the United Nations any member which wilfully violates any principle or undertaking contained in this Charter."

b. Oppose expulsion

Belgium, Doc. 2, G/7 (k) (1), p. 4.

"Any mention of the expulsion of members in Chapter V of the Proposals should be deleted and limited to the suspension of their rights."

Brazil, Doc. 2, G/14 (r), p. 7.

Therefore the Delegation of Brazil suggests that Chapter III of the Proposals be replaced by the following:

.....
"2. No State may be expelled from the Organization or voluntarily withdraw from it."

Dominican Republic, Doc. 2, G/14 (e), p. 7.

Among the sanctions listed in these Proposals that are applicable to members infringing the principles established in the Charter of the Organization is the expulsion of such members from the association.

It seems advisable that said sanction be eliminated, because, on the one hand, the character of the international organization should be universal in principle, and on the other hand, the suspension of the exercise of the rights or privileges inherent in membership in the organization, together with the sanctions provided for in Chapter VIII, Section B, paragraph 3 of the aforementioned Proposals, would at

least assure all the effects of expulsion without offering any of its undesirable features.

Mexico. Doc. 2, G/7 (c) (1), p. 8.

(Note: new paragraph 3 amplifies suspension and restoration of rights but omits provision for expulsion.)

Venezuela. Doc. 2, G/7 (d) (1), p. 9.

"The draft provides for two degrees of penalties for members who do not respect the decisions of the organization: 1. the suspension of the exercise of the rights or privileges.....
.....2. expulsion by the General Assembly, with the recommendation of the Security Council, for persistent violation of the principles stipulated in the agreement. It is not determined whether the expulsion shall be definitive or whether, on the contrary, it can be decreed for a term or subject to submission to certain requisites or dispositions. The omission seems important."

.....

The suspension having been admitted, for a longer or shorter period and with the corresponding penalties, and having established the conditions of possible restoration of rights to the suspended member, we do not see the object of the expulsion. When a State persistently violates its obligations as a member of the international organization, the logical thing is to penalize it most severely, economically, and if necessary, militarily, to oblige it to subject itself to the principles of the institution and suspend it from the exercise of its rights and privileges until it complies with the conditions that are imposed upon it. Definitive expulsion would be the permanent rejection of a State from membership in the international society: civil death with all its consequences. Expulsion for a term or conditional expulsion would add nothing to suspension. On the other hand, definitive expulsion is contrary to the ideal of universality of the institution.

Uruguay and Norway - "delete last sentence"

2. Suspension and restoration of rights

Ecuador. Doc. 2, G/7 (p), pp. 32-33.

Amendment to para. 3, Ch. V, B.

"The General Assembly, by the vote of two-thirds of its members, and upon recommendation of the Security Council, or without such recommendation, may suspend the exercise of any right or privilege inherent to membership by any State which is a member of the Organization and against which the Security Council has adopted preventive or compulsive action, or whenever grave circumstances warrant, in the judgment of the Assembly, that such suspension be enforced. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by the Assembly by the same majority of votes as provided for in this article and upon the recommendation of the Security Council or without such recommendation."

Egypt. Doc. 2, G/7 (q)(1), p. 4.

Parag. 3 should read as follows:

"Any Member of the Organization against whom preventive or enforcement measures have been decided, shall be deemed suspended from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership. The General Assembly shall be empowered to restore any suspended Member in his rights and privileges, after taking the advice of the Security Council".

Honduras. Doc. 2, G/7 (m), p. 2.

5. With regard to the functions and powers of the General Assembly, it is observed in Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 3, that the General Assembly should, upon recommendation of the Security Council, be empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council, but the restoration of the exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended shall be made, not by decision of the General Assembly, but of the Security Council. The natural thing would be that if the General Assembly has the right to suspend, it would also have the right to restore; thus the impression would be avoided that the Security Council would be restoring what the General Assembly took away.

Mexico. Doc. 2, G/7 (c)(1), p. 8.

The General Assembly should be empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by the General Assembly once the conditions giving rise to the suspension shall have ceased to exist.

Netherlands. Doc. 2, G/7 (j)(1), p. 3.

CHAPTER V SECTION B

(FUNCTIONS AND POWERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY)

Insert at the end of the first sentence of par. 3:

", and to raise the suspension of that member".

New Zealand. Doc. 2, G/14 (f), p. 2.

X. End of first sentence Insert after the word "Council" the words "or which in any way shall have violated the obligations of membership."

Norway. Doc. 2, G/7 (n) (1), p. 3.

P.4, L.21-23 Chapter V, B, 3

and

P.5, L.1-3

..... or whose Government persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter or fails to meet its financial obligations under the Charter. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by decision of the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. (Delete the last sentence).

Uruguay. Doc. 2, G/7 (a) (1), p. 5.

Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 3, shall be worded as follows:

The General Assembly shall, upon recommendation of the Security Council, be empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by decision of the Security Council, after such decision, together

with a statement of reasons therefor, has been communicated to the General Assembly. (The last sentence of this paragraph, treating of the expulsion of members of the Organization, is to be omitted.)

Venezuela. Dec. 2, G/7 (d) (1), pp. 9-10.

No. 3. The draft provides for two degrees of penalties for members who do not respect the decisions of the organization: 1. the suspension of the exercise of the rights or privileges of members decreed by the Assembly by a 2/3 majority, with power of readmission by the Security Council, in case that the preventive or compulsive action of the organization has been applied to such members.

The suspension of a member from the exercise of his rights and privileges is a penalty adequate for grave faults, such as those which give rise to the application of preventive measures or application of penalties, and it is natural that such a severe measure should pertain to the General Assembly. It appears, on the other hand, illogical and inconsistent with the powers of each body that the readmission of a member who has been guilty of faults of such significance can be made by the Security Council, without any intervention of the Assembly. The natural and proper thing would be that the Council should propose to the Assembly that it should repeal the measure that it has itself decreed and that the latter should decide. It ought not to be objected that this procedure might delay the readmission of an important member pending the meeting of the Assembly, because it would suffice to submit the contrary argument that in view of the possibility of a measure of such consequence there would be sufficient cause to convoke the Assembly extraordinarily.

SUSPENSION, EXPULSION, WITHDRAWAL

Text of Dumbarton Oaks Proposal

1st sentence

The General Assembly should, upon recommendation of the Security Council, be empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council.

Changes suggested

Ecuador: vote of 2/3 of General Assembly with or without recommendation of Security Council "or whenever grave circumstances warrant, in the judgment of the Assembly, that such suspension be enforced.

Egypt no substantive change

New Zealand add at end of sentence: "or which in any way shall have violated the obligations of membership."

Norway: Add at end of first sentence: "or whose Government persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter or fails to meet its financial obligations under the Charter."

Venezuela 2/3 majority of Assembly

2nd sentence

The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by decision of the Security Council.

Changes suggested

Ecuador restoration by same majority of votes(2/3) with or without recommendation of Security Council

Egypt Assembly empowered to restore rights "after taking the advice of the Security Council."

<u>Honduras</u>	If General Assembly has right to suspend, would also have right to restore; thus the impression would be avoided that the Security Council would be restoring what the General Assembly took away.
<u>Mexico</u>	Rights may be restored "by the General Assembly once the conditions giving rise to the suspension shall have ceased to exist.
<u>Netherlands</u>	General Assembly to be empowered "to raise the suspension of that member." (Really belongs at end of 1st sentence)
<u>Norway</u>	Restoration of rights "may be restored by decision of the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council.
<u>Uruguay</u>	Restoration by decision of the Security Council, after such decision, together with a statement of reasons therefor, has been communicated to the General Assembly.
<u>Venezuela</u>	Council should propose to Assembly that it should repeal the measure that it has itself decreed and that the latter should decide. It ought not to be objected that this might delay readmission of an important member pending meeting of Assembly, because would suffice to submit contrary argument that in view of the possibility of a measure of such consequence there would be sufficient cause to cnvoke the Assembly extraordinarily.

3rd Sentence

Re Expulsion

Opposed by

Belgium

Brazil

Dominican Republic

Mexico

Venezuela

Uruguay

Norway

Basis for expulsions - Australia

Miss Armstrong

MEMORANDUM

May 24, 1945

To: Mr. G. Haselton
From: Clarence A. Berdahl
Subject: Omission of Canadian Amendments in
Document 288

Replying to your memorandum of May 22, I am returning herewith a draft reply to Mr. Wrong of the Canadian Delegation.

This draft was prepared by Mr. Malcolm Davis and is one which seems to both of us to set forth as best we can a statement of what happened.

We regret very much that the omission of references to the Canadian document was overlooked.

Clarence A. Berdahl
Assistant Executive Officer
Commission I

1 Incl.

DRAFT FOR REPLY TO MR. WRONG

The omission, mentioned in your letter of the 20th, of a reference on page 63 of Document No. 288 to amendments put forward by Canada relating to Chapter XI of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, is sincerely regretted. It appears to have been due to loss or mislaying of the reference slip in the process of indexing the various government proposals and of composing the Guide to these documents.

The matter is being called to the attention of the Chairman of Committee I/2 for proper notice when Chapter XI comes up for consideration.

Faithfully yours,

MEMORANDUM

May 24, 1945

TO: Mr. McClintock
Miss Armstrong ✓
Mr. Brown
Mr. Staley
Mr. Gideonse
Mr. Chase

FROM: Mr. Haselton *GH*

In order that the Department may programme its personnel needs for any future Conference, and may speak authoritatively when indicating its requirements thereof, our office has been asked to ascertain the number of hours Conference personnel worked in excess of the normal eight hour day. Will you, therefore, inform us as promptly as possible the total number of hours which you and your Assistant Secretaries worked during the first four weeks in San Francisco. This would be most effectively shown by the day; if this is impossible, it should be tabulated by the week.

15 hr. day

GHH:vk