

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.	

Committee I/2

JOURNAL

June 12, 1945

The Secretary General of the Conference introduced to Committee I/2 at its meeting this afternoon Mr. Oreamuno of Costa Rica, who has been selected by his delegation to replace Mr. Bonilla Lara as Chairman of Committee I/2. Mr. Bonilla Lara departed from the Conference last Saturday.

Committee I/2 reconsidered, at the request of the Steering Committee, its vote on May 25 to omit from the Charter provision for expulsion of members from the Organization.

The Delegate of Belgium proposed that Committee I/2 reject paragraph 4 of the working paper of Subcommittee I/2/A.

May 22 and 23, 1945, which reads as follows;

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

Committee I/2 rejected the Belgian proposal by a vote of 16 to 21.



PRECIS

COMMITTEE I/2

June 12, 1945

Mr. Oreamuno of Costa Rica replaced as chairman of Committee I/2 Mr. Bonilla Lara, who departed from the Conference on Saturday. At the request of the Steering Committee, Committee I/2 reconsidered its vote of May 25 to omit from the Charter provision for expulsion of members from the Organization. The Belgian delegate proposed that provision for expulsion be omitted from the Charter. The Committee rejected the Belgian proposal by a vote of 16 to 21.

1

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

June 12, 1945  
I/2

Sec-Gen: Oreamuno, to replace  
Chi: arrived just shortly, make valuable

Steering Com. recom. reconsideration  
Chap II, B, IP 3, re: expulsion; also dep. sec-gen.  
today, only one item, you have document  
Chi will entertain motion to effect that  
nothing shall be said concerning  
expulsion

Polun: proceed concerning vote. Hasn't been  
solved definitely. Steering Com. asked us to vote.  
I pref to vote on the original S.O.  
Text — now we vote on para 4 =

I move we reject para 4 = those in  
favor of Sen. motion, yes.

Chi — we have motion to reject

Memo = second  
Bel — roll call



2

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Greece: what majority:  $\frac{2}{3}$  to retain:  
proced. unusual. Amendments need  $\frac{2}{3}$ :  
what is position —  $\frac{2}{3}$  to support  
 $\frac{2}{3}$  to defeat. Article = not followed  
in other committee.

Chr =  $\frac{2}{3}$  require, neg. vote would amt  
to amendment of D.O. Once vote is  
taken, nothing else is taken.  
If it gets  $\frac{2}{3}$  no expulsion; if no,  
Com. will take up later expulsion.  
Such may take  $\frac{2}{3}$  and fail. Refer  
matter to Com. I and St. Com, so  
later may return to Com I.

Ecuador: suggested draft by St. Com. has no inst.  
It is no matter of subst. Com 5/2  
will have to change its view. We  
should

no expulsion, no withdrawal =  
re: support. repr!

S. U. del. spoke of expulsion for limited  
time; oppon. felt this was  
suspension.

Organ. permanent and universal  
Prob. of ratif. is impt. involves

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

withdrawal Canal has charged  
new - it of <sup>from universal</sup> withdrawal <sup>should</sup> recognized  
in Charter. <sup>would be warranted</sup> justified by decision  
to include expulsion  
~~in~~ Postpone vote  
I would include expulsion if there  
is withdrawal

No vote until withdrawal  
reported by I/2/F

Ch = Agree that connection exists.  
Matter would come up later

Uruguay - Com adopted text in 200. Motion  
of Palm is not regular. Proceed  
would require reconsideration  
of its previous. Vote for or against  
reconsideration, by majority.  
Others may bring amendments to Com -

Prop<sup>se</sup> reconsider earlier decision  
see announced number, <sup>lost vote</sup> ~~if same~~

unless move for reconsider, we must  
abide by previous decision

4

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Chr = delighted to hear sug. from Uruguay  
His recommend was adopted by  
Steering Com, chief of del; such  
recom. must bear weight;  
delegates must follow their  
chief — cannot refuse to take up  
recom of Steering Com.  
Del of Uruguay has raised pt. of order —  
Person<sup>mer</sup> of Steering Com has tacit  
approval of this Com

Rolin = I wish to point out my motion is to  
facilitate progress. If we adjourn,  
we will not be able to go before  
Conf. Better to reconsider later.  
Agree with Chom as to decision of  
Steering Com; no recom on procedure  
or substance, achieve clarity in  
new. Possible to achieve clarity  
only by motion I made  
Re: withdrawal, doesn't refer to  
nominal withdrawal, - withdrawn  
on amend. Vote with understanding



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

that withdrawn left unmentioned  
of other decisions, take before  
Com.

Mot. to suppress para 4 of  
text

to suppress part of D.O.

Norway: explain vote of Norwegian deleg  
delete clause on expulsion —  
no concordance between guilt and  
sanction. Fault falls upon  
nation: guilt belongs to  
that gov't.

Expul. would have to read:  
expul "in judgment of organ,  
as most peace-loving

we'd support  
such even though  
we think it  
unwise

Vote against clause as it is  
now presented

Chr = we are concerned only with negative  
vote. your pt to come up later



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Egypt = crisis in several com; waiting  
for intensified com = working  
in vacuum; veto under consid.  
in III/1, none has suggested  
viewing matters together.

Appul, = withdrawal, =  
amend. since W and A are  
related. Disagree  
much later, have choice

Pascal, lecting only for  
democratic matter

Egypt favor universality  
asked to reconsider —

volunt withdrawal — compul  
with — dignity of state

Brazil

Coastal relations, not coercion

Poln- propose <sup>suppose</sup>  
of

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

agree with Egypt -

question - Ung has most  
brilliant deleg., doesn't speak  
in official language; Do explain  
of documents on desk

Are we taking it for granted  
that all chiefs voted to  
reconsider?

Chr = my inf. is that St. Com. decided  
by unanimous vote.

4. 5. agree with Chr's interpret as to  
reconsideration. Ung. was correct for  
normal parlia. proper interpret.

agree with Belgian that this

agree that Greer is correct.

deleg. can propose additions -  
takes  $\frac{2}{3}$ ; move to take out  
 $\frac{2}{3}$  adopt what is left



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

possible to reach impasse, known as  
a deadlock; nego. to settle or no  
result -

correlation of these matters.

Character of organ. important  
no difference on why we are here  
to furnish org for peace, mankind  
Max. of meeting of minds, )

method for peace = basis,  
harmony and unanimity of major  
powers; if org splits big powers  
we contribute to divide world.  
no peace.

"all members shall solve disputes by  
peace means - peace

solid rock upon which we build.

Task to get major powers to work  
together. More diff. in war, way  
found; when powers divided, aggression  
Unity to defeat aggression

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Enador - pt interpreted  
Continue to be peace-loving, character  
and right to exclude. Pray  
God

nations will want to get into  
it; want to stay in, faith,  
desire of members to maintain  
org

Broader than Legatities

Many phases: expulsion  
withdrawal =

tentatively take them one by  
one, more consultation

USA wants Org we can join  
by fullest majority

Jones - reason why sent back! on procedure  
or to change our mind; goes  
over detail on how it reached  
St. Com -  
wants to know what St. Com. had



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

in mind. Not question of am changing  
our mind, but to straightened out  
vote.

Chr = next speakercede to Pol

Polin. I have right to speak on  
pt

Chr = let's finish with speakers

UK = pay Polin a compliment. He has  
cooper. fully to get this over -  
Chr is ok, grasps situation

Premier's sit has led to  
procedural difficulty, which  
St. Com. has asked us to start  
again. Best way is a motion,  
amend to left, = Polin's motion

Canada: goes over proced. if D.O. not  
sustained, it drops out

No issue on principle of unity.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

diff is relating unanimity to every amendment. Canada against expulsion  
1) can be used only against certain power  
2) elabor susp sufficient. Unity of  
powers doesn't rest on this question

Soviet Union: I shall comment briefly.  
returned from St Com, not only for proceed.  
group. Serious ques. pol -  
tolerate persistent violators -  
will lose character - if no, then  
it will have char. & highly  
political nature; monolithic  
nature of Org - support D.O.

In suspension, would apply  
to redeeming violators - syst.  
violators, aggravated manner,  
must be expelled. - reconsider our  
previous decision  
Depend charact. of Org



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Greece: support UK in praise of the  
motion: reject insert of expulsion  
Charter —

we must consider merits. Ques. of  
substance.

Arg against expulsion, closely  
related to withdrawal. Diff. to  
vote separately. Ques of withdrawal  
related to amend et al, even  
insep, not insep from expulsion.

Now of us run risk of expulsion  
we have affirmed, proved our respect  
intern. t' oblig — won't us it  
against ourselves. Arg open to  
other nations. Certain have been  
aggressors;

If we eliminate, thus, argu. pro-con  
expulsion are about equal; I'd like to  
say again. If we accept suspension for  
unlimited period — tantamount to  
expulsion.

At last meeting, I appealed to

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

postpone vote confident that  
compromise reached.

if Opp. powers feel they cannot  
belong without expulsion we  
must accept decision. Want  
clear and unambiguous statement  
needed from Big Power

Chr - pt.

Polin: I find myself in diff; no  
longer reasons for

I should defend motion,  
substance discussed.

I do not propose now to  
answer appeal of Conciliation.

Too much faith in Big Powers not  
to believe they wouldn't accept  
majority. Caton

As for aggressors, we must set  
down principle. Facilitate return to

Soviet Union - redemption (theology or  
criminals). Even Germany may be



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

acceptable, must know bridges

Chr - roll call

Mexico - suff. for a member to  
ask for roll call

Egypt - pt. of order (to Latin) where do we  
stand on amendment? In  
which direction is it clearing

Belg - pending, meets tonight, report  
tomorrow, take up this  
evening. Has voted in favor of

Egypt = Abstain until hear about  
amendment

Chr - Mexico right; Chr wished to know  
whether Com. ready to vote

Urug. has written to me that we  
vote on motion of May 15  
Are we ready to vote?

Chr - Com. wishes to vote

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Uruguay = suggest to move:

vote first on roll call of  
25 of May; then vote  
on text of 23: ~~refuse~~  
majority, then Subcom  
of Spon powers and 5 to  
prepare recon

150 US-Can furst contra expulsio  
Pro Conf.

Would remind that Mexico deleg  
raised pt of whether expulsion could  
be applied to perman. members of  
Sec. Council.

Chr =

- 1) majority ready to vote on Polin's motion
- 2) Uruguayan motion cannot be complied with. We have not reconsidered those motions; only Polin's. Chr feel strongly on this

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Ei no argument except in interests of  
big 4, no new argument. Don't  
see how we can reverse, unless  
we know resol. on withdrawal.

only way is to postpone vote,  
vote after

Motion - second?

Cuba, Egypt. - seconded.

Chile.

Chi = it isn't correct to say St. Com wants  
com to reverse. I fail to agree  
with Ecuador. - asked only to  
reconsider, not reverse

Follen's motion gives oppor. to  
test views.

Does Article 4 stand or does it  
fall. I feel may. will support me  
I shall have to put motion  
Cund. to vote.



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

U.K. — Uing, Ecuador, out of order.

Other motions entertained after  
motion to vote  
I implore you to put question to  
vote

Ecuador = Stassen had clarified  
position. If we put Rolin's  
negative motion, then we can  
take up other questions later

N.Z. = May I cast vote for Norway

chr = yes

chr = yes - n

~~20~~

~~17~~ yes

16

20 no

21

*T/2 20<sup>th</sup> June 6*

PROGRESS REPORT

TWENTIETH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, June 6, 1945, 10:55 a.m.

The business of the meeting should have been completed in a short session, but once again Committee I/2 became mixed up over procedure.

1. Consideration of Coordination Committee Draft of Paragraph 1, Chapter III, second sentence.

With almost no discussion the Committee unanimously voted approval of a revised draft of paragraph 1, Chapter III, second sentence which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. The text is as follows:

"Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to carry them out."

2. Consideration of Coordination Committee Draft of Paragraph 3, Chapter IV.

The Committee considered a revised draft of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. This paragraph, which represents an amendment to The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, concerns equal rights for women in the Organization. Before the meeting was opened the women delegates from Brazil and Australia (Dr. Lutz and Mrs. Street) circulated a draft of this paragraph somewhat different from that of the Coordination Committee. It appears that they received general approval of their draft. Its adoption was



moved in the meeting by Cuba, seconded by Ukraine.

Instead of directing their remarks to this draft, other delegates commented on the original draft of Committee I/2, and on the draft of the Coordination Committee, and some suggested changes in one or the other. After a short time, however, a vote was carried unanimously to close debate.

When the Chairman announced that the Committee would vote first on the Cuban motion, various delegates (including Egypt, Philippines, Belgium) proposed contrary procedure. The Chairman's position was strongly supported by Australia, Brazil and the United States. In order to facilitate the vote, the Delegate of Ecuador, speaking for Egypt and Mexico as well as for himself, withdrew the revised drafts which they had suggested earlier in the meeting.

Just before the vote was taken the United States (Notter) asked that the English text moved by Cuba be read once again.

The Cuban motion was carried by a vote of 34 to 2  
(U.S. and U.K.)

The United States (Notter) explained that the text as read was not the text he had agreed to before the meeting. The U.K. said he expected that the text would come back again from the Coordination Committee.

The text of the paragraph as approved by Committee I/2 follows:

"The (name to be inserted) shall place no restriction on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any

capacity and under conditions of equality in the  
principal and subsidiary Organs."

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.



PROGRESS REPORT

TWENTIETH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, June 6, 1945, 10:55 a.m.

The business of the meeting should have been completed in a short session, but once again Committee I/2 became mixed up over procedure.

1. Consideration of Coordination Committee Draft of Paragraph 1, Chapter III, second sentence.

With almost no discussion the Committee unanimously voted approval of a revised draft of paragraph 1, Chapter III, second sentence which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. The text is as follows:

"Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to carry them out."

2. Consideration of Coordination Committee Draft of Paragraph 3, Chapter IV.

The Committee considered a revised draft of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. This paragraph, which represents an amendment to The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, concerns equal rights for women in the Organization. Before the meeting was opened the women delegates from Brazil and Australia (Dr. Lutz and Mrs. Street) circulated a draft of this paragraph somewhat different from that of the Coordination Committee. It appears that they received general approval of their draft. Its adoption was



moved in the meeting by Cuba, seconded by Ukraine.

Instead of directing their remarks to this draft, other delegates commented on the original draft of Committee I/2, and on the draft of the Coordination Committee, and some suggested changes in one or the other. After a short time, however, a vote was carried unanimously to close debate.

When the Chairman announced that the Committee would vote first on the Cuban motion, various delegates (including Egypt, Philippines, Belgium) proposed contrary procedure. The Chairman's position was strongly supported by Australia, Brazil and the United States. In order to facilitate the vote, the Delegate of Ecuador, speaking for Egypt and Mexico as well as for himself, withdrew the revised drafts which they had suggested earlier in the meeting.

Just before the vote was taken the United States (Notter) asked that the English text moved by Cuba be read once again.

The Cuban motion was carried by a vote of 34 to 2  
(U.S. and U.K.)

The United States (Notter) explained that the text as read was not the text he had agreed to before the meeting. The U.K. said he expected that the text would come back again from the Coordination Committee.

The text of the paragraph as approved by Committee I/2 follows:

"The (name to be inserted) shall place no restriction on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any

capacity and under conditions of equality in the  
principal and subsidiary Organs."

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

JOURNAL

COMMITTEE I/2  
June 6, 1945, 10:55 a.m.

At its twentieth meeting, on June 6, Committee I/2 considered two communications from the Coordination Committee containing revised drafts of two paragraphs which had received the approval of Committee I/2. The Committee unanimously approved the following text of <sup>the second sentence</sup> paragraph 1, Chapter III, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee:

"Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to carry them out."

The Committee considered a revised draft of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. There was general agreement that this draft was not sufficiently clear and exact. After some discussion, the



Committee adopted by a vote of 34 to 2 the following text of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which was suggested by the delegates of Cuba and the Ukraine:

"The (name to be inserted) shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs."

JOURNAL

COMMITTEE I/2  
June 6, 1945, 10:55 a.m.

At its twentieth meeting, on June 6, Committee I/2 considered two communications from the Coordination Committee containing revised drafts of two paragraphs which had received the approval of Committee I/2. The Committee unanimously approved the following text of <sup>the second sentence</sup> paragraph 1, Chapter III, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee:

"Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to carry them out."

The Committee considered a revised draft of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. There was general agreement that this draft was not sufficiently clear and exact. After some discussion, the

Committee adopted by a vote of 34 to 2 the following text of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which was suggested by the delegates of Cuba and the Ukraine:

"The (name to be inserted) shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs."



SUMMARY REPORT OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING OF COMMITTEE 1/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, June 6, 1945, 10:55 a.m.

The meeting was opened by the Chairman at 10:55.

1. Consideration of Text on Chapter III, paragraph 1, second sentence, communicated by the Coordination Committee.

In <sup>its</sup> ~~the~~ communication of June 4, 1945 to the Secretary of <sup>Committee</sup> ~~Commission~~ 1/2, the Coordination Committee had suggested certain changes in the phrasing of Chapter III, paragraph 1, <sup>second sentence,</sup> concerning the formula for the admission of new members to the Organization. The principal purpose of the suggested change was to clarify the procedure by which the new members would accept the obligations of the Organization, inasmuch as such new members <sup>would</sup> ~~will~~ not be signatories to the Charter.

Decision: The Committee accepted unanimously the suggested change by the Coordination Committee.

The text of Chapter III, paragraph 1, reads as follows: <sup>second sentence, as approved by Committee I/2</sup>

"Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to carry them out."

2. Consideration of Text of Chapter IV, Paragraph 3, Communicated by the Coordination Committee.

The Secretary read to the Committee <sup>the</sup> draft of Chapter IV, paragraph 3, suggested by the Coordination Committee. It was understood by Committee I/2 that the suggested changes were ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> intended to affect the substance of this paragraph but <sup>rather</sup> ~~intended~~ to clarify the meaning.

The Delegates of Cuba and the Ukraine submitted an alternate draft to that suggested by the Coordination Committee and then presented to the Committee a joint amendment. The Delegate of Mexico proposed that the

as adopted by Committee I/2,  
original text be maintained and the Delegate of Ecuador  
proposed that the words "the eligibility for" be inserted  
in the original text between the words "no restrictions on"  
and "the representation and participation". In discussing  
the subject under consideration, the Delegate of the Philip-  
pine Commonwealth suggested a wording to the effect that  
no restriction <sup>should</sup> ~~shall~~ be placed upon the eligibility of men  
and women to participate in the Organization on an equal  
basis.

After a motion to close the debate had been unanimously  
adopted, there followed an exchange of views on the order  
in which the motions before the Committee <sup>should</sup> ~~would~~ be consid-  
ered. It was the sense of the Committee that the text sug-  
gested by the Coordination Committee would not have to be  
put to a vote first, <sup>but that</sup> the amendments to the text suggested  
by the Coordination Committee would have precedence over  
the Coordination Committee's text itself.



2

Decision: The Committee Voted 34 in Favor and Two Against  
the Text for Chapter IV, Paragraph 3, Proposed  
Jointly by the Delegates of Cuba and the Ukrainian  
Soviet Socialist Republic.

"The \_\_\_\_\_ shall place no restrictions on  
the eligibility of men and women to participate  
in any capacity and under conditions of equality  
in the principal and subsidiary organs."

Those who voted against the ~~Cuba-Ukrainian~~ motion explained that this motion might be construed to permit interference with the <sup>freedom of each state to</sup> ~~selection of~~ personnel to participate in the Organization by each government.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15.

PRESS REPORT

COMMITTEE I/2

June 6, 1945, 10:55 AM

At its twentieth meeting, on June 6, Committee I/2 considered two communications from the Coordination Committee containing revised drafts of two paragraphs which had received the approval of Committee I/2. The revisions concerned only the wording of the paragraphs, not their substance. The Committee unanimously approved the following text of second sentence, paragraph 1, Chapter III, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee:

"Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to carry them out."

The Committee considered a revised draft of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. There was general agreement that this draft was not sufficiently clear and exact. After some discussion, the Committee adopted by a vote of 34 to 2 the following text of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which was suggested by the delegates of Cuba and the Ukraine:

"The (name to be inserted) shall place no restrictions, on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs."

Committee I/2 considered no other business at this meeting.



PRESS REPORT

COMMITTEE I/2

June 6, 1945, 10:55 AM

At its twentieth meeting, on June 6, Committee I/2 considered two communications from the Coordination Committee containing revised drafts of two paragraphs which had received the approval of Committee I/2. The revisions concerned only the wording of the paragraphs, not their substance. The Committee unanimously approved the following text of second sentence, paragraph 1, Chapter III, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee:

"Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to carry them out."

The Committee considered a revised draft of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had been suggested by the Coordination Committee. There was general agreement that this draft was not sufficiently clear and exact. After some discussion, the Committee adopted by a vote of 34 to 2 the following text of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which was suggested by the delegates of Cuba and the Ukraine:

"The (name to be inserted) shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs."

Committee I/2 considered no other business at this meeting.

PRECIS OF TWENTIETH MEETING OF

COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, June 6, 1945, 10:55 a.m.

Committee I/2 considered alternative drafts of paragraph <sup>the second sentence of</sup>

1, Chapter III, and of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had

been suggested by the Coordination Committee. The suggested

<sup>the second sentence of</sup>  
draft of paragraph 1, Chapter III was approved unanimously.

The Committee approved a revised draft of paragraph 3,

Chapter IV proposed <sup>jointly</sup> by the delegates of Cuba and the Ukraine.



PRECIS OF TWENTIETH MEETING OF

COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, June 6, 1945, 10:55 a.m.

Committee I/2 considered alternative drafts of paragraph <sup>the second sentence of</sup>

1, Chapter III, and of paragraph 3, Chapter IV, which had

been suggested by the Coordination Committee. The suggested

<sup>the second sentence of</sup>  
draft of paragraph 1, Chapter III was approved unanimously.

The Committee approved a revised draft of paragraph 3,

Chapter IV <sup>proposed</sup> by the delegates of Cuba and the Ukraine.

June 6, 1945

I/2

11/55

Ch - consider commun. from Coord Com.  
proceed with para 1

U.S.A - clarify to show how  
subseq. members join. Accept. of  
oblig. is a matter for the state  
to undertake, not the Org

I move new text.

Phil. Com. second  
Turkey "

Egypt - " , never happy of original  
text; we are not able to judge  
whether state is willing

Ch - no objection: unanimity

yes

no

5

Ch - para 3,

Sec - reads



Chile: Coed. Com. raised pt

Ch = 'no roll call, withdrawn by Aus

Ch - vote on Cuba - UK

34 pour

2 <sup>US</sup>  
Hond  
ag

USA - objection because ~~the~~ word  
and conditions of equality =  
interference

Honduras. I consider the wording  
of Phil Com preferable.

UK = I should to have the text again.

Ch = approved by large vote

Turkey - are we prepared to transpose  
order - men and women.

---



Cuba: Com. has already approved the principle. Text by Coord. Com. introd. changes. Exchange of views. <sup>reads - text</sup> Org. shall place -

Chr = We are not discussing. We are only changes in wording.

Turkey: support Cuban proposal. In Const it provides for "women and men".

Ukraine: support Cuban prop. - Coord text is neither clear nor exact. ~~Coord~~ text could imply that women would be restricted to Sec. reads new text.

Geek - avoid repetition of official name of Org in the paragraph.

Chr - we shall discuss Czech pt in a moment.

Iran = doubts about word "eligibility" might only cover election  
Dufresne = better word for "eligibility" in French



Egypt: Is any spec. sign<sup>ing</sup> attached to  
insert spec. name of Org instead of  
just "Org" which is being used  
in Charter

Mexico: We are favor original  
text; style is correct; no error  
of concept; no need to coords.  
<sup>any other</sup>  
with Article

Phil Com = Must speak on subject.  
feels that clause should be  
very general - suggest a text -  
positive expression - Urban  
prop. too restrictive. leave it to  
Subcom. of women.

Egypt - motion of order - merely question of  
drafting, move close of discussion

Ecuador - add to Orgn "eligibility for"

Chi - vote on closure, provided by  
Bel.

Vote 34

No



Phil Com - what are we voting on? Only  
on Cuban motion. If that is  
defeated, we continue debate.

Chr = We have four propositions before  
us:

1. Cuba, Turkey
2. Ukraine (to be seen)
3. Mexico - retain
4. Coad. Com - retain

Chr - Motion by Chile  
Motion by Brazil

Egypt - the Com. has already approved a  
text. We should first vote on  
Coad. Com. We would consider  
only new ideas

Brazil: Opposed to placing Coad. Com.  
before Com

Ukraine: Ukr. and Cuba have agreed  
on a text. Ukr. text should be  
voted on.



Bel. = I support interpret of Egv

Austral = Com. has already approved a text, went back to Coord. Com., Cuban amend. has general support. Cuban amend. may apply to Orgen. or the Coord. Com. - Matter for det. - Cuban amend. as proposal of Coord. Com. Suggest that we place motion of Cuba before Com.

~~U.S.~~ = support Aust. Several other motions have not been phrased as " Cuba

Ch = ruling: first motion - Cuban/Edkran  
if reject we will vote on Mexico  
if " we will vote on Egypt to  
main s

Egypt: I support Mexico - Ecuador

Aus - roll call

U.S. - Is this the text: reads

Ecuador = There is the C-U Amend, Permit to  
C E M amend - we withdraw our  
amend

1/2 18<sup>th</sup> June 2



18th meeting

72

the discussion 3-45

3. <sup>on X</sup> ~~question~~

Rec. by sub comm

Vener.

Language

U.S. Africa Sugg. raised

"Say you may bring to the attention  
of the committee again"

re Vener. — feel embarrassing  
to say if has to bring lesser matters to  
light. — Can find functions mentioned  
here.

Vener re V. amend.

Answer arguments:

1) UK — raised of whether "in order".

was submitted in time — before meeting

2) Competence of I/r —

discussed by vote yesterday. Does feel within

I/r — discussed today. Suggested

Vener in I/r to withdraw from them

Arguments against

1) Better decision be sought but, powers  
entrusted to Council & Head of  
Assembly — right of I/r to



conduct matters - before SC or before  
Assembly.

Re: selection committee of S-G members to be  
appointed. Proposed and/or

Re: revolutionary in scope

Not - want to reach out Charter -

Called to make amendments & alterations.

Nothing as which it reveals

Re: putting committee in place to watch leaders  
on S-G -

Since must make rep. to SC -

surely to make copy for Quaker

Re: no prior reasons - state can apply  
directly to US

would be two of the roughly  
involved in state - both under  
of it. As Canada said. must

consider when 2 or 3 might at  
make over. Involving 3rd -  
3rd might not be aware

Re: duplication of overlapping functions & roles

Canada - ~~the~~ A & all state  
have no right to bring disputes to  
sit & settle by less of C - if  
perhaps there also & DS

Re: So Africa

Prop. to sub. competent leader



Does not solve prob. Should solve here

Done in Done. amend.

Competence of Gen. Sec. to deal w. Sit.  
Threaten place of Sec. already recog.  
No objection in DOP regarding Sy.  
to call atten. of Gen. Sec. to such a situation.  
Would strengthen Org.

on Lunguoya amend  
add: "or violate the prin. of the Charter  
Valid - desirable addition. Section on  
of Lungu. legitimate. Prin. of Charter -  
basis of Org. to violate them means  
to threaten structure as whole. Reasonable.  
intended state should be able to  
call atten. of Gen. Sec. to such sit.  
Some intended state might not  
be aware - approx for Sy to call  
atten. of Gen. Sec. to such. Re. embarrassing  
position - we propose formation  
of ind. - must fulfill within  
embarrassing as not. Gen. Sec. extraordinary  
powers - not so great as Sy of League  
hasnt thereby fulfilled Sy - will  
Charter of willing to work in  
interests of Charter & Org. as whole



4 days

Teitkens Always felt same doubt re DOP  
with extracting SG with some  
political power - not actively concerned  
w. being admin. chief

agmt  
law Thinking of circumstances before  
were - state under heavy pressure  
did not feel free to appeal to Council -  
in such situa. did - might be  
advantageous to grant SG powers  
but unique SG using powers in  
normal circumstances - state <sup>would</sup> appeal  
to its friends if within the my  
hasty

Have proposed to increase power  
SG - already heavy burden - where  
prin of the violated turn admin  
prin into potential official  
Principles of the being ~~in~~  
of states put pressure on SG to  
appeal - embarrassing  
options -

(see. 11.11.7) Other prop: draft II SG appeal  
also to Assembly - again embarrassing -  
real objection I had to choose  
bet 2 bodies w diff function



Could argue: appeal to Ass - reg. of  
would opinion. Disadv. no action  
re threat to peace. SC can. Argument  
for appeal only to SC

Should not be able to appeal to  
both; one or other. If preference  
- SC - since can act. Would  
only use power in very great crisis.  
Would intrude. cir. If must appeal -  
almost bound to appeal to SC.

Better to let text stand as it is.

WS re Assembly

SG already has power to submit <sup>annual</sup> report  
+ presumably to special. To particularizing  
function (agree with) would make  
include diff in functions of Ass. & SG.  
(would have to write in act that I/r)

Objection SC continuous session,  
Ass. not. Duplication that SG would  
have power to convene Synods - otherwise  
meaningless

Re. ass. power - re printing of reg.  
For mostly pub. ~~the~~ members of  
~~the~~ would make SG court of  
common appeals. Would subvert  
SG with decision extremely difficult



If wish to strengthen - don't burden him.  
As Canada not - power exceeds the  
principles - extend beyond power -  
EC & Sec Council - wanted weaker  
sq.

Reasons for present text:

EC body in continuous revision,  
exec. powers - 5 + 1. Place  
in doubt power of SG to raise  
matter in C or to speak. Under  
this can expl. reasons. Designed  
to strengthen SG as head of an organ.  
Authorities & clarifies modernizing  
function, line of League Ltd without  
authorization - more on basis of  
personality

None of these amendments well-received.  
Recog. that also not all are well-served.

Wd - ask Monday  
with agree

Monday. Conc. decision to call SG &  
not Dir. Strong case for giving  
as much auth. as possible (SG -  
League, Ltd Ltd).



Since a preliminary clause - would place  
the, an advantage

2) for proposed addition - create  
part of Ch. 1. Different sub. Surveys  
judicial functions - If given that  
auth. would be to ask legal advisers  
prop. doc. - would advise going  
carefully - would sub to SC -  
& Supp. that all this under since of  
ability - unlikely want to exercise it.

3) re report to Com as well as SC.  
Invaluable delicate of } relationship  
of SC & Com - no exp. Test & speak.

Belgium Should come to decision today - may  
dis. Cuba permitted

che // ExT & Subcom<sup>2</sup> in you. no objection  
over // Union. first act on  
law, amend. & later date.

Lexis Take note on amend to something  
not yet approved



Dinner. amend.

"and/or to the Gen. Assembly"

vote:

11

favor

18 oppose

lost

not adopted

Language

"~~as stated~~ violate the principles  
of the Charter"

13 favor

~~16~~ oppose

amendment did not carry

Text submitted by Subcom<sup>ee</sup>

carried unanimously

31 favor

0 oppose

Paragraph 4

work. <sup>pt of order</sup> papers 4 & 5 together - related -  
Chile second

USSR - <sup>pt of order</sup>

text of 285 is same as text of 84 & 4 papers

Com. can vote on 4. To divide: not

competent to do. Up to Com. Com. to

instead. such

Examine 84 & 4 of Sp. Powers

that as single unit



Ch Consider notation of Keith & Chiles to  
consider <sup>discuss</sup> 4 & 5 together

From: 35 in favor

Consider 4 & 5 jointly -

E.H. Asked if Keith wished to discuss  
& Parv -

Ch Keith pref. avoid A 4 - & sp. parv -  
(read)

Ask them to remember:

2 As of Subcom

A 4 & sp. Parv

E.H. In prin. should discuss in same  
way as others - Subcom & proposed.  
Why go back to 4 Parv. In this  
case, not much diff. in sub & orig.  
In subcom, possibly found use  
to divide. Dist from practical  
pt of view - discuss Subcom

Ch Agree E.H. in exp. surprise - how to  
put forward prop. of Keith  
Key of Subcom. Cant. just slight  
variation of 4



Noway Agree w. Ch. & remarks of E. Gordon.

Said might be misunderstanding  
work paper 20 P. Date when  
subcom on 4. Power. Seems to be  
misunder. Have subcom for reason.  
Free 20 1 P - <sup>work</sup> right - will be  
decided by C.C.

If work has also against 20s  
instead of 1 - subcom would be  
agreed. Sub. slightly enlarge 4 P.  
Power change 20s - Sure cannot  
if work paper 1 P - agree.

Ch. (To Noway)

Now consid 4 + 5 of subcom.  
Prog. of work can only be consid.  
as amend.

Since subcom has proposed 30s for  
consid. (4-5-6) 4 + 5 minutes.  
some matter incl 4 + 5 of Sp Power  
#6 is new.

When work prepared - <sup>understood</sup> reason why  
proposed on 4 + 5 of P that it was  
pract. identical - on this assumption  
prop. to vote 4 + 5. That not quite correct.  
4 + 5 not identical -



Spous. Power - <sup>omits sentence - new sent.</sup> functions well. in H.

Pointed out the differences -

Was it correct - the translation -  
2 texts identified. No objection to  
29s being one.

Ch U.S. has asked to be heard to expl. sib.  
All surprised to see what has happ.  
& Power taken as basis of sub com.  
S. Com. unanimously agreed on 405  
Full only way to consider & Power  
as amended.

As on p<sup>t</sup> of order

US Subcom on basis of & Power -  
consid. other amend - much more  
to present here for consid.

In consid. & Power & other -  
slight changes occurred - in some  
can conform exactly to spirit  
of & Power - & in one case  
spelled out what was inherent.

1st sub. same

2nd " - London City 2 part - latter  
part same. 1st half - expressed



in 4th sent. & in 3rd.

3rd sent. presented as ability  
members - <sup>highly n.w.</sup> fastest state - possible.  
Existed with friends might violate  
~~very~~ resp. of staff to org & int. char.  
Result: undertake fairly fully to  
carry out by P.

"Exclusively" insisted -

~~the~~

Us feeling confirmed precisely  
to 4 former amend. Slight change  
& some thought of other amend.

Procedure: may not have had  
opp. to consult with deleg. May be  
well to allow time for ref. of  
this problem.

Chair - no. of subcom. } amend. to  
& power } pursued at  
length

Prob: Subcom. is amend. of basic  
amend before the Com.

Chair ask apologies

3 y. object of notes. sub. & then when  
1) reports, rep. set aside - go backward  
around 4 p.

2) end not & P have full opp during



dis- of submarine to uphold views of 4 P  
3/ what is purp of sub work. until  
midnight - my sub aside -

China + US rep. in submarine

Continue dis. # 4 + 5 of submarine

Canada Larry + the same debate - result  
of misheard. Confused sp of Green Mt.  
No great diff. in substance.  
Even 4 Powers go use more  
words - drafting can be better  
workings.

on course. & after hearing  
sp. work with again but improved  
Eng as Fr Larry - at adv. of each  
wishes mention -

Dis. an pt of order - long  
enough - Discontinue & ask if  
USSR wishes to act as board for  
discussion

USSR an pt of clarification -

See rep of sub. Stated # 4 of Canada. prop  
that as long as dis. # 4 of Canada  
had been

Noticed 2 #s 4 + 5 - my first objection



Two objections by Com. to combine P's  
Just appear same.  
Wish to eliminate matter whether or  
not ~~it~~ <sup>sub</sup> Com had really imposed  
an add'l matter. Hope sub. would  
present & Sp. Power first - & then  
explain changes. Was a really Com.  
or big 4.

Ukraine pt of order

Discussion of sub-com of D & of Sp P.  
was expl of US & motives for  
changes - discontinue debate -  
<sup>not</sup> ~~sub-com~~ leave matter to ~~the~~ of 2 P's or 1

Motion to close debate said by Rich. Penn  
Canada

Ch on close of debate

US on pt of order -

- 1) sub-com took as basis of dis. of  
any other of & Power - Canadian -  
embedded most of pts of view
- 2) should have informed both UK &  
US & R - apologies -



P.2 motion to close not debatable

Vote on closing discussion -  
unanimous vote

Vote on text of Subcom

Mexico vote esp. on Ag. text (Fr. not  
corresponding)

Vote on # 4 + 5 separately

Vote on # 4 (Subcom) ~~is~~ approved

31 approve 0 -

Europe

Vote on # 5

31 oppose 0 - oppose

USSR Ukraine that div. of 2 Rs be transferred  
to CC Stavitsky of that:

Ch no written statement from Ukraine  
Ukraine simply proposed loan to CC  
to decide

Conway Allow CC to take 4 + 5 + make 1  
without any change - would allow  
only that Stavitsky no changes



If vote are wishing 1 & end of 4 & 5 -  
winded fence.

Ukraine proposed to give CC to decide whether  
to combine 4 & 5 of sub. a leave

Chile ask of CC to deal w. of such as this.  
no objection to follow. Ukraine

Grace grateful to CC to avoid this here.  
Doubt if any member would  
object to putting in 1. makes no  
diff from legal pt  
Date now - paragraph

(s.c. by Grace)  
one language moved:  
4 & 5 become 1 &  
21 carried unanimously

Paragraph 6  
both favor it. Prin. supp. by rep. of League.  
change in drafting: replace "selected"  
by "appointed."

Grace fully justified - Agree "appointed"

both will run into same diff.  
Text sent to members not on screen.  
Sug. adjournment

Adj. 6.15'

SUMMARY REPORT OF EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
Veterans Building, Room 303, June 2, 1945, 3:45 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at  
3:45.

*Continuation of*  
1. Discussion of Chapter X. (The Secretariat)

The Committee continued its consideration of the  
draft report of Subcommittee I/2/P (The Secretariat) June  
1, 1945. In considering the proposed paragraph 3 of Chap-  
ter 10, the Committee had before it the text recommended  
by the Subcommittee and amendment by Venezuela <sup>which was</sup> to permit  
the Secretary-General to bring certain matters to the atten-  
tion of the Assembly, as well as the Security Council, and <sup>any matter</sup>  
amendment by Uruguay to authorize the Secretary-General to  
bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter  
<sup>which in his opinion might violate</sup>  
~~involving the violation of~~ the principles of the Charter.

The Venezuelan Delegate explained that his amend-  
ment was intended to give the Secretary-General discretionary



power to bring certain matters which threaten international peace and security to the attention of the Assembly. He stated that the function will not place <sup>too great a</sup> ~~such~~ burden on the Secretary-General. Its advantage was to keep the Assembly informed of certain situations which states might not bring to the attention of the Assembly. He announced that the Venezuelan Delegate in Committee II/2 had been instructed to ~~withhold~~ <sup>with draw</sup> this amendment from that committee in view of the competence of Committee I/2 to settle this question. In supporting the Venezuelan amendment, the delegate stated that this would be further recommendation of the competence of the General Assembly on matters concerning peace and security. ~~The same delegates supported the Uruguayan amendment.~~

Some delegates in opposing the Venezuelan and Uruguayan amendments discussed the direct and embarrassing position in which the Secretary-General might be placed in <sup>having to choose</sup> ~~choosing~~ between the Assembly and the Security Council <sup>in presenting</sup> ~~on~~ matters



concerning peace and security and ~~not~~ <sup>indict</sup> having to ~~indite~~ member states for violating the principles of the Organization of the Charter. It was argued further that the Secretary-General would be exercising powers which are not even possessed by the member states.

At this point of the discussion, Mr. Alexander Loveday, official representative of the Economic, Financial and Transit Department of the League of Nations was invited to speak on this matter before the Committee. He pointed out that the subcommittee's recommendation intended to strengthen the Secretary-General, whose title he thought well chosen.

*Said That The Uruguayan amendment*  
He indicated the difficult position in which the Secretary ~~would place~~ *impose a difficult judicial* ~~would be placed in having to fulfill the amendments of Venezuela~~ *function on the Secretary General.* ~~and Uruguay.~~

Decision: The Committee ~~voted against~~ <sup>rejected</sup> the Venezuelan amendment by a vote of 11 in favor and 18 against.



did not correspond exactly to paragraph 4 of the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers, but the changes in wording were for the purpose of improving the draft without changing the substance. One idea was added and that was to provide that the staff of the secretariat be not subject to the influence of any external authority.

~~The delegate of the Ukraine proposed that the Committee vote on paragraphs 4 and 5 as suggested by the sub-committee and refer the question of whether there should be one paragraph or two paragraphs on this subject to the Coordination Committee.~~

Decision: Committee I/2 unanimously adopted the following text of paragraph 4, Chapter X:

"In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall be responsible only to the Organization. They shall not seek or receive instructions from



Decision: <sup>Committee rejected The</sup> The <sup>Uruguayan motion</sup> ~~was defeated 15 in favor,~~  
~~16 opposed.~~ amended by a vote of 16 to 11.

Decision: The Committee unanimously adopted the following  
text:

"The Secretary-General may bring to the  
attention of the Security Council any matter  
which in his opinion might threaten international  
peace and security."

The Committee proceeded to <sup>consider</sup> ~~examine~~ <sup>The Subcommittee</sup> its report on the  
proposed paragraph four of Chapter X. It was proposed that  
the paragraphs 4 and 5 be considered together inasmuch as  
they were related. The Soviet delegate pointed out that  
paragraphs 4 and 5 <sup>closely</sup> corresponded to paragraph 4 of the amend-  
ment of the Sponsoring Powers on Chapter X and proposed  
that the Committee consider that amendment of the Spon-  
soring Powers. It was explained by several delegates that  
~~The Subcommittee had taken~~ The Sponsoring Powers' amendment  
the wording of the two paragraphs proposed by the subcommittee

as a basis of discussion in considering  
other amendments. The



any Government or from any other authority  
external to the Organization. They shall  
refrain from any action which might reflect  
on their position as international officials."

Decision: Committee I/2 unanimously adopted the following  
text of paragraph 5, Chapter X:

"Each member undertakes to respect the ex-  
clusively international character of the  
responsibilities of the Secretary-General  
and the staff and not to seek to influence  
them in the discharge of their responsi-  
bilities."

It was proposed that ~~the Committee favor the in-~~  
~~corporation of paragraph 5 into paragraph 4 of Chapter X.~~  
~~paragraph 4 and 5 be combined into one~~  
~~paragraph.~~

Decision: Committee I/2 voted unanimously in favor of <sup>combining</sup> uniting  
the proposed paragraph of 4 and 5, Chapter X. In  
<sup>late hour</sup>  
view of the ~~latter~~, the Committee decided ~~not~~ to



*herefore*  
proceed<sup>^</sup> to the consideration of the proposed  
paragraph 6 in the subcommittee's report

*until its next  
meeting*

The meeting adjourned at 6:20.



SUMMARY REPORT OF EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
Veterans Building, Room 303, June 2, 1945, 3:45 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 3:45.

1. Discussion of Chapter X. (The Secretariat)

The Committee continued its consideration of the draft report of Subcommittee I/2/<sup>P</sup> (The Secretariat) June 1, 1945. In considering the proposed paragraph 3 of Chapter 10, the Committee had before it the text recommended by the Subcommittee and amendment by Venezuela to permit the Secretary-General to bring certain matters to the attention of the Assembly, as well as the Security Council, and amendment by Uruguay to authorize the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter involving the violation of the principles of the Charter.

The Venezuelan Delegate explained that his amendment was intended to give the Secretary-General discretionary



SUMMARY REPORT OF EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
Veterans Building, Room 303, June 2, 1945, 3:45 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 3:45.

1. Discussion of Chapter X. (The Secretariat)

The Committee continued its consideration of the draft report of Subcommittee I/2/<sup>P</sup> (The Secretariat) June 1, 1945. In considering the proposed paragraph 3 of Chapter 10, the Committee had before it the text recommended by the Subcommittee and amendment by Venezuela to permit the Secretary-General to bring certain matters to the attention of the Assembly, as well as the Security Council, and amendment by Uruguay to authorize the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter involving the violation of the principles of the Charter.

The Venezuelan Delegate explained that his amendment was intended to give the Secretary-General discretionary



SUMMARY REPORT OF EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
Veterans Building, Room 303, June 2, 1945, 3:45 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 3:45.

1. Discussion of Chapter X. (The Secretariat)

The Committee continued its consideration of the draft report of Subcommittee I/2/<sup>D</sup>/S (The Secretariat) June 1, 1945. In considering the proposed paragraph 3 of Chapter 10, the Committee had before it the text recommended by the Subcommittee and amendment by Venezuela to permit the Secretary-General to bring certain matters to the attention of the Assembly, as well as the Security Council, and amendment by Uruguay to authorize the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter involving the violation of the principles of the Charter.

The Venezuelan Delegate explained that his amendment was intended to give the Secretary-General discretionary



power to bring certain matters which threaten international peace and security to the attention of the Assembly. He stated that the function will not place much burden on the Secretary-General. Its advantage was to keep the Assembly informed of certain situations which states might not bring to the attention of the Assembly. He announced that the Venezuelan Delegate in Committee II/2 had been instructed to withhold this amendment from that committee in view of the competence of Committee I/2 to settle this question. In supporting the Venezuelan amendment, the delegate stated that this would be further recommendation of the competence of the General Assembly on matters concerning peace and security. The same delegates supported the Uruguayan amendment.

Some delegates in opposing the Venezuelan and Uruguayan amendments discussed the direct and embarrassing position in which the Secretary-General might be placed in choosing between the Assembly and the Security Council on matters



power to bring certain matters which threaten international peace and security to the attention of the Assembly. He stated that the function will not place much burden on the Secretary-General. Its advantage was to keep the Assembly informed of certain situations which states might not bring to the attention of the Assembly. He announced that the Venezuelan Delegate in Committee II/2 had been instructed to withhold this amendment from that committee in view of the competence of Committee I/2 to settle this question. In supporting the Venezuelan amendment, the delegate stated that this would be further recommendation of the competence of the General Assembly on matters concerning peace and security. The same delegates supported the Uruguayan amendment.

Some delegates in opposing the Venezuelan and Uruguayan amendments discussed the direct and embarrassing position in which the Secretary-General might be placed in choosing between the Assembly and the Security Council on matters



power to bring certain matters which threaten international peace and security to the attention of the Assembly. He

stated that ~~the~~ function will not place <sup>too great a</sup> ~~much~~ burden on the Secretary-General. ~~Its advantage was to keep the Assembly~~

~~informed of certain situations which states might not bring~~ to the attention of the Assembly. He announced that the

Venezuelan Delegate in Committee II/2 had been instructed to

<sup>withdraw</sup> ~~withhold~~ this amendment from that committee in view of the

competence of Committee I/2 to settle this question. In

supporting the Venezuelan amendment, the delegate stated

that this would be further recommendation of the competence

of the General Assembly on matters concerning peace and se-

curity. <sup>2</sup> ~~The same delegates supported the Uruguayan amendment.~~

Some delegates in opposing the Venezuelan and Uruguayan

amendments discussed the ~~direct and~~ embarrassing position in

which the Secretary-General might be placed in <sup>having to</sup> ~~choosing~~ be-

tween the Assembly and the Security Council <sup>in preventing</sup> ~~on~~ matters



concerning peace and security and ~~not~~ <sup>indict</sup> having to ~~indite~~ member states for violating the principles of the Organization of the Charter. It was argued further that the Secretary-General would be exercising powers which are not even possessed by the member states.

At this point of the discussion, Mr. Alexander Loveday, official representative of the Economic, Financial and Transit Department of the League of Nations was invited to speak on this matter before the Committee. He pointed out that the subcommittee's recommendation intended to strengthen the Secretary-General, whose title he thought well chosen. He indicated the difficult position in which the Secretary would be placed in having to fulfill the amendments of Venezuela and Uruguay.

Decision: The Committee voted against the Venezuelan amendment by a vote of 11 in favor and 18 against.



concerning peace and security and ~~not~~ having to <sup>indict</sup> ~~indite~~ member states for violating the principles of the Organization of the Charter. It was argued further that the Secretary-General would be exercising powers which are not even possessed by the member states.

At this point of the discussion, Mr. Alexander Lovesay, official representative of the Economic, Financial and Transit Department of the League of Nations was invited to speak on this matter before the Committee. He pointed out that the subcommittee's recommendation intended to strengthen the Secretary-General, whose title he thought well chosen. He indicated the difficult position in which the Secretary would be placed in having to fulfill the amendments of Venezuela and Uruguay.

Decision: The Committee voted against the Venezuelan amendment by a vote of 11 in favor and 13 against.