

UNCIO - Working Papers - Commissions + Technical Committees - Committee '12  
(Corrigenda, Summary + Progress Reports)

1 June 1945  
15 June 1945

Ular

UN ARCHIVES

SERIES	<u>1018</u>
BOX	<u>03</u>
FILE	<u>09</u>
ACC.	<u></u>

June 14, 1945

4:15

*X Friedman*

Chr = Mem. of June 4, WD 301 =

Sec. will read upon power amend  
on amend.Sec = reads amend. on general conference =  
(p. 14, p. 3)

Chr = subcom. voted 9-6, reads 301-3, p. 2

4.5 I presume that portion of subcom.  
rept is before com. Leave date open,  
call any year, minority in subcom.Ans = supported recommend, with C, Bayl, other-  
view of subcom. period before Const is  
reviewed. Period of transition. Period  
5 to 10 yrs, conference along lines of San  
Fran. Does C prejudice ordinary amend.  
Not ordinary method. Better course, in line  
with sentiments of many powers on veto question:  
see how experiment works. Ans. related  
Avoid annual changes: not to deprive  
org of perman, stable character.

2

Dray: Spon. power not insisting on veto  
in calling conf. As for period of experiment,  
necessary. He first favored minimum time  
period. We accept current proposal.

Canada: Must not disassoc. from ordinary  
procedure: assuming method with  
veto. Ciplains on interest in issue.  
time - 3 prop = any time by s.p. we want  
certainty of calling Conf: fixed time,  
fixed year: wish to set a period  
Necessary for procedure to call  
conf, if it doesn't work, then automatic  
provision for Conference

Aqua: need for revision of Charter. Ques. re  
time? If period is 5 yrs, exper,  
may indic. it too long, some as  
10 years. As long as Assembly, majority  
of Council would decide. This  
might invite Amends. but they  
will come principally when there  
is a need.



Peur = Suppt Can, Bray amend; no contradi  
with Stassen's statement.

We are getting charter satisfaction  
to public opinion to know S.F.  
has foresight for revision.  
Tremend. psycholog. effect. -  
Vote doesn't apply in calling

$\frac{2}{3}$  may be too much. - revisions  
will be made. At Conf, many  
parts not approved overwhelming

Revision provision has public  
appeal

United Union = Ques. is simple

Advan. on side of Sp. powers.

- 1) 4 sp. power suggests such a  
Conf at any time -  $\frac{2}{3} + 7$
- 2) Com. dec. gives impression  
Org is temporary, reorgan  
every few years



3) If Charter is good, possible that Gen Ass will not seek revision even after 15 yrs.

If it is unsuccessful, prop. of 4 sp. power permits calling for early Conference.

4) Assume Charter is found to be good, not necessary for spec. conf. present decision would contradict wish of Presetibly

Conseq., S.U. supports Stassen's proposal of no time limit

Belgium: Why do we ask for 5/10 period?

This prop. doesn't exclude amend by ordinary proced, before or after 5/10.

We are asking full exam of Charter in certain period. Pressures for revision, held off for five years. as long as conf. is prospective

III/3 have shown del. feel deeply on anomalies in Charter. Diff to secure public opinion for Charter if no poss of change. Impt matter is element of certainty.

Re. Soviet del, conf. at any time, fears  
tendency of too many conf. instability -  
provision only for one conference,  
not periodic revision.

left to General Assembly, S.C., = as to  
need of Conf; such a Conf should be held  
even in absence of many; number of states  
wish to enter Org with understanding for  
change.

Lenons ques for small countries,  
no difficulties for great powers.

Del. has shown in previous votes that  
they would coop if poss. of general  
Many appeals in Conf for the  
Ask spon. powers make concessions

Brasel. Arguments against 5/10 period, were  
really in our favor. Stassen referred to  
12 years as a possibility. Syria put up  
less than 5 years. S.U. foresees poss  
ibility of no need for provision.

Too soon, not give Org. a chance  
No revision, contrary to mutual  
concession. Many may have  
proposal



Brazil Great Powers more luck than others  
in getting proposal

Compare to engineering proj = no early  
tinkering;

no need to be afraid of revision;  
We do not propose a temporary organ-  
ship of hope in dry dock  
Good will among us,  
let us vote for it

Lebanon: Agree with US, USSR, Syria, Iraq.

SubCom. doesn't

at end of ten years, what happens?

Soviet Union: answer Belgium, small powers  
concessions; impression is created that  
major powers have forced measures on  
others - such impress should not be cre-  
ated.

I consider Great Powers made greatest  
concessions by protecting them in present  
war; homes, parlia. inst  
lease/land out



Differences  
interplay of  
collective powers.

Great Powers acting mainly in interest  
of little nations. Small nations cannot  
defend selves, Big Powers can do so.

if at end of ten yrs, conf would  
have to be held anyway. If in 10 yrs,  
there is no  $\frac{2}{3}$  ... , then gov'ts are  
unwilling to call for a Conference.

Uruguay. Supp'ts of — proposal. Necessary  
to meet to see how veto is  
exercised. Not challenged to  
big powers

Change of major powers. —  
opportunity to denounce any  
country abusing veto

Speak on veto on revision  
Charter eternal if it can be  
blocked by one.

Egypt. Present debate has confused me.  
Starting with second pt. Crucial

point is ratify. pt. 4 (5) is key.  
In IV/1 on veto, on amend, <sup>nation</sup> ~~done~~

Ans = conf in taking up ques. 2 in  
isolation of other pts. If I/2 can  
solve problem, we will finish  
flawed speech unconst, )  
invidious ~~operation~~  
Prayer  
Backs Roken; see problem in  
perspective.

Ques. all relat

Tag, 5, 7 oversimplify  
matter.

Only one conference under  
proposal = reviewing constitutional  
conf. general review of  
charter:

Once held, power is exhausted  
Choice between general review or <sup>at one time</sup>  
another.

Prop = all related, 3

Ratify lies behind whole ques.

If Con. Conf. has power  
to estab ratify proced, Time element  
not important

// No vote until tomorrow's  
meeting,

One Conference offered

Phil. Del: Subcom. prop sets min. and  
maximum limit for one conference.

" " may be acceptable,  
// but minimum limit may cause  
difficulty. There should be  
vote on minimum and on  
Max = 2 votes

U.S.A = we tend to get off on different tangents.  
50 nations here for one charter.  
war calamity to all.

And. Approved the procedure for  
voting. Vote on each section,



para, full charter.

Aus = vote separately; ~~all~~ should have chance to read report -

Stassen: plenty of discuss

Aus = not yet

Stassen: we must reach decisions

Chr = prop. interrelated. Aues. of imp. as time, para. 3 = other pts  
all simpler = will submit pt 3 to vote

Mexico: In subcom, I voted for Canad-Brazil prop. It has taken on interp I cannot agree, namely, voting for it would imply lack of confidence. If this sense, I shall have to vote against

Dr. Ag. / Augt. deleg. has linked Dr, S, & together  
Since we are on one pt, we shall take advantage of concession of Great Powers yielded to Great Powers in Com. III.  
during discuss of Aus Amend.

Syria = Thank Ans, assure him that Syrian  
miserable expressed in light of the  
other points

Canada = Mexico

Mexico = If such interp. implies lack of  
conf, I have to vote against it.

Ecuador: If it doesn't involve lack of confid,  
then he'll vote for it.

Mex = yes

Mex = I made this remark because it was  
indicated that govt of major  
power would change

Chi = The ques. doesn't arise.

Peru = agree with

mutual confidence in govt of Confer

New Zeal = agree that powers should have  
indication of time limit.

On veto, we have no alternative



7.3 = before Parl, I'll be accused of violating trad. of country.

Need to offer oppor. for change.  
Not a question of confidence in govt: cannot express "

" what future

We must be able to say we have oppor. for change. Safety value

We want to seek ratif with enthusiasm.

Reasonable time for change, to meet change of new big powers, new small powers

Veto will still exist = maj powers have gone to their limit on matter

chr = pts 1 and 2 had been adopted unanimously = reads pt 1 and 2  
reads pt 4, also unanimously  
pt 5, approved 7 to 5.

Is Com. ready to vote on number 2?



Egypt = 3 and 5 closely related.

Hope that ratif. be settled

Guess: how many years for amend.  
without veto

Rulin = reads p. 4 =

veto = withdrawal

We must accept fact.

No, No,

Revision on withdrawal.

Aus =

pt. of order. Rulin is giving his  
view and that of Com.

Only if pt 5 is accepted,  
then ques. of withdrawal is open

Vote tomorrow on Number 3

U.S. = Is debate closed?

Chr = yes

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Chairman's announcements

Secretary's reading of Subcommittee's report.

U.S.A. (Starrs)

Australia (Frost)

Iraq

Canada (Pearson)

His gov't's proposal was to definitely ensure the holding of an international Conference at some date. His notion was in the nature of a compromise.

Syria

~~For~~ Argued that it was impossible to predict date of need of revision of Charter. Hence, he wished to have it left to the Assembly to call a constitutional convention whenever it chose by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Fern (Belarussia)

Supported the amendment of Canadian and  
Brazilian Delegates. He saw no contradiction  
between this amendment and the statement  
of Col. Starren. He ~~thought~~ disapproved  
of the idea that a  $2/3$  majority of Assembly  
should be necessary to convene a constitutional  
convention. Hence he supported the action  
of Delegates of Canada and Brazil which issued  
the automatic occurrence of a constitutional  
convention.

USSR

Spoke in behalf of the four sponsoring  
gov'ts proposal. (1) He pointed out  
that a constitutional convention could be  
called at any time by  $2/3$  of Assembly and  
7 votes of Council. (2) The present Charter  
is not to be constructed as a temporary,  
the but is designed for permanence.



(2)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

③ The Assembly may find the Charter so successful that there may never be the need of calling a constitutional convention ④ on the other hand, should it fail, the four powers' proposal allows the calling of such a convention in one or two years. ⑤ same argument as point ③ ⑥ Consequently USSR whole-heartedly supports Starren's idea.

Belgium (Kolbin)

Spoke in support of Karamchian and Brazilian Delegates' motion. Pointed out that the motion did not exclude possibility of amendments before or during that period by the ordinary amending process. Pressures of various ~~part~~ home populations can be held off by the assurance that there definitely will be held a constitutional convention. He then proceeded to answer the

(8)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

arguments of the USSR Delegates. He thought the subcommittee's motion provided more pervasiveness than did the four powers' suggestion since it provided for specifically one Conference. He pointed out how many times the little 45 had made concessions to the big 5 - even on issues of principle. He now pleaded for reciprocity.

Brazil (Luty)

Shallfully agreed that previous arguments con of USA, Syria and USSR were, in reality, pro. Pleaded for justice and thought it only fair that, as little 45, had made so many concessions, they should be given the opportunity of revision later on. Asked for the spirit of goodwill which marked both the opening and the conclusion of this Conference.



(5)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Lebanon

Supported the Great Powers. Argued from the premise that it might be quite conceivable that ~~it~~ a constitutional convention might not be called in which case the motion of Delegates of Brazil & ~~Belgium~~ to Canada leaves the whole problem of revision up in the air.

USSR

As delegate of a country that had born the weight of the war, he argued against the creation of the false impression that the Great Powers had steamrolled over the Little Powers. He thought the Great Powers had made the greatest contribution to the Little Powers by the physical defence of their ways of life and traditions of democracy. In actuality, Great Powers ~~have been~~ <sup>have been</sup> acting in behalf

(6)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

of small powers throughout the conference since they have been in mind the little powers are unable to defend themselves. His second point was, that if  $\frac{2}{3}$  of Assembly and  $\frac{7}{10}$  of Security Council did not want a constitutional convention at end of 10 years (or any other time), then there would be no need of it.

Uruguay

There must be a further meeting to clarify the whole question of the veto. Not because we distrust the spirits of today, but because we cannot predict those of tomorrow. He used as an example the case of Nazi Germany which was born out of the Weimar Republic.



(7)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Egypt

Argued that the question of  
revision of the Charter ~~is~~ (A 3) and  
of Voting Procedure (A 4) were inseparable.

Australia (Cutt)

Pointed out importance of each  
member reading the report of Subcommittee  
as a whole. Said that no speaker  
should be announced in strain work  
Delegate announced Gen. Rollin. ~~He~~  
Because of the inter-relationship of the  
questions on agenda, he suggested  
that voting be delayed until the  
next morning in order that the Delegates  
could have a further opportunity of  
studying the Subcommittee's recommendations.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Philippines

He thought the Subcommittee's  
Report had two extremes - a five  
year minimum and a ten year maximum.  
Hence he pleaded that asked that  
the vote be taken first on the 5 yr.  
minimum and secondly upon the 10 yr  
maximum.

USA

Pleaded that the Committee  
remember its task and keep on the  
subject. We should vote upon the  
various proposals of the Subcommittee  
and then vote upon the whole.

Evatt and Spurgeon then argued back  
and forth on advisability of working now  
or waiting.



THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

The Chair sought to decide  
the question by announcing that  
three more speakers would be heard  
and that, then, there would be a vote.

Mexico

As one of Delegates <sup>in</sup> at Subcommittee,  
I voted in favor of motion of Brazilian  
and Canadian Delegates. But, now he  
realized that voting for this would  
imply a vote of lack of confidence and  
the five powers. Therefore, he announced  
he would swing his vote.

~~Greece~~ Iraq

Agreed with the Australian

Delegates.

(9)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Syria  
expressed agreement with Azzat,  
said he had expressed his views -  
full knowledge & contents & report of  
the subcommittee.

Canada  
Asked question of Mexico if as to  
clarification of his meaning.

Mexico  
Only if vote in favor of Subcommittee's  
Report was construed as implying a lack  
of confidence in Great Powers, he would be  
~~not~~ forced to vote against it, ~~the~~  
Otherwise he would vote for it.

Ecuador  
Also asked ~~same~~ similar  
question of Mexico.

Peru  
Said that mutual confidence is not only



(9)

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

a postulate, but a reality.

New Zealand

Pointed out difficulties of  
small nations in ~~accepting~~ bringing  
back of their countries' propositions  
that are against their spirit. They  
had to have the assurance that  
there would be a possibility of review  
and revision. He also emphasized  
that mutual confidence already  
existed.

Chairman

Recapitulated notes of

Subcommittee, #s 1, 2 and 4 were  
approved unanimously. Asked if the  
Committee was ready for the vote.

Egypt

Pointed out that # 3 could not

he reported from ~~out~~ of the

~~Canada~~

Belgium - pointed out the opinion of  
subcommittee.

Australia -

pointed out that Mr. Rollin

had expressed only the view of the  
majority of the subcommittee and not  
the very strong <sup>viewpoint</sup> opposition of the  
minority

Chairman

~~Rollin~~

Announced that ~~closed~~

further debate was closed and  
that the vote would be taken  
at start of <sup>next</sup> meeting. ~~in~~

Meeting adjourned at 6.40

PRECIS

COMMITTEE I/2

June 13, 1945

Committee I/2, in reconsidering its previous vote on deputy secretaries general, adopted Chapter X, paragraph 1, sentences one and two of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. The Committee rejected the Soviet proposal to include in the Charter provision for five deputy secretaries general and the amendment of the sponsoring powers to include in the Charter provision for four deputy secretaries general.



I/2 19<sup>th</sup> June 4

CRA

SUMMARY REPORT OF NINETEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room , June 4, 1945, 8.40 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Bonilla Lara

(Costa Rica) at 8.40 p.m.

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

completed

The Committee ~~continued~~ its discussion of the report of ~~the~~ Subcommittee

I/2/D with a consideration of paragraph 6. Since the Committee, at its

previous meeting had agreed to combine paragraphs 4 and 5, this last paragraph

will become number 5.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. <sup>was concerned with minor technical details and</sup> felt that this paragraph should not appear

in the Charter, ~~since it~~ which is the most important historical document of

this period. He also ~~called attention to the~~ pointed out that in addition to

the Secretariat, ~~there were~~ the other organs of the Organization which would

require staff and it would not be logical to ~~it provide for only~~ limit the

provisions <sup>defined in paragraph 5</sup> to the Secretariat. He therefore moved that paragraph 5 be <sup>deleted</sup> ~~suppressed~~

from the Charter. The Delegate of the Ukraine seconded this motion and pointed

out <sup>certain</sup> ~~the apparent~~ contradictions in the paragraph <sup>itself</sup> and in the provisions in

other chapters of the Charter. ~~He also reminded the Committee that at an~~

~~earlier meeting it had been argued that details concerning Deputy Secretaries~~

✓

~~Ukraine~~

He ~~also~~ reminded the Committee that at an earlier meeting it had been decided that no mention should be made in the Charter

of <sup>number of</sup> ~~the~~ Deputy Secretaries General, ~~of either their number,~~ the

method of their election, their term of service, or their re-

election. If <sup>provision for</sup> ~~the subject of the~~ Deputy Secretaries General ~~is~~ <sup>were</sup> not included, <sup>in the Charter, there would be</sup> ~~then there is still less~~ reason for including

paragraph 5, which concerns the Secretary's staff. A further

contradiction exists in paragraph 5 where, on the one hand, the

personnel is to be elected in accordance with rules set down

by the Assembly\* and on the other hand, there are <sup>regulations</sup> ~~instructions~~ <sup>as to the selection of staff.</sup>

~~as to who may be chosen and the principles to be followed in the~~

~~selection.~~ <sup>He</sup> The Delegate added that if the question of reelection

of deputy secretaries General <sup>h</sup> ~~could be discussed,~~ <sup>considered</sup> he would vote against

reelection in order to give an opportunity for <sup>participation</sup> ~~greater number of~~

<sup>by a greater number of states</sup> ~~states nominate candidates~~ and that this was in agreement with

the desire to <sup>have</sup> ~~have~~ wide geographical representation in the Secretariat.

He <sup>continued</sup> ~~add~~ thought, however, that if it was unnecessary to <sup>include a</sup> ~~write in~~

<sup>provision</sup> ~~the Charter provision~~ for such representation in the case of



3  
the deputies, there was ~~even~~ less reason for such a provision  
for <sup>subordinate</sup> ~~less important~~ personnel.

Professor Dr. A. Palladin, Delegate of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic.

I support the proposal of the Delegate of the USSR to exclude paragraph 5 from the Statute, for the following reasons:

1. By accepting this paragraph, the Committee would fall into self-contradiction, since, during the discussion of the question of the Deputy Secretaries General, the majority of the Delegates were of the opinion that no mention should be made in the Statute of either their number, the method of their election, their term of service, or their re-election. If the subject of the Deputy Secretaries General is not included in the Statute, then there is still less reason for including paragraph 5 which concerns the Secretary's staff.

2. Moreover, paragraph 5 contains a contradiction: on the one hand, the personnel is to be elected "in accordance with rules set down by the Assembly", on the other hand, there are instructions as to who may be chosen, and the principles to be followed in electing. Either the rules are set down by the Assembly, or else everything is fixed by the Statute. However, for some reason, this matter is stipulated with regard to the Secretary General's staff, while it is considered impossible for the Statute to stipulate anything concerning more important officers such as the Deputy Secretaries General.

I shall say here nothing concerning the subject matter of paragraph 5 - for instance, the geographical principle. The small nations at the Conference have expressed their desire to participate actively in the work of the Organization. The Ukraine will support this desideratum; although, of course, there can be no perfect equality between States. Privileges are contingent upon obligations, and the obligations of the various members of the Organizations will be unequal. If, for instance, the question should be discussed as to whether or not the Assistant Secretary should be re-elected, the Ukrainian Delegation should vote against re-election in order to give a chance to a greater number of States to nominate candidates for the office of Assistant Secretary General. Such a desideratum was evidently at the basis of the geographical principle with regard to the staff of the Secretary-General. I shall, however, not speak concerning the subject matter of this paragraph, as I believe that if in one case we consider it unnecessary to write something into the Statute, there is then even less reason for writing in something similar, especially if it concerns less important personnel.

I shall therefore support the proposal of the Delegate of the USSR.



Professor Dr. A. Palladin, Delegate of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic.

I support the proposal of the Delegate of the USSR to exclude paragraph 5 from the Statute, for the following reasons:

1. By accepting this paragraph, the Committee would fall into self-contradiction, since, during the discussion of the question of the Deputy Secretaries General, the majority of the Delegates were of the opinion that no mention should be made in the Statute of either their number, the method of their election, their term of service, or their re-election. If the subject of the Deputy Secretaries General is not included in the Statute, then there is still less reason for including paragraph 5 which concerns the Secretary's staff.

2. Moreover, paragraph 5 contains a contradiction: on the one hand, the personnel is to be elected "in accordance with rules set down by the Assembly", on the other hand, there are instructions as to who may be chosen, and the principles to be followed in electing. Either the rules are set down by the Assembly, or else everything is fixed by the Statute. However, for some reason, this matter is stipulated with regard to the Secretary General's staff, while it is considered impossible for the Statute to stipulate anything concerning more important officers such as the Deputy Secretaries General.

I shall say here nothing concerning the subject matter of paragraph 5 - for instance, the geographical principle. The small nations at the Conference have expressed their desire to participate actively in the work of the Organization. The Ukraine will support this desideratum; although, of course, there can be no perfect equality between States. Privileges are contingent upon obligations, and the obligations of the various members of the Organizations will be unequal. If, for instance, the question should be discussed as to whether or not the Assistant Secretary should be re-elected, the Ukrainian Delegation should vote against re-election in order to give a chance to a greater number of States to nominate candidates for the office of Assistant Secretary General. Such a desideratum was evidently at the basis of the geographical principle with regard to the staff of the Secretary-General. I shall, however, not speak concerning the subject matter of this paragraph, as I believe that if in one case we consider it unnecessary to write something into the Statute, there is then even less reason for writing in something similar, especially if it concerns less important personnel.

I shall therefore support the proposal of the Delegate of the USSR.





THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

that in fact the paragraph  
contained no more than  
general principles to guide  
the Assembly when it  
established the detailed  
regulations governing the  
staff of the Secretariat.



Notes of remarks by Ukrainian delegate - Cttee I/2

June 1, '45

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

to be translated  
for Miss Armstrong  
as basis for  
summary report  
MUD

Делегат СССР, проф. г-н А. Тарандин

Я предлагаю признать решение СССР от 15 июня 1945  
по следующим пунктам:

1. Если бы Комитет принял этот §, он был бы в противоречии  
с самим собой, ибо при обсуждении вопроса о "Secretariat General"  
было ясно, что Генеральный Секретарь не должен  
иметь ни о чем из них, ни о стране Израиля, ни о евреях, ни о переселении.  
Если не принимать в учет вопроса о "Secretariat General", то тем  
менее сам оставшийся § 5 о переносе секретаря.  
2. Противоречие есть и в самом §: с одной стороны перенос избирется  
"среди правящих, установивших Ассамблею", с другой стороны  
указывается, что только один Израиль, принявший Израиль, или же  
принимая установивший ген. ассамблею, или же фиксируется в статуте;  
но это противоречит фиксации ген. ассамблеи ~~как~~ секретаря,  
и сам собой возникает вопрос: что-либо ~~в~~ в учете фиксации о  
более важных вещей - "Secretariat General".

Я не хочу здесь ничего по существу §, напр., о геогр. принципе,  
на Конференции наше намерение ~~было~~ провозгласить принцип активности  
представителей и равные права. Это желание Украины будет поддержано,  
хотя, конечно, полное равноправие между государствами не должно  
быть в слухе с объективностью, а объективностью у разных народов  
организм быть не должен. Если бы, напр., решался вопрос



о том, переопубликовать материалы, секретарь, дипломат  
Украины голосовала бы против переопубликации, тогда бы  
возможность боюшему этому воспринять секретаря кандидатуры в  
помощи. ген. секретаря. В Тегеране же, наоборот, перед началом  
в основе всего принимается ~~факт~~ персона ген. секретаря.  
Но я не буду спорить по существу содержания этого параграфа,  
ибо считаю, что если мы в основе своей считаем не нужным  
что-либо вносить в устав, то тем более не должны ~~его~~ вносить  
никуда же и, особенно, в отношении миссии восточного персонала.  
Поэтому я поддерживаю предложение делегата СССР



*E. Varneken  
translation*

Dr.  
Professor A. Palladin, Delegate of the Ukrainian  
Socialist Soviet Republic.

I support the proposal of the ~~Delegate~~ <sup>representative</sup> of the USSR  
to exclude paragraph 5 from the Statute, for the following  
reasons:

*By accepting*  
1. If the Committee should accept this paragraph,  
*would fall into a* self-contradiction, since,  
the Committee ~~should find itself in contradiction~~  
*method of question of the*  
~~because~~, during the discussion of the ~~problem of the~~  
*Deputy Secretaries General*  
~~"sous-secretsaires generaux"~~, the majority of <sup>the</sup> delegates  
~~XXXXXX~~ were of the opinion that no mention should be  
made in the Statute of either their number, ~~or~~ the method  
of their election, ~~the term of~~ <sup>term of</sup> their service, or their  
~~re-election.~~ *subject the Deputy Secretaries General*  
If the ~~question of~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~sous-secretsaires~~ is not  
included in the Statute, then there is still less reason for  
including paragraph 5, ~~XXXXXX~~ which concerns the Secretary's  
staff, ~~(personnel)~~.

2. Moreover, ~~the~~ <sup>in itself the</sup> paragraph 5 ~~itself~~ contains a contra-  
diction: on <sup>the</sup> one hand, the personnel is to be elected "in  
accordance with rules set down by the Assembly," on the  
other hand, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ there are instructions as  
to who may be chosen, and the principles <sup>to be followed in</sup> ~~XXXXXX~~ electing.  
~~Either~~ <sup>But</sup> the rules are set down by the Assembly, or else  
everything is fixed by the Statute. ~~But this matter, for~~  
~~some reason, is fixed~~ <sup>But, However,</sup> ~~XXXXXX~~  
<sup>But</sup> for some reason, this matter

3480



is <sup>stipulated</sup> ~~fixed~~ ~~for~~ with regard to the ~~personnel~~ ~~staff~~ ~~of the~~ ~~Secretary General~~ <sup>staff</sup> ~~and~~ ~~yet~~ while it is considered impossible ~~to~~ <sup>stipulate</sup> for the Statute to ~~fix~~ anything concerning more important ~~officers~~ <sup>sous-Reputy Secretaries General</sup> such as the ~~secretares generaux~~.

I shall say here nothing concerning ~~the essence~~ the subject matter of paragraph 5 - for instance, the geographical principle. The small nations at the Conference have expressed their desire to participate actively in the work of the Organization. The Ukraine will support this desideratum; although, of course, there can be no perfect equality between States. Privileges are contingent upon obligations, and the obligations of the various members of the Organization will be ~~unequal~~ unequal. If, for instance, the question should be discussed as to whether or not the ~~Assistant~~ <sup>S</sup> Secretary should be re-elected, the Ukrainian Delegation should vote against re-election in order to give a chance to a greater number of States ~~to~~ to nominate candidates <sup>for the office of</sup> ~~for~~ ~~Assistant~~ <sup>Secretary</sup> General. ~~This~~ Such a desideratum was evidently at the basis of the geographical principle with regard to the staff of the General Secretary. ~~Never~~ I shall, however, not speak concerning the subject matter of ~~this~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~paragraph~~ <sup>if</sup>, ~~because~~ I believe that ~~nothing~~ ~~in~~ one case we consider it unnecessary to write ~~something~~ <sup>then</sup> into the Statute, there is <sup>even</sup> less reason for writing <sup>in something</sup> a similar condition especially if it concerns less important personnel.

~~Therefore~~ I shall ~~Therefore~~ support the proposal ~~suggestion~~ of the Delegate of the USSR.



~~General should not appear in the Charter.~~

A number of delegates agreed that the Charter should not contain excessive details, but <sup>continued</sup> ~~pointed out~~ that the paragraph in question was concerned with matters

of principle and not of detail; ~~It provides for the selection of staff by the~~ <sup>that in fact the details were</sup> ~~that in fact the details were~~ <sup>to be decided later and approved by</sup> ~~Secretary General under rules established by the Assembly and~~ <sup>the General Assembly.</sup> (X)

<sup>Contained in the paragraph:</sup>  
Four important principles are laid down: the selection of the staff by the

Secretary General, in his capacity as chief administrative officer, the

~~Assembly shall establish the regulations concerning appointment, the importance~~ <sup>ment by the Assembly of employment</sup> ~~need for~~

<sup>provision for</sup> ~~of securing~~ the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity,  
and <sup>provision for recruiting staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.</sup>  
~~and the importance of recruiting citizens of different countries. It was~~

~~stated~~ <sup>the principles set down in this</sup> ~~noted that this paragraph applied not only to the staff of the Secretariat,~~  
<sup>would should apply</sup>

<sup>Since the Secretariat would practice</sup> ~~but to the staff of all bodies and organs of the Organization, and it was~~

suggested by one delegate that the attention of the Coordination Committee

The Secretariat should practice these bodies except in military staff for all



There is only one Secretariat of  
the Organization and it will  
serve the General Assembly,  
the Security Council and the  
Economic & Social Council.

Our delegate remarked that  
it might be necessary at  
some future date to consider  
at some future date.



The ~~delegate~~ of the Soviet Union  
contended that

In reply to the statement by the  
del of the S. U. that the provisions  
of paragraph 5 would apply only to  
the Secretariat and not to the  
staffs of the Security Council, Economic and  
Social Council and other organs, it was  
~~stated~~ contended by several  
delegates that these provisions would  
apply, ~~not only to the Secretariat, but~~  
~~to the~~ all all such staff, ~~because~~  
since the Secretariat would ~~provide~~ <sup>serve</sup>  
~~the necessary staff for~~ all these  
organs. One delegate remarked  
that it might be appropriate  
~~at some future~~ to consider the wording  
of paragraph one of Chapter X  
in order to make it clear that the  
Secretariat referred to is the  
Secretariat of the whole Organization.  
It was suggested by a ~~second~~  
delegate that the <sup>question referred by the Soviet</sup> ~~matter~~ <sup>Delegate</sup>  
referred to the Coordination Committee



~~It was suggested by one delegate~~  
~~that~~  
for consideration of a general provision  
that any staff of the Organization should  
be recruited on the same basis as that  
provided for the Secretariat. There was  
no discussion of this suggestion.



attention was called to the fact  
 that the unanimous recommendation of  
 the Subcom — arose from the fact that  
 the language of this paragraph was based  
 upon various int — matter, ~~int~~  
~~already accepted by the participants~~  
 establishing international organizations  
 already accepted by means of the  
 participants in this Conference. Similar  
 provisions appear in the Constitution

of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Bretton Woods

documents, and other international agreements.

It was agreed, on the suggestion of the Delegate of the Netherlands, to change the word "selected" to "appointed" in the text submitted by the Subcommittee.

~~A vote was taken on~~ The U.S.S.R. motion was rejected by a vote of 26 to 6.

Decision: The Committee, by a vote of 30 to 3, approved the following

text for paragraph 5 of Chapter X:

"The staff shall be appointed by the Secretary-General under regulations established by the General Assembly. The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible."

*and The United States drew The attention*  
The Delegate of the United Kingdom <sup>1</sup>proposed that when the report of Chapter  
of the Commission to the fact that certain adjustments  
X goes to the Commission, that the following sentence be appended to the report:

*might have to be made in the report in accordance with whatever decision might*  
The Delegate of the United States supported the proposal ~~which~~ as an indication  
*be taken by the Steering Committee in regard*  
that when action has been taken by the Steering Committee the ~~the~~ report will

*to Deputy Secretaries General.*  
~~be adjusted accordingly.~~



It was agreed that ~~attention should be called to this fact in the~~ <sup>should be noted</sup>  
report of the Committee on Chapter X.

The Delegate of Brazil moved that the interpretation of paragraph 5 as set out in the Subcommittee report be accepted by the Committee. This was seconded by Norway and Greece. The interpretation of paragraph 5 referred to is that the positions in the Secretariat, as one of the principal organs of the Organization, would be open to men and women on an equal basis, ~~Provision for such participation on a equal basis has been provided in paragraph 3, Chapter IV.~~

*It was pointed out that it was not necessary to approve the report of the changes noted in the Summary Reports of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth meetings of Committee I/2 since the a Reporters Report would be submitted for approval before*  
2. Reports of the Coordination Committee to Committee I/2

The Secretary read two communications from the Coordination Committee submitting alternative texts for paragraph 1 of Chapter III and paragraph 3 of Chapter IV. It was agreed that the proposed texts should be distributed to the Committee <sup>I/2</sup> for consideration and be discussed at the next meeting of ~~Committee I/2.~~

The meeting adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

*Submitted to the Commission*



PROGRESS REPORT

NINETEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, 8:40 p.m.

Committee I/2 finally concluded consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Chapter X. (The Secretariat) (Doc. 720) The entire session was devoted to the last paragraph (paragraph 6 in Subcommittee report, paragraph 5 as approved by the Committee.)

Objection to the inclusion of this paragraph was made by the delegate of the Soviet Union (Mr. Tsarapkin), who declared that technical details of this sort should be left to staff regulations. This objection produced a whole evening of debate on a matter which was expected to receive prompt approval.

Arguments were presented against the Soviet objections by the delegates of Netherlands, New Zealand, Belgium, Greece, and Canada. The Soviet position was supported by

the delegate of the Ukraine.

The Delegate of Ecuador made a short statement which at first appeared to be a compromise offer, but which was not followed up. He suggested that since the Soviet delegate opposed the inclusion of these technical details, the Committee should provide only for the Secretary-General or if it decided to deal with the rest of the staff, should likewise provide for deputies.

During the discussion, the Delegate of the Soviet Union had contended that the details of paragraph 5 referred only to the Secretariat and not to such staff as might be attached to the various organs of the Organization, such as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Other delegates answered that the staffs of these organs would be included in the Secretariat. The Delegate of Greece suggested, accordingly, that this matter be referred to the Coordination Committee and that attention



be paid to the inclusion of a general provision that any staff of the Organization should be recruited on the same basis as that recommended by the Secretariat. This suggestion <sup>was</sup> is not followed up.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the motion of the Soviet Union to delete paragraph 5 was defeated by a vote of 6 in favor (including U.S.S.R., Ukraine, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile and Colombia), and 26 against. (The United States and United Kingdom abstaining).

The Committee agreed by a vote of 30 to 3 to accept the text of paragraph 5 recommended by the Subcommittee.

After the vote was taken, the Delegate of the United Kingdom (Gore Booth) drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that its decision on the matter of the Deputy Secretaries-General had been questioned. He suggested the inclusion in the Committee's report to



Commission I on Chapter X of a statement to the effect that: The Committee noticed that inclusion in the above report of any provisions concerning Deputy Secretaries-General must await the decision of the Steering Committee on the question referred to it in that connection. Upon the suggestion of the Delegate of Norway (Hambro), the Delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States agreed to reword the statement as follows:

"The Delegates of the United States and United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that certain adjustments might have to be made in the report in accordance with whatever decision might be taken by the Steering Committee in regard to Deputy Secretaries-General."

The Delegate of Brazil (Lutz) referred to the interpretation in the Subcommittee report to the effect that positions in the Secretariat would be open to men and women on an



equal basis. She moved that this interpretation be approved by Committee I/2 and reported to Commission I. Her motion was seconded by Norway and Greece. There followed some discussion as to whether the Committee should vote approval of the draft report of the Subcommittee. (Doc. 720) Although no formal decision was reached, there seemed to be general agreement that such approval should be given to the report of the Rapporteur on this matter to the Commission. It was clear, however, that the Committee agreed with the proposal of the Delegate of Brazil.

The Committee received two communications from the Coordinating Committee:

- (1) Relating to Chapter III, paragraph 4 and
- (2) Relating to Chapter IV. (See Doc. 783).

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.



PROGRESS REPORT

NINETEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, 8:40 p.m.

Committee I/2 finally concluded consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Chapter X. (The Secretariat) (Doc. 720) The entire session was devoted to the last paragraph (paragraph 6 in Subcommittee report, paragraph 5 as approved by the Committee.)

Objection to the inclusion of this paragraph was made by the delegate of the Soviet Union (Mr. Tsarapkin), who declared that technical details of this sort should be left to staff regulations. This objection produced a whole evening of debate on a matter which was expected to receive prompt approval.

Arguments were presented against the Soviet objections by the delegates of Netherlands, New Zealand, Belgium, Greece, and Canada. The Soviet position was supported by



the delegate of the Ukraine.

The Delegate of Ecuador made a short statement which at first appeared to be a compromise offer, but which was not followed up. He suggested that since the Soviet delegate opposed the inclusion of these technical details, the Committee should provide only for the Secretary-General or if it decided to deal with the rest of the staff, should likewise provide for deputies.

During the discussion, the Delegate of the Soviet Union had contended that the details of paragraph 5 referred only to the Secretariat and not to such staff as might be attached to the various organs of the Organization, such as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Other delegates answered that the staffs of these organs would be included in the Secretariat. The Delegate of Greece suggested, accordingly, that this matter be referred to the Coordination Committee and that attention



be paid to the inclusion of a general provision that any staff of the Organization should be recruited on the same basis as that recommended by the Secretariat. This suggestion <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ not followed up.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the motion of the Soviet Union to delete paragraph 5 was defeated by a vote of 6 in favor (including U.S.S.R., Ukraine, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile and Colombia), and 26 against. (The United States and United Kingdom abstaining).

The Committee agreed by a vote of 30 to 3 to accept the text of paragraph 5 recommended by the Subcommittee.

After the vote was taken, the Delegate of the United Kingdom (Gore Booth) drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that its decision on the matter of the Deputy Secretaries-General had been questioned. He suggested the inclusion in the Committee's report to



Commission I on Chapter X of a statement to the effect that: The Committee notice that inclusion in the above report of any provisions concerning Deputy Secretaries-General must await the decision of the Steering Committee on the question referred to it in that connection. Upon the suggestion of the Delegate of Norway (Hambro), the Delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States agreed to reword the statement as follows:

"The Delegates of the United States and United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that certain adjustments might have to be made in the report in accordance with whatever decision might be taken by the Steering Committee in regard to Deputy Secretaries-General."

The Delegate of Brazil (Lutz) referred to the interpretation in the Subcommittee report to the effect that positions in the Secretariat would be open to men and women on an



equal basis. She moved that this interpretation be approved by Committee I/2 and reported to Commission I. Her motion was seconded by Norway and Greece. There followed some discussion as to whether the Committee should vote approval of the draft report of the Subcommittee. (Doc. 720) Although no formal decision was reached, there seemed to be general agreement that such approval should be given to the report of the Rapporteur on this matter to the Commission. It was clear, however, that the Committee agreed with the proposal of the Delegate of Brazil.

The Committee received two communications from the Coordinating Committee:

- (1) Relating to Chapter III, paragraph 4 and
- (2) Relating to Chapter IV. (See Doc. 783).

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.



PROGRESS REPORT

NINETEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, 8:40 p.m.

Committee I/2 finally concluded consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Chapter X. (The Secretariat) (Doc. 720) The entire session was devoted to the last paragraph (paragraph 6 in Subcommittee report, paragraph 5 as approved by the Committee.)

Objection to the inclusion of this paragraph was made by the delegate of the Soviet Union (Mr. Tsarapkin), who declared that technical details of this sort should be left to staff regulations. This objection produced a whole evening of debate on a matter which was expected to receive prompt approval.

Arguments were presented against the Soviet objections by the delegates of Netherlands, New Zealand, Belgium, Greece, and Canada. The Soviet position was supported by



the delegate of the Ukraine.

The Delegate of Ecuador made a short statement which at first appeared to be a compromise offer, but which was not followed up. He suggested that since the Soviet delegate opposed the inclusion of these technical details, the Committee should provide only for the Secretary-General or if it decided to deal with the rest of the staff, should likewise provide for deputies.

During the discussion, the Delegate of the Soviet Union had contended that the details of paragraph 5 referred only to the Secretariat and not to such staff as might be attached to the various organs of the Organization, such as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Other delegates answered that the staffs of these organs would be included in the Secretariat. The Delegate of Greece suggested, accordingly, that this matter be referred to the Coordination Committee and that attention



be paid to the inclusion of a general provision that any staff of the Organization should be recruited on the same basis as that recommended by the Secretariat. This suggestion <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ not followed up.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the motion of the Soviet Union to delete paragraph 5 was defeated by a vote of 6 in favor (including U.S.S.R., Ukraine, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile and Colombia), and 26 against. (The United States and United Kingdom abstaining).

The Committee agreed by a vote of 30 to 3 to accept the text of paragraph 5 recommended by the Subcommittee.

After the vote was taken, the Delegate of the United Kingdom (Gore Booth) draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that its decision on the matter of the Deputy Secretaries-General had been questioned. He suggested the inclusion in the Committee's report to



Commission I on Chapter X of a statement to the effect that: The Committee notice that inclusion in the above report of any provisions concerning Deputy Secretaries-General must await the decision of the Steering Committee on the question referred to it in that connection. Upon the suggestion of the Delegate of Norway (Hambro), the Delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States agreed to reword the statement as follows:

"The Delegates of the United States and United Kingdom draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that certain adjustments might have to be made in the report in accordance with whatever decision might be taken by the Steering Committee in regard to Deputy Secretaries-General."

The Delegate of Brazil (Lutz) referred to the interpretation in the Subcommittee report to the effect that positions in the Secretariat would be open to men and women on an



equal basis. She moved that this interpretation be approved by Committee I/3 and reported to Commission I. Her motion was seconded by Norway and Greece. There followed some discussion as to whether the Committee should vote approval of the draft report of the Subcommittee. (Doc. 720) Although no formal decision was reached, there seemed to be general agreement that such approval should be given to the report of the Rapporteur on this matter to the Commission. It was clear, however, that the Committee agreed with the proposal of the Delegate of Brazil.

The Committee received two communications from the Coordinating Committee:

- (1) Relating to Chapter III, paragraph 4 and
- (2) Relating to Chapter IV. (See Doc. 723).

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.



SUMMARY REPORT OF NINETEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2.

Veterans Building, Room 303, June 4, 1945, 8:40 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman,  
Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica) at 8.40 p.m.

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

The Committee completed its discussion of the report of Subcommittee I/2/D with a consideration of paragraph 6. Since the Committee, at its previous meeting had agreed to combine paragraphs 4 and 5, this last paragraph becomes number 5.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. felt that this paragraph was concerned with minor technical details and should not appear in the Charter, which is the most important historical document of this period. He also pointed out that in addition to the Secretariat, the other organs of the Organization would require staff, and it would not be logical to limit the provisions proposed in paragraph 5 to the Secre-



tariat. He therefore moved that paragraph 5 be deleted from the Charter. ¶ The Delegate of the Ukraine seconded this motion and pointed out certain contradictions in the paragraph itself and in the provisions in other chapters of the Charter. He reminded the Committee that at an earlier meeting it had been decided that no mention should be made in the Charter of number of Deputy Secretaries General, the method of their election, their term of service, or their re-election. If provision for Deputy Secretaries General were not included in the Charter, there would be less reason for including paragraph 5, which concerns the Secretary's staff. A further contradiction exists in paragraph 5 where, on the one hand, the personnel is to be elected in accordance with rules set down by the Assembly and, on the other hand, there are regulations as to the selection of staff. He added that if the question of re-election of Deputy Secretaries-General should be considered, he would vote against re-election in order



to give an opportunity for participation by a greater number of states, and that this was in agreement with the desire to have wide geographical representation in the Secretariat.

He contended, however, that if it was unnecessary to include a provision for such representation in the case of the deputies, there was less reason for such provision for subordinate personnel.

A number of delegates agreed that the Charter should not contain excessive details, but contended that the paragraph in question was concerned with matters of principle and not of detail; that in fact the paragraph contained no more than general principles to guide the Assembly when it established the detailed regulations governing the staff of the Secretariat. Four important principles are contained in the paragraph: the selection of the staff by the Secretary General, in his capacity as chief administrative officer, the establishment by the Assembly of the regulations concerning