

UNCIO - Working papers - Commissions & Technical Committees  
- Committee 1/2 (miscellaneous)

01 May 1945  
31 May 1945

clear - NK  
7/65

S-1018  
Box-3  
File-5

(PAGE 2-2-3)



SUMMARY REPORT OF TENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, May 21, 1945 8:45 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica) at 8:45 p.m.

1. Consideration of Withdrawal, Suspension and Expulsion.

*In discussing withdrawal from the Organization.*  
~~The delegates had under consideration two propositions with respect to the right of withdrawal; first, whether or not withdrawal from the organization should be permitted, and second, whether explicit provisions should be made in the Charter with regard to withdrawal.~~ It was suggested that the omission of specific reference to withdrawal in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal was deliberate and for the purpose of excluding such a possibility. On the other hand, it was explained that, although omission was deliberate, its purpose was to permit the consideration of each proposed case of withdrawal in light of the circumstances existing at the time. Various delegates spoke in favor of an explicit statement on withdrawal from the organization. Since this was a matter of substance, and further clarification was needed as to the intentions of the sponsoring powers in the omission of reference to withdrawal in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, it was suggested that a special subcommittee, including delegates from the sponsoring powers be appointed.

Decision: The Committee agreed that a special subcommittee should be appointed to draft a report on the question of withdrawal from the organization. This Committee will also consider the questions of expulsion and suspension, which are necessarily related to withdrawal.

The Chairman appointed a subcommittee consisting of the President of Commission I, the Chairman of Committee I/2, the Rapporteur, and delegates of the following countries: United States, United Kingdom, USSR, China, Syria, Philippine Commonwealth, The Netherlands, Ecuador and Uruguay. The Committee will meet on May 22 and report to the full committee, ~~the following day.~~

2. Report of the Rapporteur on Chapter IV (Principal organs)

It was brought to the attention of the Committee that the report of the rapporteur summing up the discussion and action of

*it was pointed out that two questions were involved: the U.S. by the Delegate*

the Committee on Chapter IV (Principal Organs) had been distributed to the members during the course of the meeting.

3. Consideration of Chapter X (The Secretariat)

The Chairman <sup>called attention to the overlapping jurisdiction</sup> described to the Committee the situation within the Conference, in which the subject of the secretariat was being considered. Committee I/2 had been assigned the composition and functions of the Secretariat, and Committee II/1 the method of election and Committee III/1 the nomination of the Secretary General.

Several delegates observed that the division of labor on this subject might lead either to duplication and possibly conflicting decisions or to the inability of any of the Committees to treat the question comprehensively. Although other committees may have taken action on certain phases of the secretariat, several delegates expressed the desire for Committee I/2 to discuss all the questions relating to the Secretariat which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction. It was pointed out that the final decision would rest with the Coordination Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40.

The various committees on the subject were a



May 16, 1945

REPORT OF THE EIGHTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

The Rapporteur read a report of the discussion which had taken place on Chapter IV. Paragraph 1 of Chapter IV was adopted pending further decisions of other committees of the Conference.

The Chairman opened discussions on paragraphs 2 and 3 of Chapter IV. The Delegate of Cuba seconded the Uruguayan amendment and pointed out that Cuba has in its constitution a clause guaranteeing against discrimination. He said that he would not repeat the arguments advanced by Australia, Brazil and Mexico but he did want to add another argument, namely that several countries had not provided for full rights and that the Uruguayan amendment would facilitate the task of extending such rights.

He presented the Cuban amendment asking for the creation of a council for intellectual cooperation. He said that the international court would protect the material interests of mankind while the intellectual cooperation council would protect the moral interests. The Conference of Mexico realized the necessity for setting up such an organization and Cuba proposed to add to the Social and Economic Council in the organ. Cuba would be satisfied however if the Committee adopted the principle and the General Assembly created such a council after deliberating about the structure.

He suggested that paragraph 2, Chapter IV should read as follows:



"The Organization should have such subsidiary organs as may be found necessary to the accomplishment of its task, including a Council for Intellectual Cooperation".

The Delegate of Belgium remarked that the Uruguayan amendment had been discussed at an earlier meeting and that M. Rolin had at that time said he believed the amendment superfluous and therefore harmful. He favored the equality of women but thought the amendment mixed two problems. It tried to assure women a place in the Organization as delegates which is up to the governments and also positions in the Organization which really belongs in Chapter X. He referred to the Egyptian comment that the equality of women clause was already provided for in Chapter I by the Sponsoring Powers amendment. He requested Uruguay to limit the amendment to Chapter X, and if she was not willing to do this, he requested the Chairman to divide the amendment into two parts. In that case Belgium would favor the second, namely, equality of women for positions in the Secretariat.

The Delegate of Uruguay remarked that she understood many members were in favor of her amendment. She referred to a letter in support received from Mexico, Australia, Haiti, Dominican Republic and Brazil and she felt she could rely on the support of many others. So far as the suggestion that this should apply to Chapter X, she thought it obvious that women should be eligible. In reply to Belgium she said that women should be able to bear full responsibility.

throughout the Organization in peace as well as war and suggested that all positions should be open to women. The Delegate from Uruguay recommended that her amendment be considered as a new paragraph to Chapter IV.

The Chairman said that before discussing the motion of order raised by Uruguay it would need to be seconded. Brazil seconded. The Chairman then said that there were two speakers for and two against the motion. Canada asked what the motion was and the Chairman replied that the Uruguayan Delegate proposed that her original amendment should now become paragraph 3 of Chapter IV.

The Venezuelan Delegate agreed and Uruguay seconded. The United Kingdom Delegate remarked that he thought it unwise to waste time in discussing as to whether it should become paragraph 2 or 3.

The Delegate of Mexico rose to answer Belgium. She reminded that Chapter VII of the League Covenant refers to all the positions in the League and not just to the Secretariat. Second, she said that she thought it was not proper here to decide whom governments should choose, but she thought it proper and right to offer positions in various other organizations.

The Delegate of Australia said that she was not clear whether she was speaking to a point of order or not but she she pointed out that the Committee had been appealed to



to expedite its deliberations, and she thought it unwise to pile up oppositions in favor of the decision already made. She believed that there was an equanimity concerning the Uruguayan proposal. She explained that the real meaning of the Uruguayan amendment was that there should be no discrimination whatsoever when referring to the position in any organ. She said that if the Committee agreed in supporting Uruguay, then a vote should be taken.

The United Kingdom Delegate on a point of order said that the Committee was only discussing whether this should be paragraph 2 or 3.

The Canadian Delegate suggested that since five <sup>speeches</sup> objections had already been made and there was no opposition, it might be taken unanimous that the point of order be sustained.

The Chairman asked for a vote on the point of order which was approved by a vote of 28 to nothing. The United Kingdom Delegate on a point of order said that the Committee was only discussing whether the amendment should be paragraph 2 or 3 and not the question as to whether it should be in the chapter at all. The Chairman suggested reversing the order of debate and discussing paragraph 2 before 3. He decided he was wrong and he asked for a redemption of discussion of the substance of paragraphs 2 and 3.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. spoke in favor of the Uruguayan amendment. He pointed out that the constitution of the U.S.S.R. and the two Republics grant equal rights to all women and particularly the right to work. The Soviet

civil laws and family laws take care of the rights of women. In 27 years Soviet women have proved the worth of equal rights in fulfilling their duties in peace and war. He pointed out that the four sponsoring governments proposed an amendment to Chapter I which includes the phrase "without distinction as to sex". This amendment is repeated in Chapter V and Chapter IX. He said that he had first thought that the Uruguayan amendment which had been seconded by Australia and Brazil was not necessary but he had changed his mind and said that it must be accepted as relating to Chapter IV. He said that 38 years ago he had worked on a case relating to such a question and it meant deciding whether a provision of the Russian Czarist Constitution referred to both men and women. He learned the text of law must clearly state that women are included and therefore he thought the proposition of Uruguay must be accepted and submitted to a drafting committee. He was of the opinion that the phrase "in the organs and in the agencies" as proposed by Australia should be included. Brazil on a point of order moved that the Uruguayan amendment be adopted. The United Kingdom representative pointed out that this was not a motion of order but a motion to close debate. Brazil replied that the motion was to ask the Committee whether it were ready to vote. Australia objected to the motion as she wished to speak on the question of substance and did not want the debate closed. As the motion was opposed by the U.S.S.R. and Australia, Brazil



withdrew the motion. The Delegate of the United Kingdom pointed out that it was important for the Committee to be clear what it was doing. He said that he was speaking as one of the delegates of the United Kingdom which was in the best possible position to speak on such a subject since his Delegation had 23.3% women and Brazil had remarked that the total percentage of women was only 1% at this Conference.

He thought it all very well to decide questions concerning the recruitment of employees for the Organization but to go farther than that and tell the governments what to do means interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. He said that he was ready to accept the phrase "under the same conditions", but preferred the words in the Covenant of the League "shall be open equally to both men and women". He suggested that this was more appropriately the concern of Chapter I and suggested the following wording "participation in employment in all positions of the Secretariat and all its subsidiary organs shall be open equally to men and women." He thought this would achieve the objections desired and the Committee would agree unanimously. The United States seconded the United Kingdom proposal.

The Delegates of the Ukraine supported the Uruguayan proposal which would make it possible for women to participate in the governing organs. He said that in the Ukraine no state office is closed to women--that his country had found out the benefits of the contributions that women were

making during the war. In the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia women have fought in the army. They have been decorated for their heroism and exceptional skill as military women. He said that some delegates had said that the equal status of women was understood and that there was no necessity for specific mention. He thought that, on the contrary, there was so deeply recorded in the subconscious the idea of the inequality of women that the phrase must be stated. He pointed out that the Delegate of Belgium had said that women were automatically eligible but that at the same time were eligible only in the Secretariat.

The Canadian Delegate on a point of procedure said the debate had reached a degree of unanimity on the Uruguayan amendment and he suggested that the Committee approve this amendment and refer it to a drafting committee. The Chairman said that this proposal would seem to close the debate and others wished to speak so it was up to other members to decide whether the discussion should continue. The Canadian Delegate replied that he was not suggesting that the substance be referred to the drafting committee but thought that the Committee could approve in principle the proposal relating to participation in the organs or agencies of the Organization and that this could be referred to a drafting committee. He suggested as an example the following text: "The Organization shall place no restrictions on the participation or representation in its organs and agencies under the same conditions to men and women". The United States seconded this proposal.



The Delegate from Guatemala on a point of order seconded the Canadian motion and expressed support of the amendment of Uruguay which expressed the views of the majority of the Committee. He suggested that a unanimous vote be cast. He did not believe that it needed to be referred to a committee but asked that there be a vote by acclamation.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that eight delegates still wished to speak and Canada had suggested a method of procedure closing the debate and referring the matter to the drafting committee. He referred to the precedent already established that a draft is not discussed when it is referred back to the Committee. The Canadian replied that the debate had shown that no one was against the principle but thought that the word if put to a vote might mean that he and others would have to vote again or abstain. He suggested the approval in principle and the submission to a drafting committee and expressed the hope that when the report was brought back the Committee would adopt it unanimously.

Australia asked for an interpretation. Would such a motion mean that there would be no further opportunity to express or discuss the principle? The Chairman replied that if he had understood Guatemala and Bolivia clearly, the text of the drafting committee would have to be discussed again.

The Delegate of Greece said that it was clear there were two conflicting motions. According to Uruguay the motion was to proceed to vote on the amendment and according to Canada

the motion was to refer the it to a committee, approving the amendment in principle first. He thought it would be more expedient to avoid discussing which motion had precedence. He asked if he could put forth a compromise to avoid submitting the amendment to a committee and therefore please Uruguay and give a chance to the Committee to decide at once, taking cognizance of the United Kingdom's important remarks. (The point raised concerning the inclusion in the Charter of any provision which might be construed as interference in domestic affairs). He proposed inserting as paragraph 3 of Chapter IV the following:

"Nothing in this Charter may be construed to preclude the participation in the organs, agencies, Secretariat or other offices of this Organization of women on an equal footing with men".

The Guatemalan Delegate asked that the Committee vote immediately on the amendment and not refer it to a drafting committee. The Delegate from Belgium reminded the Committee that before the discussion had been opened the United Kingdom had submitted a text and he asked whether the Committee had taken cognizance of that text. The Chairman replied that the Committee was still discussing the Canadian proposal of referring the amendment to a drafting committee and submitted the report back on Friday when it would be discussed. The motion/<sup>of Canada</sup> was put to a vote and carried by 19 to nothing. The



motion read: "This Committee approves in principle the Uruguayan amendment to Chapter IV and refers <sup>it</sup> to a drafting committee. The Chairman appointed a drafting committee to meet the following morning, the committee to include the President of Commission I, the Chairman of Committee I/2, the Rapporteur and the delegates of the following countries: Australia, Chile, United States, Norway, Netherlands and Uruguay. On the suggestion of Canada he added the Delegate of Brazil.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 10:50 with the remarks that ten minutes had been devoted to the report of the Rapporteur, fifty minutes to a discussion of substance and seventy-five minutes to points of order.

8 - Mr. Stewart 9:30 pm  
6th Meeting  
SUMMARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 314 5:20 p.m., May 14, 1945

1. Schedule of meeting.

The Chairman announced the <sup>new</sup> schedule of meetings for the ~~Committee~~ next week which will be as follows:

Tuesday, May 15	3:30	Friday, May 18	10:30
Wed., May 16	8:30	Sat., May 19	3:30
Thurs., May 17	none		

2. Report of Drafting Committee on proposed text of Chapter III, Membership.

The Rapporteur presented the report of the subcommittee on Chapter III, Membership. It was explained that the text in its first paragraph defines those who are members at the outset, and in the second, those who will become members later. The subcommittee had agreed unanimously to retain the phrase "peace-loving nations", <sup>which had the approval</sup> because it expresses so well the idea of universality <sup>of</sup> which so many delegations have approved. No reference was made by the subcommittee to the requirement of democratic institutions, since this would imply an undue interference with internal arrangements. It was felt that the text should be a flexible one rather than an outline of specific criteria. <sup>by the Committee</sup> It was noted that the French translation of paragraph 2 in the subcommittee report was not wholly satisfactory from the standpoint of language. It was agreed that a revised French text should be submitted at a later date.

~~In answer to a question, the Chair ruled that the preamble, which had been discussed earlier, as well as the motion which~~



~~would be voted on in this Committee today, could be reopened in the Commission stage.~~

Decision: The Committee unanimously approved the English text submitted by the subcommittee on Chapter III, Membership, as follows:

"Members of the Organization are the signatories of the Charter whose ratification has become effective in accordance with Chapter XI.

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

2. Suspension of, and expulsion from, membership.

The Chairman explained that the question of suspension and expulsion did not come within the original terms of reference of this Committee, but that the matter had been discussed by the Presidents of Commissions I and II and referred by them to the Coordinating Committee for decision.

On the question of withdrawal of membership from the Organization the Chairman explained that the subcommittee had considered this matter, and was of the opinion that the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals deliberately omitted provisions for withdrawal in order to avoid the weakness of the League Covenant which had permitted withdrawal. The subcommittee was strongly of the opinion that withdrawal should be impossible.

The Delegate of Uruguay pointed out that Uruguay had presented a proposed amendment providing that universality and permanence of the Organization should prevent withdrawal from it. He recommended that an express prohibition against withdrawal of any member should be written into the Charter.

Decision: The Committee agreed to place on the agenda at a convenient date, to be fixed by the Chairman, the discussion of the question of withdrawal from the Organization.

3. Consideration of Chapter IV, Principal Organs.

The Chairman announced that a discussion of Chapter IV would be resumed at the next meeting and a subcommittee would be appointed to draft a text.

The Committee adjourned at 6:30.



SUMMARY REPORT OF EIGHTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, May 16, 1945, 8:40 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 8:40 p.m.

1. Report by the Rapporteur

(Saudi Arabia)

The Rapporteur, (Sayyid) Jamil Daud, presented a report summarizing the progress of the discussion on Chapter IV (Report attached).

2. Continuation of Discussion on Chapter IV (Principal Organs)

The Delegate of Cuba suggested a modification of paragraph 2 providing for a Council on Intellectual Cooperation. He also spoke in support of the Uruguayan amendment asking for equal status for women in the Organization.

The Delegate of Uruguay moved that her amendment be incorporated as <sup>a new</sup> paragraph 3 of Chapter IV rather than as paragraph 2 as previously proposed. The motion, seconded by Venezuela, was adopted.

Decision: The Committee agreed to consider the Uruguayan amendment as paragraph 3 of Chapter IV.

Some delegates suggested that the Uruguayan amendment embodied two proposals, one pertaining to the representation of women on national delegations, the other pertaining to their employment in the agencies of the Organization. <sup>explanation</sup> In pursuance of this distinction these delegates felt that the <sup>some</sup> Uruguayan amendment should deal only with the latter and should therefore be considered for discussion under Chapter X rather than under Chapter IV. Others urged that delegates as such sat only

in the General Assembly and that limiting the Uruguayan amendment to the Secretariat and its agencies might preclude the seating of women on the Security Council, the Social and Economic Council, and similar organs outside the Assembly.

Decision: The Committee approved in principle the Uruguayan amendment to Chapter IV and agreed to submit it to a subcommittee for drafting.

3. Appointment of a subcommittee

To carry out the above decision the Chairman appointed a subcommittee ~~consisting of the President of Commission I, the Chairman of Committee I/2 and the Rapporteur (Saudi-Arabia)~~ as ex officio members, and the delegates of the following countries: ~~Australia, Chile, United States, Norway, Netherlands, Uruguay, Brazil.~~

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 p.m.



PROGRESS REPORT ON CHAPTER IV BY THE RAPPORTEUR OF COMMITTEE I/2

May 16, 1945

1. Committee I/2 has adopted paragraph 1 of Chapter IV, pending further decisions of other Committees of the Conference. The paragraph, as agreed by the Committee on May 15, reads as follows:
  1. The Organization should have as its principal organs:
    - a. A General Assembly;
    - b. A Security Council;
    - c. An Economic and Social Council;
    - d. An international court of justice; and
    - e. A Secretariat.
2. The Secretary of Committee II/3 has formally notified the Secretary of Committee I/2 of the following action taken at the fourth meeting of Committee II/3:

"It was unanimously agreed that the Committee should recommend to Committee I/2 that a new paragraph "c" be inserted in Chapter IV, 1, as follows:

(c) Economic and Social Council,

and that subsequent paragraphs be relettered accordingly.

It was agreed that if the title of the Economic and Social Council should be changed in subsequent discussion, this amendment should be changed accordingly."
3. This action of Committee II/3 was noted in the decision of Committee I/2 at its meeting yesterday, May 15, when

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Summary Rept I/2  
May 8,

Delivered to Mr. Stewart  
at 3:45.

Com. adjourned at 12:30



SUMMARY REPORT, SECOND MEETING OF COMMITTEE 1/2

May 8, 1945, 10.<sup>45</sup>~~30~~ a.m., Room 303, Veterans Building

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. ~~Sam~~ Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica), at ~~10.35~~. The Chairman reported on the number of amendments received pertaining to matters within the jurisdiction of this Committee.

At eleven o'clock the Committee observed one minute of silence in memory of those who gave their lives to make possible the victory celebrated at this time.

1. Consideration of Joint Amendments of Sponsoring Powers

The Chairman reported that at an informal meeting on the morning of May 7, 1945, the Commission Presidents and Committee Chairmen had agreed, in order to expedite the work of the Conference, to recommend that the twenty-seven joint amendments submitted by the sponsoring powers (Dec. 2, 1945) should be embodied in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. He asked for the opinion of the Committee on this matter. Several delegates agreed that this procedure would speed up the work, observing that many of the amendments submitted by other States were covered, at least in part, by these joint amendments. Other delegates felt that the amendments of all States should be treated in the same way, and pointed out that incorporating the joint amendments in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would give them a different status. It was also suggested that since these amendments did not constitute a part of the original agenda of the Conference, they should be considered, discussed, and voted on in the same way as all other amendments.

The Committee agreed that this was a matter to be decided by the Steering Committee or Executive Committee, and that in the meantime discussion should proceed on Chapters III and IV of the Dumbarton

proposals to which the sponsoring governments had not suggested amendments.

## 2. Consideration of Chapter III (Membership)

After some discussion of the work of the Committee, it was agreed to begin with the consideration of Chapter III (Membership). The delegate from Australia presented an amendment to the present text of Chapter III as follows:

"Membership of the United Nations shall be open to any State which accepts the obligation of this Charter and which ~~is~~ is admitted to membership in accordance with the Charter."

He felt that this amendment avoided the possibility of uncertainty of interpretation which might result from the term "peace-loving nations" in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

The delegate from Norway submitted the following amendment for consideration:

"Membership of the Organization should be open to all peace-loving States whose governments can be relied upon to work in harmony with the purposes and principles of the Organization."

He explained that this amendment, like that proposed by Australia, was inspired by the need for clarity.

The delegate from Uruguay spoke in favor of universal and permanent membership, pointing out the need for a precise juridical definition of a State.

It was agreed, owing to the lateness of the hour, to resume discussion at the next meeting of the Committee, tentatively scheduled for May 9.

The meeting adjourned at 12.30 p.m.



Summary, Rept - Com. I/

5/15/45

The Delegate of Mexico supported the amendment of Uruguay concerning the representation of women in different organs and agencies of the Organization, pointing out that the League of Nations Covenant provided in Article 7 that positions in the League Secretariat should be open to women on a basis of equality. The Delegate of Australia also supported the Uruguayan amendment, suggesting that the intent of the amendments submitted by the sponsoring powers to Chapters I, V, and IX, providing against discrimination as to race, language, religion or sex, would find practical application within the Organization itself through the inclusion in Chapter IV of a clause specifically granting equal status to women. The Australian Delegate proposed the addition of two words to the Uruguayan proposal, which would then read as follows:

22 "Representation and participation in the organs and agencies of the Organization shall be open both to men and women under the same conditions."

The Delegate of Mexico supported the amendment of Uruguay concerning the representation of women in different organs and agencies of the Organization. <sup>pointing</sup> She pointed out that the League Covenant provided in Article 7 that positions in the League should be open to women on a basis of equality <sup>with men.</sup>

The Delegate of Australia <sup>also</sup> supported the <sup>Uruguayan</sup> amendment proposed by Uruguay. She expressed her disagreement with the agreement raised earlier that no necessity exists for the inclusion of a specific provision guaranteeing the rights of women. Historical experience has demonstrated that in the absence of any such specific provision women have been denied the right of participation in public life and institutions.

<sup>suggesting that the intent of the amendments submitted by</sup> The Delegate of Australia recognized that the four sponsoring powers had presented amendments to Chapters I, V, and IX, providing against discrimination as to race, language, religion or sex. These amendments, however, did not obviate the necessity for including in Chapter IV, dealing with the organs of the Organization, a clause granting equal status to women. The intention expressed by the sponsoring powers in the amendments would find practical application within the Organization itself through the inclusion of such an amendment in Chapter IV. <sup>of a specific guarantee of the rights of women.</sup> The Delegate of Australia proposed the addition of two words to the Uruguayan proposal, which would then read as follows:

"Representation and participation in the organs and agencies of the Organization shall be open both to men and women under the same conditions."



The Delegate of Mexico supported the amendment of Uruguay concerning the representation of women in different organs and agencies of the Organization, <sup>Pointing</sup> ~~she pointed~~ out that the <sup>Nations</sup> League Covenant provided in Article 7 that positions in the <sup>Secretariat</sup> League should be open to women on a basis of equality.

The Delegate of Australia <sup>also</sup> supported the <sup>Uruguayan</sup> amendment, ~~proposed by Uruguay. She expressed her disagreement with the agreement raised earlier that no necessity exists for the inclusion of a specific provision guaranteeing the rights of women. Historical experience has demonstrated that in the absence of any such specific provision women have been denied the right of participation in public life and institutions.~~

<sup>suggesting that the intent of the amendments submitted by</sup> ~~The Delegate of Australia recognized that the four sponsoring powers had presented amendments to Chapters I, V, and IX, providing against discrimination as to race, language, religion or sex. These amendments, however, did not obviate the necessity for including in Chapter IV, dealing with the organs of the Organization, a clause granting equal status to women. The intention expressed by the sponsoring powers in the amendments would find practical application within the Organization itself through the inclusion of such an amendment in Chapter IV.~~ <sup>of a specific guarantee of the rights</sup> The Delegate of Australia proposed the addition of two words to the Uruguayan proposal, which would then read as follows:

"Representation and participation in the organs and agencies of the Organization shall be open both to men and women under the same conditions."

The Delegate of Mexico supported the amendment of Uruguay concerning the representation of women in different organs and agencies of the Organization. She pointed out that the League Covenant provided in Article 7 that positions in the League should be open to women on a basis of equality.

The Delegate of Australia supported the amendment proposed by Uruguay. ~~She expressed her disagreement with the agreement raised earlier that no necessity exists for the inclusion of a specific provision guaranteeing the rights of women. Historical experience has demonstrated that in the absence of any such specific provision women have been denied the right of participation in public life and institutions.~~

~~The Delegate of Australia~~ <sup>she</sup> recognized that the four sponsoring powers had presented amendments to Chapters I, V, and IX, providing against discrimination as to race, language, religion or sex. These amendments, however, did not obviate the necessity for including in Chapter IV, dealing with the organs of the Organization, a clause granting equal status to women. The intention expressed by the sponsoring powers in the amendments <sup>we</sup> could find practical application within the Organization itself through the inclusion of such an amendment in Chapter IV. The Delegate of Australia proposed the addition of two words to the Uruguayan proposal, which would then read as follows:

"Representation and participation in the organs and agencies of the Organization shall be open both to men and women under the same conditions."



111

SUMMARY REPORT OF FIFTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
May 26, 1945, 10:45 a.m., Room 314 Veterans Building.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman,  
Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica) at 10:45 a.m.

(1) Appointment of Drafting Committee for Chapter III.

In accordance with the agreement reached at the meeting of May 10, the Chairman appointed a drafting committee for Chapter III, consisting of the Chairman of Committee I/2, the President of Commission I, the delegate from Haiti (Rapporteur) and representatives of the following delegations:

Ecuador	Syria
Netherlands	United Kingdom
Philippines	Soviet Union

The Chairman reminded the Committee that amendments and proposals to Chapter III should be submitted to him in writing for the consideration of the drafting committee.

(2) Discussion of Terms of Reference.

The Delegate of Belgium on a point of order referred to the exchange of correspondence between himself, as President of Commission I, and the President of Commission II, regarding the division of work between the two Commissions (see Summary Report of First Meeting of Committee I/2, Doc. 112). He moved that this Committee should proceed to a discussion of the conditions for expulsion from membership. It was suggested that suspension and expulsion might be considered together. After further discussion the motion was rejected.

It was agreed that the drafting committee should be authorized to consider suspension and expulsion and should report back to the Committee, at which time there might be further discussion of the matter.

(3) Consideration of Chapter IV. (Principal Organs)

The Delegate from Uruguay spoke in behalf of the amendment of her delegation which provides that participation and representation in the Organization and its agencies shall be open to men and women on a basis of equality. This proposal was supported by the Delegate from Brazil, who called attention to a similar joint amendment of Brazil, Mexico and the

Dominican Republic under Chapter V. In reply several delegates stated that the inclusion of a reference to equal rights for women was unnecessary since it is understood that women are not to be excluded from participation in this and other international organizations.

The Delegate of Cuba pointed out that his delegation favored the inclusion of a Council of Intellectual Cooperation as a principal organ.

The Delegate from Ecuador pointed out that his delegation had also submitted an amendment to Chapter IV for the inclusion of an Economic and Social Council and an Educational and Cultural Council. He suggested, however, that the most effective manner for the Committee to proceed would be to submit a memorandum stating that Chapter IV should enumerate such organs as other Committees of this Conference should designate as principal organs. There was general support of this suggestion.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.



CAB File

FOURTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

May 10, Room 314, Veterans Building, 2:50 p.m.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:55 p.m.

He stated that in the future whenever a motion on a point of order was made and seconded, speakers would be limited to two for and two against the motion. He hoped that this would avoid prolonged delay.

The Delegate of Haiti spoke in support of the amendment of his delegation. He pointed to the close links between Chapters I, II, and III of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. The amendment of Haiti concerns the inclusion in the Principles of the Charter of the principle of racial nondiscrimination. He did not propose to offer amendment to Chapter III but pointed to the close relationship between this principle and that of Membership.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom expressed his belief that discussion had proceeded to the point where a decision by the Committee was possible. He outlined the main themes which had been made in the speeches so far: (1) A general desire that the Organization should, by the "Terms of the Charter", be capable of being universal in membership, and (2) the warning of other Delegates who were anxious to keep out of the Organization those states which were not peace-loving but which otherwise could establish claim to membership. He suggested that the text of this Chapter should be flexible and that any attempt to reach a precise definition on the second point would be extremely

difficult and unsatisfactory in practice. He reminded the Committee that the General Assembly would pass on all cases of admission; therefore he suggested the following text for Chapter III:

"Membership of the Organization shall be open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to accept the obligations contained in the Charter."

He pointed out that the words "peace-loving" were enshrined in the Moscow Declaration and that it would be difficult to secure unanimous agreement to their omission. He further stated that the summary made at the conclusion of the last meeting by M. Rolin had been of great value to the members of the Committee.

The Delegate of Mexico, noting the distinction which had been drawn between "state" and "government", urged that the Committee should not depart from the principle of nonintervention, which the sponsoring nations had already accepted in the drafting of the Dumbarton Oaks Charter. He stated that the formula of the United Kingdom was most appropriate.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union pointed out that the principle of universality was acceptable in the distant future but that at the present time it is impossible and that the delegation of the Soviet Union is against its inclusion in the Charter. He strongly defended the use of the words "peace-loving". On the matter of a more precise definition, which had been raised by France and the Netherlands, he felt that the wording of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals was adequate and precise. The



provisions of Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 2, which relate to the admission of new members by the General Assembly, were sufficient in the mind of the delegation of the Soviet Union. He stated that he would speak on the matter of neutrality at a later stage. The Delegate of Australia agreed to withdraw his motion in order to permit the Delegate of the United Kingdom to present his amendment as a motion. He asked, however, that the United Kingdom text be amended by inserting the word "principles" after the word "accept". This change was agreed to by the Delegate of the United Kingdom, and his motion to consider this amendment was seconded by the Delegation of the United States.

The Delegate of Brazil urged that the records of the discussion of the principle of universality and other matters relating to membership should be put into a formal memorandum which could be made available to future students of this Organization.

The Delegate of Norway suggested that the United Kingdom draft be amended by the addition of the words "and live up to" after the word "accept". In answer to this proposal, however, the Delegate of the United Kingdom pointed out that in his opinion the word "accept" implied that the member was ready to fulfil all obligations. He preferred to stand on his motion as originally presented.

The Delegate of Ecuador pointed out that the points of view of those supporting the principle of universality and of those

who insisted upon the necessity of all members complying with certain conditions and requirements were not far apart. He therefore proposed, not as a motion but as a contribution to the discussion, the following text:

"Members of the Organization are those states which have subscribed to the present Charter.

"Membership in the future will be open to all states of the world if they possess the qualifications and fill the requirements that shall be determined by the Assembly."

The Delegate of Belgium then moved that the Committee terminate discussion of Chapter III and that the Chairman appoint a subcommittee to consider all amendments and proposals which had been made.

The Delegate of the Philippines spoke in support of the amendment of his delegation. He explained that within the meaning of "state" as defined in international law his country would not be included at this time as a member. He suggested therefore that Chapter III take into account two kinds of members: (1) The original members of the United Nations, (2) any other peace-loving and law-abiding state or nation which may hereafter be admitted.

In reply to the request of the Delegate of the United States that the Committee consider the motion of the Delegate of the United Kingdom, the Delegate of Belgium pointed out that such a course would reopen discussion of the whole matter of membership, and would lead to prolonged delay. After some further discussion, the motion of the Delegate of Belgium was seconded, and the Committee agreed to terminate discussion.



The Chairman then announced that he would appoint the members of the subcommittee at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT OF FIFTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
May 10, 1945, 10:45 a.m., Room 314 Veterans Building.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman,  
Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica) at 10:45 a.m.

(1) Appointment of Drafting Committee for Chapter III.

In accordance with the agreement reached at the meeting of May 10, the Chairman appointed a drafting committee for Chapter III, consisting of the Chairman of Committee I/2, the President of Commission I, the delegate from Haiti (Rapporteur) and representatives of the following delegations:

*Chairman: Bonilla*  
*Rap.: Lesart (Haiti)*

Ecuador ( <i>Pablo Olaya Lasso</i> )	Syria ( <i>Farid Zaidi</i> )
Netherlands ( <i>Adrian Pelt</i> )	United Kingdom ( <i>William Malbone</i> )
Philippines ( <i>Vicente G. Sison</i> )	Soviet Union ( <i>Prof. S.B. Kuylov</i> )

The Chairman reminded the Committee that amendments and proposals to Chapter III should be submitted to him in writing for the consideration of the drafting committee.

(2) Discussion of Terms of Reference.

The Delegate of Belgium on a point of order referred to the exchange of correspondence between himself, as President of Commission I, and the President of Commission II, regarding the division of work between the two Commissions (see Summary Report of First Meeting of Committee I/2, Doc. 112). He moved that this Committee should proceed to a discussion of the conditions for expulsion from membership. It was suggested that suspension and expulsion might be considered together. After further discussion the motion was rejected.

It was agreed that the drafting committee should be authorized to consider suspension and expulsion and should report back to the Committee, at which time there might be further discussion of the matter.

(3) Consideration of Chapter IV. (Principal Organs)

The Delegate from Uruguay spoke in behalf of the amendment of her delegation which provides that participation and representation in the Organization and its agencies shall be open to men and women on a basis of equality. This proposal was supported by the Delegate from Brazil, who called attention to a similar joint amendment of Brazil, Mexico and the



Dominican Republic under Chapter V. In reply several delegates stated that the inclusion of a reference to equal rights for women was unnecessary since it is understood that women are not to be excluded from participation in this and other international organizations.

The Delegate of Cuba pointed out that his delegation favored the inclusion of a Council of Intellectual Cooperation as a principal organ.

The Delegate from Ecuador pointed out that his delegation had also submitted an amendment to Chapter IV for the inclusion of an Economic and Social Council and an Educational and Cultural Council. He suggested, however, that the most effective manner for the Committee to proceed would be to submit a memorandum stating that Chapter IV should enumerate such organs as other Committees of this Conference should designate as principal organs. There was general support of this suggestion.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

FOURTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE 1/2

May 10, Room 314, Veterans Building, 2:50 p.m.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:55 p.m.

He stated that in the future whenever a motion on a point of order was made and seconded, speakers would be limited to two for and two against the motion. He hoped that this would avoid prolonged delay.

The Delegate of Haiti spoke in support of the amendment of his delegation. He pointed to the close links between Chapters I, II, and III of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. The amendment of Haiti concerns the inclusion in the Principles of the Charter of the principle of racial nondiscrimination. He did not propose to offer amendment to Chapter III but pointed to the close relationship between this principle and that of Membership.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom expressed his belief that discussion had proceeded to the point where a decision by the Committee was possible. He outlined the main themes which had been made in the speeches so far: (1) A general desire that the Organization should, by the "Terms of the Charter", be capable of being universal in membership, and (2) the warning of other Delegates who were anxious to keep out of the Organization those states which were not peace-loving but which otherwise could establish claim to membership. He suggested that the text of this Chapter should be flexible and that any attempt to reach a precise definition on the second point would be extremely



difficult and unsatisfactory in practice. He reminded the Committee that the General Assembly would pass on all cases of admission; therefore he suggested the following text for Chapter III:

"Membership of the Organization shall be open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to accept the obligations contained in the Charter."

He pointed out that the words "peace-loving" were enshrined in the Moscow Declaration and that it would be difficult to secure unanimous agreement to their omission. He further stated that the summary made at the conclusion of the last meeting by M. Rolin had been of great value to the members of the Committee.

The Delegate of Mexico, noting the distinction which had been drawn between "state" and "government", urged that the Committee should not depart from the principle of nonintervention, which the sponsoring nations had already accepted in the drafting of the Dumbarton Oaks Charter. He stated that the formula of the United Kingdom was most appropriate.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union pointed out that the principle of universality was acceptable in the distant future but that at the present time it is impossible and that the delegation of the Soviet Union is against its inclusion in the Charter. He strongly defended the use of the words "peace-loving". On the matter of a more precise definition, which had been raised by France and the Netherlands, he felt that the wording of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals was adequate and precise. The

provisions of Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 2, which relate to the admission of new members by the General Assembly, were sufficient in the mind of the delegation of the Soviet Union. He stated that he would speak on the matter of neutrality at a later stage. The Delegate of Australia agreed to withdraw his motion in order to permit the Delegate of the United Kingdom to present his amendment as a motion. He asked, however, that the United Kingdom text be amended by inserting the word "principles" after the word "accept". This change was agreed to by the Delegate of the United Kingdom, and his motion to consider this amendment was seconded by the Delegation of the United States.

The Delegate of Brazil urged that the records of the discussion of the principle of universality and other matters relating to membership should be put into a formal memorandum which could be made available to future students of this Organization.

The Delegate of Norway suggested that the United Kingdom draft be amended by the addition of the words "and live up to" after the word "accept". In answer to this proposal, however, the Delegate of the United Kingdom pointed out that in his opinion the word "accept" implied that the member was ready to fulfil all obligations. He preferred to stand on his motion as originally presented.

The Delegate of Ecuador pointed out that the points of view of those supporting the principle of universality and of those



who insisted upon the necessity of all members complying with certain conditions and requirements were not far apart. He therefore proposed, not as a motion but as a contribution to the discussion, the following text:

"Members of the Organization are those states which have subscribed to the present Charter.

"Membership in the future will be open to all states of the world if they possess the qualifications and fill the requirements that shall be determined by the Assembly."

The Delegate of Belgium then moved that the Committee terminate discussion of Chapter III and that the Chairman appoint a subcommittee to consider all amendments and proposals which had been made.

The Delegate of the Philippines spoke in support of the amendment of his delegation. He explained that within the meaning of "state" as defined in international law his country would not be included at this time as a member. He suggested therefore that Chapter III take into account two kinds of members: (1) The original members of the United Nations, (2) any other peace-loving and law-abiding state or nation which may hereafter be admitted.

In reply to the request of the Delegate of the United States that the Committee consider the motion of the Delegate of the United Kingdom, the Delegate of Belgium pointed out that such a course would reopen discussion of the whole matter of membership, and would lead to prolonged delay. After some further discussion, the motion of the Delegate of Belgium was seconded, and the Committee agreed to terminate discussion.

The Chairman then announced that he would appoint the members of the subcommittee at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



MINUTES OF SIXTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

May 14, 1945, 5:20 p.m.

The Chairman announced the schedule of meetings for the Committee for the week;

Tuesday, 3:30	Friday, 10:30
Wednesday, 8:30	Saturday, 3:30
Thursday, no meeting	Monday, 8:30

The Rapporteur (Haiti) presented a report of the drafting committee on a meeting of subcommittee 1, which contained the proposed text of Chapter III (Membership), as follows:

"Members of the Organization are the signatories of the Charter whose ratification has become effective in accordance with Chapter XI.

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

The Chairman pointed out that the Committee was to vote on the text, but that there would be no discussion.

The Delegate of Belgium (M. Rolin) explained that the text of the subcommittee added two paragraphs--the first of which defines those who are members at the outset. He explained that they had deliberately refrained from mentioning the "original" members. The second paragraph deals with those

who become members later and is open to "peace-loving nations". The phrase was retained because it had been used in the Moscow Declarations and expressed so well the idea of universality as requested by so many delegations.

He explained that the phrase "able and ready" implied not only the acceptance of obligations, but the ability to carry out and the sincere acceptance of, these obligations. The "aims and principles" are omitted for the sake of simplicity since those nations which adhere to the Organization accept the aims and principles as a matter of course. There was no reference to democratic institutions since this would mean interference with internal arrangements.

M. Rolin explained that the Organization (which includes the General Assembly and the Security Council) will consider the past



and recent attitude of the state and the public statements of its leaders to see if these are in harmony with the principles of the Organization. The Committee did not want to include specific points, however.

The Delegate of Greece on a point of order noted that the French translation of the second paragraph was not quite satisfactory. He thought the American text very good and that a closer ~~and~~ interpretation of "able and ready" should be provided. The U.S. Delegate said that he thought it was an excellent draft and he proposed to vote in the affirmative for both parties. However, he objected to the paragraph concerned with withdrawal, since his delegation had not considered this question and he therefore wished to reserve the right to bring it to the attention of his delegation.

The Chairman said that the Committee was to vote on the text only, and that a second opportunity would be given to discuss this and vote again when the text is presented to the Commission.

The Delegate of Brazil, speaking on a point of order, asked whether the preamble had been accepted by Committee I/1 since there was a desire for some declaration of human rights and the feeling that this should be more than a legal document. She questioned whether the preamble and principles would be incorporated into the draft. The Delegate from Belgium replied that the ~~preamble~~ preamble had not yet been accepted, ~~by~~ but would be after the Chapter on Principles had been discussed. If, after it was adopted as part of the charter and the Delegate felt that there were omissions, amendments could be submitted.

The Delegate of New Zealand, speaking on a point of order, asked whether the Chairman<sup>ruling</sup>~~asked~~/out any discussion before the vote on this would constitute a precedent; he hoped that it would not, since often there would be a desire to discuss the text before voting upon it. The Chairman explained that there were two ways of handling the problem: (1) to vote on the report; and (2) the Committee to sustain the motion to re-open discussion. If, however, it were opened without the authorization of the Committee, there would be a lengthy discussion and unless there were many changes to be made in the draft, he preferred to have a vote on the report as submitted. It was agreed that the text should be voted upon and there was no move to re-open discussion.

The Delegate of France, on a point of order, said that he desired to associate himself with the Delegate of Greece and that the French translation should be amended in order to bring it into line with the English text. The Australian Delegate asked whether it would be special procedures for the admission of certain countries, such as ex-enemy countries. M. Rolin explained that it was open for the Assembly to decide whether a nation was peace loving or not, and whether it was able and ready to accept the obligations. The Australian Delegate said that in another Committee it had been suggested that before enemy states could be admitted they must run the gauntlet of the Security Council. M. Rolin replied that the text said "organization", which included the Security Council, and that this was really a question for Commission II. The Australian delegate remarked that he agreed with the text and thought it excellent.



The Delegate of Greece, in answer to a question from the Chair as to whether his comment had been one of form or substance, said that he wanted to know if there were two different texts to vote upon. He thought that a clearer text was needed.

The Delegate of Brazil asked if the text was final or liable to be changed later, and the Chairman explained that a vote would be taken on two paragraphs, <sup>using the English version.</sup> The vote was carried unanimously to adopt the text of the subcommittee on Chapter III, using the English version only.

The Delegate of Uruguay noted that withdrawal had not been covered in this text and the Chairman explained that the question ~~was~~ of suspension, expulsion and withdrawal did not come within the terms of reference, but should be sent to the Committee on Coordination for clearance as to which Committee should be concerned with this question.

M. Rolin referred to the U. S. Delegate's comment on withdrawal (Mr. Eden <sup>?</sup> had said that he had not discussed this with his delegation). The Constitution of the United States does not mention withdrawal--similarly it is taken for granted in Dumbarton Oaks that there shall be no withdrawal. If the United States wished to make an amendment concerning it, they should have made it earlier.

The Chairman spoke on behalf of the subcommittee. He wished to strengthen M. Rolin's remarks concerning withdrawal. The subcommittee had in mind the Covenant of the League which clearly mentioned withdrawal. This subject was omitted in Dumbarton Oaks since it was believed that in this new world organization withdrawal should be impossible.

The Delegate from Norway asked whether reports from drafting committees should not be placed on the table 24 hours before consideration, and he asked for a rule in the future. The Delegate from France said that at the meeting before last it was suggested that the question of neutrality should be referred to the First Committee and he requested that this be done now. The Chairman replied to Norway that the report was delivered by messenger yesterday morning to each delegation, and in reply to France's question, said that the question of neutrality had been referred to Committee 1.

The Delegate from Uruguay said that he wished the question of withdrawal to be put as number one on the Agenda of the next meeting. Uruguay had presented the fundamental proposal which must be given serious consideration. Positive law must be clearly expressed in the code. He rallied to Mr. Rolin's words on withdrawal--there must be a juridical basis for withdrawal--and he pointed out that the comparison of this Organization with the U.S. was not analogous. He emphasized the need for stating the proposal definitely and decisively in the Charter. Uruguay opposes withdrawal and wants the Charter to state specifically that no withdrawal is possible.



The Chairman remarked that the motion for placing an item on the Agenda had been seconded by Chile and that this motion for consideration could be debated by two speakers in favor and two opposed. He asked, however, that the day not be fixed but it be left to the Chairman to put this item on the Agenda at a convenient date.

The Delegate from the Netherlands suggested that no amendment had been put forward on this subject <sup>but</sup> ~~by~~ the Delegate from Uruguay replied that it had been.

The Delegate from Chile explained that he had seconded Uruguay and referred to Chile's experience in the League.

The United Kingdom representative opposed the motion as not being on a point of order. He thought it would be difficult if the procedure of allowing the Chairman to decide what would go on the Agenda were varied. He suggested that the rule be adhered to which allows the Chairman to decide on the Agenda.

The Delegate from Australia agreed in general with Uruguay and thought it wise to secure the substance of their amendment but that the method is for the Chairman and Coordinating Committee to decide.

On the principle of permanence of membership, he agreed but he thought that the particular amendment must be ~~xxxx~~ subject to the convenience of arrangements by the organs of the Organization. He particularly recommended that the question of the consideration of suspension and expulsion be ruled upon

by the Coordinating Committee.

A vote was taken on the motion of Uruguay to place on the Agenda the discussion of the question of withdrawal, the date to be fixed by the Chairman. This was unanimously approved.

The Chairman announced that the following two meetings would be devoted to consideration of Chapter IV (Principal Organs) and that a subcommittee would be appointed to draft a text for this Chapter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30.



*Seventh*  
MINUTES OF ~~EIGHTH~~ MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

May 15, 3:40 p.m.

The Chairman opened the meeting with the remark that the discussion of Chapter IV would be continued, that there would be no limit on the number of speakers, although he hoped they would preserve brevity and precision, and it was his purpose to hear all who wished to speak before closing debate.

The Delegate of Greece spoke to the motion of Uruguay and Brazil requiring provision in Chapter IV for placing women on an equal footing with men. He referred to the Belgian remark that this was unnecessary, since there was nothing in the Charter limiting or confining the right of women to be represented. He pointed out that it perhaps had been overlooked; that in Chapter X on the Secretariat, it was clearly stated that the Secretary-General should be a man "since it used the pronoun "he". In private law it is admitted that man embraces woman, but this is not the rule in public law, which says that the term "man" does not comprise both sexes.

The Delegate of Egypt reminded the Committee of the amendment of the four sponsoring powers which had been considered in Committee I/1. It provides for equality of race, language, religion and sex. He thought that since definite equality was already covered Uruguay would be satisfied with this. As far as Chapter IV was concerned, the Egyptian amendment would include the Social and Economic Council as

one of the principal organs. He said that this had been in the minds of the authors of Dumbarton Oaks and that they had considered the Council important enough to give it a whole chapter. If the Egyptian amendment is adopted, minor changes will be needed in other chapters. The Delegate of Mexico supported the amendment of Uruguay concerning the representation of women in different organs of the Organization and its agencies. She thought all should be open on a basis of equality of men and of women. She remarked that it had been said that specific mention was not needed but she felt that she must insist on having such rights mentioned in the Charter. When the text is vague, it lends itself to vague interpretations. In referring to the remark that the Belgian had made previously that if specific provision were made in one part of the Charter that where it was not mentioned in another part women would be excluded, she thought this was not true. She also wished to correct a statement that the League had not specifically provided for the inclusion of women. She referred to Article 7 of the Covenant, which states that appointments to the League are open to women on a basis of equality. She also referred to the International Conference of Labor which provides that in all questions dealing with labor problems where women are involved a woman is to be present as an adviser. She said that we should not now abandon the triumphs achieved so far, and if there is no mention specifically in the Charter now, it will



be a backward step. She emphasized the importance of the Organization to women and related to Uruguay's proposal which presented such "a lofty sense of human justice".

The Delegate of Ecuador on a point of order said that according to the agenda of this meeting the discussion should start on Paragraph 1 and then proceed to Paragraph 2 in order to expedite the approval of the chapter. He suggested that Chapter IV should include all organs already listed in the original draft plus those which might be constituted by the present conference. Although he had not summarized this proposal at the previous meeting, he wished to do so and proposed that the discussion proceed to Paragraph 1 first and then to Paragraph 2. After that, the discussion of the representation of women could come up. He added that the United Nations accepted equal rights as a matter of fact. The motion was seconded by Bolivia. The Chairman said that when the motion had been signed there would be a brief discussion with not more than two speakers for and two against.

The United Kingdom Delegate thought that the discussion could be expedited by considering the two main questions separately: (1) Should any organs be added to the list in Chapter 4; and (2) the position to be given formally to women in this chapter. He remarked on the almost universal assent that the Economic and Social Council should be one of the principal organs and thought that it would be a waste of time to discuss this. He suggested that the motion of Ecuador might be more simple if it were proposed that an Economic and

Social Council be added. He thought it would be difficult to add others hypothetically. The Delegate of Ecuador said he had in mind only the listing of the organs; that it was not within the jurisdiction of this Committee to decide which organs. Many delegations have suggested others, such as the educational and cultural, but Committee I/2 was not in a position to decide whether these were major or secondary organs. If the Economic and Social Council is included, it should be with the understanding that other organs may be created. The Chairman asked the Ecuadorian if his motion would bring his discussion to a close and the reply was that it would as far as paragraph 1 was concerned. The United Kingdom Delegate thought that if the Economic and Social Council were added it should be without prejudice to the addition of any other organization the Conference may decide upon. The Delegate of Australia supported the United Kingdom and thought that the question of equal status for women and the Social and Economic Council had been confused. He suggested that there should be a vote on the Economic and Social Council as a principal organ of the Organization, and that this be done without prejudice to any additional organs which might be created by the conference. This would not close discussion on Paragraph 1 but would preclude discussion of the status of women. The United Kingdom Delegate remarked that Uruguay proposed a new Paragraph 2, which was agreed to by Uruguay. The Delegate of Norway said that his Delegation favored any



any proposal that would strengthen the Social and Economic Council, but he wanted to make clear that this would not preclude a discussion of the relation between the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council. The United Kingdom Delegate reminded him that this was for another committee to discuss.

The Delegate of Greece pointed out that some delegations had expressed the opinion that the Social and Economic Council should be listed before the Court. It certainly should not be listed after the Secretariat, which would disparage its importance.

The Delegate of Belgium reminded the Committee that Committee II/3 on May 11 decided unanimously that the Social and Economic Council should be one of the principal organs and should be (c) immediately after the Security Council and before the Court and Secretariat, which would then become (d) and (e). The Chairman, speaking in the language of conciliation, requested Ecuador to withdraw his motion to bring the discussion on Paragraph 1 to a close. He pointed out that five proposals had been submitted:

1. Uruguay - concerning the rights of women to participate
2. Australia - Economic and Social Council
3. Mexico - to exclude the court as one of the principal organs
4. Cuba and Ecuador - amendment
5. Cuba - proposal concerning intellectual cooperation

The Delegate of Ecuador was not willing to withdraw his motion, since he proposed merely listing the organs that other

other committees would create. The Delegate of Cuba on a point of order said that the Cuban Delegation had submitted several amendments on Paragraph 1 but felt satisfied to have the Economic and Social Council as one of the principal organs and therefore did not object to the Ecuadorian motion. He referred the right on Paragraph 2 to refer to other amendments.

The Delegate of Ecuador said that it would clarify the situation still more if the Committee were to adopt the recommendation of Committee II/3 as to the order in which the organs should be listed.

The Delegate of Australia asked for an explanation as to whether in voting on Paragraph 1 the decision on the position of women would not be excluded. He supported the motion of Ecuador. The Delegate of Greece on a point of order said that he understood that in voting on Paragraph 1 he would also have to vote on the amendment of Uruguay as to equality. He thought the proper position for Uruguay's amendment was after Paragraph 2.

The Delegate of Haiti on a point of order asked for elucidation of the United Kingdom proposal. He asked whether it would not be possible to add other organs after agreeing to add the economic and social. The United Kingdom Delegate answered that the proposal was that there be added as a principal organ an Economic and Social Council, and this be resolved without prejudice to the addition of any other organs that might be created. The question of the position of women would come up as a separate paragraph.



The Chairman asked for a vote, but before this was taken the Delegate of Belgium said that he understood that the Uruguayan proposal had been modified in accordance with the decision of Committee II/3 and therefore with the permission of the United Kingdom representative he suggested that Committee I/2 support the decision of Committee II/3 concerning the inclusion of the Economic and Social Council among the principal organs without prejudice of any subsequent decision regarding the creation of further organs.

The vote was taken and passed with only one nay (Uruguay).

The Chairman proposed to appoint a subcommittee to draft this Chapter, but Australia rose to ask the continuation of the debate on the Uruguayan motion. The Chairman recognized the Australian Delegate, who said that if the Drafting Committee were appointed was it to draft a new paragraph 1 or a new Chapter IV. She asked for a continuation of the discussion of the Uruguayan proposal. The United Kingdom Delegate said that Paragraph 1 of the discussion had been closed, and that now the Committee should proceed to Paragraph 2 and consider the Uruguayan proposal. The Chairman in reply to Australia said that the discussion was now on Paragraph 2, Chapter IV.

The wording of the Uruguayan amendment is as follows:

"Representation and participation in the organs of the Organization shall be open both to men and women under the same conditions."

The Australian Delegate spoke in support of the amendment of Uruguay concerning the position of women. She said that her whole Delegation was entirely in sympathy with full

opportunities for women to participate under the same conditions as men, but as someone who had for years been interested in the position of women in different countries, she knew that laws were generally interpreted as applying to men only unless women were specifically included. She referred to the question of franchise. Nothing excluded women from voting, and yet it took many years of long agitation before they got the vote. There is prohibition in practically every country in the world against women holding certain positions. In Australia women are excluded from jury service because they are not specifically mentioned. They are also excluded from the diplomatic service on the grounds that the law does not say that such service shall extend to women. The need for this was exemplified in a conference held in New Zealand last November in which a special resolution was adopted, asking that the Four Freedoms be applied to women as well as to men. A conference in Melbourne had a similar resolution, and a cable signed by 66 women's organizations in Australia asked for specific mention in the Charter concerning equal responsibilities and opportunities. This wide-spread demand should not be disregarded. She believed specific mention necessary; that there was discrimination everywhere because there was not specific mention.

Concerning the remark that Chapter IV was not the proper place for this, she referred to the amendment of the four sponsoring powers which in Chapters I, V, and IX provide for non-discrimination because of race, language, religion or sex.



She maintained that in every other part of the Chapter this appeared as an aim and a pious expectation. If specific provision were made in Chapter IV, however, it would mean that the Organization would be in a position to put these words into effect. It would mean something practical, since this would create the machinery for providing equal opportunity. The general organization has responsibility for setting up a body. It must give women equal status.

She commented on the contribution that women would make and said that women could not be blamed for the three great tragedies that had taken place in our lifetime--World War 1, the depression, and World War 2. If women had been able to take part in the Council of Nations, it is quite possible that many of the crises would have been prevented.

She asked for the addition of two words in the proposal of Uruguay "and agencies" so that participation by women would be in all the organs and agencies of the Organization.

The Delegate of Brazil agreed that there was a need for more than the proposal of the four sponsoring powers. This is no a general principle. She agreed with Australia and supported her proposal. In answer to the arguments that had been presented by other members at previous meetings, she pointed out that it was necessary to mention women specifically, and pointed to the fact that it had taken 25 years in Brazil to get the vote, 60 years in the United States, and 70 in the United Kingdom because women were not specifically mentioned as being enfranchised. If one looked at the constitution of most countries, it would

be found that it would not be considered unnecessary to make a statement of what the rights of men are. If it is not unnecessary for them, why is it unnecessary for women? The argument that women are included in the term does not hold, since the use of this term has always resulted in women having no participation in public affairs. She said that the last two lines in English had tended to say "men and women" and President Roosevelt's speeches always referred to "men and women". She emphasized that if you want someone to have rights you must mention those rights. All rights have to be fought for. If men had to have rights explained, why not women?

She emphasized that the Uruguayan amendment would not interfere with the rights of nations in their laws concerning rights of women. This would merely say that the Organization accepts women as being on an equal basis as men. It does not obligate the governments to accept. She thought it was an obligation of the Organization to incorporate the participation of women in international organizations.

As far as Chapter IV itself was concerned, there was no legal reason for not stating here this principle that the Organization is willing to accept human beings without discrimination. She asked the rhetorical question of "why do we want it?" and replied that it was an obligation toward the future of humanity to work for a better world and more peaceful one. She spent some time discussing the contribution of women in achieving victory and the greater hardship of sending someone out to fight



instead of going one's self. She ended the speech with the statement that it is not a right but a duty that women participate in the international organization.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30.

Sent to Stewart 9:30 pm

6th Meeting

SUMMARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 314 5:20 p.m., May 14, 1945

1. Schedule of meetings.

The Chairman announced the <sup>new</sup> schedule of meetings for the ~~Committee~~ <sup>Committees</sup> next week which will be as follows:

Tuesday, May 15	3:30	Friday, May 18	10:30
Wed., May 16	8:30	Sat., May 19	3:30
Thurs., May 17	none		

2. Report of Drafting Committee on proposed text of Chapter III, Membership.

The Rapporteur presented the report of the subcommittee on Chapter III, Membership. It was explained that the text in its first paragraph defines those who are members at the outset, and in the second, those who will become members later. The subcommittee had agreed unanimously to retain the phrase "peace-loving nations", <sup>which had the approval</sup> ~~because it expressed so well the idea~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~of universality which so many delegations have approved.~~ No reference was made by the subcommittee to the requirement of democratic institutions, since this would imply an undue interference with internal arrangements. It was felt that the text should be a flexible one rather than an outline of specific criteria. <sup>by the Committee</sup> It was noted that the French translation of paragraph 2 in the subcommittee report was not wholly satisfactory from the standpoint of language. It was agreed that a revised French text should be submitted at a later date.

~~In answer to a question, the Chair ruled that the preamble, which had been discussed earlier, as well as the motion which~~



~~would be voted on in this Committee today, could be reopened in the Commission stage.~~

Decision: The Committee unanimously approved the English text submitted by the subcommittee on Chapter III, Membership, as follows:

"Members of the Organization are the signatories of the Charter whose ratification has become effective in accordance with Chapter XI.

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

2. Suspension of, and expulsion from, membership.

The Chairman explained that the question of suspension and expulsion did not come within the original terms of reference of this Committee, but that the matter had been discussed by the Presidents of Commissions I and II and referred by them to the Coordinating Committee for decision.

On the question of withdrawal ~~of membership~~ from the Organization the Chairman explained that the subcommittee had considered this matter, and was of the opinion that the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals deliberately omitted provisions for withdrawal in order to avoid the weakness of the League Covenant which had permitted withdrawal. The subcommittee was strongly of the opinion that withdrawal should be impossible.

The Delegate of Uruguay pointed out that Uruguay had presented a proposed amendment providing that universality and permanence of the Organization should prevent withdrawal from it. He recommended that an express prohibition against withdrawal of any member should be written into the Charter.

Decision: The Committee agreed to place on the agenda at a convenient date, to be fixed by the Chairman, the discussion of the question of withdrawal from the Organization.

3. Consideration of Chapter IV, Principal Organs.

The Chairman announced that a discussion of Chapter IV would be resumed at the next meeting and a subcommittee would be appointed to draft a text.

The Committee adjourned at 6:30.



*Detailed Draft*  
*File*  
THIRD MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

May 9, Room 213, Veterans Building, 5:15 p.m.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. He drew attention to the work of the Committee, which was to proceed with the amendments on Chapter III, IV, X, and XI, and suggested that the meeting should proceed in an orderly manner with no new matters being brought up at this time. He reminded the members of the need for amendments being submitted in writing.

The Chairman pointed out that he had requests to speak from seven states which he would recognize in the order of their requests, namely, Venezuela, Philippines, France, Mexico, Egypt, Chile, and the Netherlands.

The Delegate from Venezuela stated that his Government had made a very careful study of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals and on Chapter III had observed that the meaning was that the Organization should have universal scope. He said this was emphasized in the draft which his Government submitted recognizing that the International Organization should be a universal institution with all states regularly recognized as such and with an obligation to act in conformity with the basic principles of the Charter. He said he was in basic agreement with the Australian proposal--no state should have the right to break its link with the International Organization.

He suggested that the word "peace-loving" should be

replaced by one with wider scope such as indicated in the proposal of Australia.

Concerning universality, he stated his Government supports the position taken at Chapultepec which underlines the idea of future universality.

Venezuela proposed that the Australian proposal be reconciled with the concept of universality as recommended by Uruguay. In that case the proposal would begin with the words:

"In view of the actual interdependence of all countries in the modern world...."

The Chairman drew attention to the fact that the Netherlands Delegate was due to speak at another meeting and had requested permission to speak at a certain time. It was agreed that the Netherlands Delegate should be permitted to speak immediately.

The Delegate of the Netherlands agreed that in the future in admitting new members the Organization should try to become as universal as possible, but it would be necessary to have a maximum guarantee of the intention of the state to abide by the Charter. He pointed out the difficulty of establishing whether a state is peace-loving or not. He suggested that some rule should be inserted in the Charter indicating how states can be judged and recommended that two criteria be set up. One, the matter of political institutions of the state--it is not sufficient for a state to declare itself peace-loving. There is the fundamental relationship of state to citizens--the state should be the servant. The second criteria would be the observance of pacta sunt servanda. The state should furnish proof by its behavior that it will carry out international commitments.



He mentioned that there should be specific procedures for peaceful change included in the Charter in some place.

In regard to universal membership, while fully recognizing the ideal, he sounded a warning that there should be a very careful scrutiny before admitting all states, and this would require rules. Each request for admission should be dealt with on its own merit. The Dumbarton Oaks Organization is a free association and membership is not necessarily open to all, especially outlaw states.

The Philippine Delegate raised to make a motion. He said that in looking over the amendments he saw several points in which there was general agreement, as for example, that peace-loving is not a sufficient pre-requisite for admission. Everyone agrees that obedience to international law should be included, at least as one requirement. He wondered if it would not save time if the Chairman of the Committee appoint a small subcommittee to consolidate, coordinate and simplify the amendments and submit the simplified form to this Committee for its consideration. Only in this way could there be something concrete on which to vote. He therefore moved that a subcommittee be appointed by the Chairman for this purpose. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia seconded the motion. The Delegate of the United Kingdom stood to a point of order. He said that there could not be two motions before the Chair at one time and reminded the Committee that there was already a motion before it from Australia. The Philippine Delegate asked the Chair to refer to the records to see if a recommendation had previously been made by Australia. The Chair reminded the Committee

that any motion must be seconded. South Africa seconded it. South Africa explained that he understood that the procedure was that after each delegation had put forward its motion explaining the principle of its amendment, then there would be appointed a committee of delegates of the countries submitting motions plus the sponsoring powers and rapporteurs.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia understood the motion of the Philippine Delegate to mean that the Committee would hear all the amendments and then refer to the same gentlemen who are already familiar with the Chapter, the question of single text.

The Chairman consulted the Committee whether they wished to hear speeches or consider the motion of the Philippine Delegate. The Delegate of Mexico thought that time would be gained if the discussion were not continued but a subcommittee of the Delegates presenting amendments and the four sponsoring powers were set up. The Chairman stated that before recognizing the Delegate from the United Kingdom, he wished to draw attention to the fact that there were 17 nations plus four sponsoring powers. The Delegate from the United Kingdom said that he was eager to hear the delegations which had already asked to speak and he thought that the minds of the Committee would not be prepared until their views were heard. The Delegate from Belgium (Rolin) insisted that discussion should continue, that the Committee would not be able to work if it did not know the feeling of the entire Committee. Certain attitudes had already developed, for instance, the need for



universality. On the other hand, the concept of peace-loving states would have to be argued and the proposals of the sponsoring powers. There would be no useful purpose in appointing a subcommittee now. He moved to continue the discussion. The Delegate from Egypt supported the United Kingdom. The Delegate from the Philippines said he had not the slightest intention of depriving any delegate from expressing his view. He had already prepared a speech on his own amendment which he withdrew in order to present a motion to save time. He thought that observations and explanations could be presented when the subcommittee presented its report.

The Australian Delegate was not quite sure whether the Philippine Delegate had withdrawn his motion. He felt the Committee was doing the opposite of what the Philippine Delegate desired and submitted that the Committee was wasting time. He supported the United Kingdom and Belgium and thought the Committee should get on with its job. Every nation submitting an amendment has the right to explain and all the right to express their opinions. The subcommittee would be a committee of the majority and would then report back to the minority. He suggested that the final analysis would be the result of a drafting committee. The Delegate from Ecuador did not agree with the Philippine Delegate but suggested that the speeches be restricted to a discussion of principles rather than drafting and thought that two main points had been developed so far: (1) restricted or universal membership, (2) withdrawal or not.

The Delegate from Syria suggested that the Committee should let the Chairman preside. He suggested that the Philippine Delegate had been deprived of his speech and he would prefer to hear the speech and get something of substance. Mexico asked the Philippines to withdraw the proposals. The Delegate of the Philippines said the motion was made because other Committees had followed this procedure, and a small sub-committee gathered all the amendments and submitted them to the Committee.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom moved to a point of order that there was a previous motion before the Committee. The Chairman ruled that there was only one motion before the Committee and that was the Philippines. Vote was taken and there were only four votes in favor of the subcommittee so the motion was rejected.

The Delegate from France supported the Netherlands--felt the idea of universality was all very well but there are aggressor states and a cautious and firm line should be taken. It was essential that rules governing new members should be written down. The meaning of the French amendment<sup>which</sup> was not really an amendment, he explained, was an amplification of what is meant by peace-loving nations, a phrase that should be made more precise. He desired that countries admitted should give some proof of the spirit of peace. It was necessary that a condition of admission should be a guarantee of existence of certain



common ideals and political forms and customs. He raised the question of neutrality saying that this cannot be reconciled with a condition of membership. It implies understandings incompatible with neutrality. It is impossible for nations to take the juridical status of neutrality and thus avoid responsibility.

The Delegate from Mexico said the matter under discussion raised the problem far more important in the future--the question of universality. In 1937 in Geneva, Mexico voted against universality. Now they are voting on the question of principle. No state should have the right to remain outside the international community. He explained that this had been fully developed in the memorandum sent to the Secretariat.

Egypt would like to see the maintenance of a tendency toward universality and supported Uruguay. He thought that a condition of membership should be the moral character of the applicant, on which the Assembly will express judgment. In the final analysis the General Assembly will execute judgment on their character by a two-thirds vote. France and the Netherlands will both be in the Assembly. Each believe in the tendency toward universality and no expulsion. All nations make up the human family and cannot be allowed to withdraw. Although there may be a wolf in sheep's clothing, he cannot be kept outside the fold, others may join him and there may be a pack of wolves. The principle of universality should be maintained. Concerning the Australian amendment he thought that the qualifications of membership applying could be summed up by the

requiring of members to accept the obligations of the Charter. This should be sufficient. He wished to add to the Australian proposal the need for the acceptance of obligations and the judgment to be exercised by the Assembly.

"I second the proposal put forward by Australia: 'Membership of the United Nations shall be open to any state which accepts the obligations' and I should like to add: 'the aims of the Charter and which is admitted to membership in accordance with the Charter.'"

The Australian Delegate replied that he was prepared to accept the amendment.

The Delegate from Chile said there was general agreement among all Delegates re universality with the exception of France. There is also general agreement that the word "peace-loving" is more or less meaningless. Therefore the proposal of Australia solves it by requiring states to accept the "obligations" and as Egypt adds "the aims of the Charter". The Delegate from Chile pointed out that all countries, even totalitarian countries, are ready to accept obligations. To the proposal of the French Delegate should be added:

"Membership of the Organization shall be open to all peace-loving states which offer proof by their institutions, international behavior, political customs, that they will respect their international obligations."

He referred to the Netherlands proposals which required that three conditions be fulfilled: (1) the government should be made by law, (2) limitation of authority by the state, (3) equality between men and nations.

The Delegate of Belgium spoke briefly on points on which there was need to vote at the next meeting.



(1) Is the Committee of the opinion or not that the Organization should be universal, possibly providing conditions of recommendation of the majority of members and conditions of diplomatic relations of governments desiring to participate actively in the Organization.

(2) Is the Committee of the opinion that the states or governments should be admitted as members?

(3) Shall we limit ourselves to states and governments or return to the terminology used at Geneva--states, dominions, and colonies.

(4) Is the Committee of the opinion that the only words to be taken into consideration by the Assembly are that a state shall be a peace-loving state.

(5) Is the Committee of the opinion that it would be necessary to ask a state to undertake to comply with the Charter or ask guarantees that this should be the case.

(6) Is the Committee of the opinion that members to be admitted are states? Does this Committee wish that the nature of their institutions be mentioned?

(7) Is the Committee of the opinion that neutrality should be referred to and included under Chapter III rather than Chapter II? M. Rolin suggested that there should be no votes taken now but the memorandum should be circulated to the Committee. The Chairman announced that two delegations had asked to speak: Haiti and the United Kingdom. He also remarked that the schedule of meetings as now set up is:

Thursday	2:45
Friday	10:30
Saturday	8:30

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT OF FOURTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 314, May 10, 1945, 2:50 p.m.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:50 p.m.

Rules of Procedure

The Chairman outlined some rules of procedure for expediting the work of the Committee.

Continuation of Discussion on Chapter III

The Delegate of Haiti called attention to the proposal of his Government concerning the principle of racial non-discrimination which, although it properly came under Chapter II, was nevertheless closely related to Chapter III. He indicated his approval of the idea of universality as a goal for the Organization.

The Delegate from the United Kingdom emphasized that the provision concerning membership should be flexible and should not attempt precise definition of qualifications of membership. He pointed out that the words "peace-loving" had been enshrined in the Moscow Declaration and that they



do imply a consideration of past behavior. He offered the following text as a substitute for Chapter III:

"Membership of the Organization should be open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to accept the obligations contained in the Charter."

He reminded the Committee that the text suggested would impose upon the Council and the Assembly an obligation to consider in full the qualifications of new members. He stated that if the Delegate of Australia was prepared to withdraw his motion he would move the adoption of the United Kingdom text.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union opposed any amendment embodying the principle of universality as being attainable only in the distant future. He felt that the text of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals was sufficiently clear and precise to require no change and added that the provisions of Chapter V, Section B, paragraph 2, would constitute a sufficient safeguard in the admission of new members.



The Delegate from Australia withdrew his motion in order to permit the Delegate of the United Kingdom to move his revised text of Chapter III with the qualification that the word "principles" be inserted after the word "accept" so that the text would read as follows:

"Membership of the Organization should be open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to accept the principles and obligations contained in the Charter."

The Delegate from the United Kingdom moved his revised text with the word added by Australia. This was seconded by the Delegate from the United States.

Several delegates spoke in support of the proposal of the United Kingdom. In answer to a question, the delegate from the United Kingdom explained that the phrase "able and ready to accept the obligations contained in the Charter" implied ability to fulfil these obligations.



It was suggested that the records of the discussion of this Committee concerning universality of membership and of other general principles should be preserved for the use of future students of the Organization.

It was pointed out by the Delegate of Ecuador that the two points of view which had developed in the discussion, namely, universality of membership and restricted membership, were not far apart, since universality could not be achieved until sometime in the future.

It was then moved and seconded on a point of order that the Chairman appoint a drafting committee to consider the amendments and suggestions on membership and that all those speakers who had not yet presented their views should do so in writing to the drafting committee.

The delegate from the Philippines explained that his government prefers the word "nation" to "state" inasmuch as the term "state" would not allow the Philippines to become a member

---



of this Organization at this time. He recommended that there be two kinds of membership, the original signatories which would be the United Nations, and then any other peace-loving or law-abiding state or nation which hereafter might be admitted in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

After some discussion the motion to appoint a sub-committee was put to a vote and carried without opposition.

DECISION: That debate on Chapter III (Membership)  
be closed and a sub-committee appointed to consider the  
amendments and comments on Chapter III.

The Chairman pointed out that there were three main questions to be considered by the drafting committee:

(1) universality, (2) the definition of "peace-loving" and (3) the difference between "state and government" or "nation and state". He announced that he would appoint a small drafting committee at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



REPORT OF FIFTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

May 11, 1945 Veterans Building, Room 314 10:45 a.m.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m.

In accordance with the agreement reached at the last meeting, the Chairman ~~was~~ appointed a subcommittee to draft a text for Chapter III; the subcommittee to include the Chairman of Committee I/2, the President of Commission I, the Delegate from Haiti (Rapporteur), and the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Netherlands, Ecuador, Syria and the Philippines. The subcommittee is to meet May 11, at 3 o'clock in room 316.

Mr. Rolin on a "point of order" moved that the Committee proceed to consideration of the conditions for expulsion from membership. The motion was seconded by the Delegate from Egypt. After some discussion, it was agreed that the Committee might consider suspension together with expulsion. Mr. Rolin (Belgium) again referred to the exchange of correspondence between himself as President of Commission I, and Field Marshal Smuts, President of Commission II, concerning the distribution of work between the two Commissions. He reminded the Committee that they had suggested that the first Commission consider the conditions under which the State would be admitted, suspended or expelled from the Organization, and that Commission II would consider the competence of organs to vote upon these matters.



The Delegate from Uruguay asked if it would be possible for the subcommittee to consider the three important matters relating to membership, namely, (1) principle of universality, (2) permanence of membership, and (3) the obligation or compulsion of remaining within the Organization. He felt that the drafting committee was fully authorized to consider these questions, but if it was not so authorized, the full Committee should consider these matters. The Delegates of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union opposed the motion of Mr. Rolin. They felt that suspension and expulsion were not within the competence of this Committee.

The motion of Mr. Rolin was rejected by the Committee.

The Delegate from Uruguay spoke in behalf of the amendment of her delegation that participation and representation in the Organization and its agencies should be open to men and women on a basis of equality. She did not defend this amendment as a principle but rather in recognition of the fact that in her country positions in all fields were open to women. The Delegate of Egypt raised a "point of order". He suggested that the Committee would go outside of its terms of reference if they were to discuss this amendment. The Chairman replied that he felt that the discussion was on the general principles of Chapter IV and suggested that the Delegate of Egypt withdraw his motion. The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that he felt that this was a "point of order" of some little substance. He suggested that the Committee should proceed immediately to consider each of the amendments submitted on this Chapter one by one, and expressed the hope that the discussions should



be concluded within a half hour. After some discussion of this point of order, the matter was dropped.

The Delegate of Brazil spoke in behalf of the amendment of Uruguay. She pointed out to the Committee that a similar amendment had been submitted by the Delegations of Brazil, Mexico, and the Dominican Republic under Chapter V. She stated that these amendments resulted from consultation between the women delegates of Latin American countries and a few others, including Australia, and of representatives of the women's organizations which were attending the Conference as consultants to the United States delegation. She said that although it was recognized that women had equal rights nevertheless a specific reference to this right in the Charter was essential. She spoke of the particular interest of women in the establishment of an organization for the preservation of peace.

The Delegate of Ecuador stated that his delegation had submitted an amendment to this Chapter for the inclusion of the Economic and Social Council and the Educational and Cultural Council, among the principal organs. He was supported by Mr. Rolin. He suggested, however, that the best procedure for the Committee would be to submit a memorandum stating that Chapter III, Section 1, should list all organizations which were designated principle organs by other Committees of the Conference. The Delegate of Haiti, while expressing sympathy for the amendment of Uruguay, saw no need for a special amendment to this effect. Mr. Rolin also felt that the amendment was unnecessary and that the interests of women would be ill-served by



such a proposal.

The Delegate of Cuba pointed out that his delegation had submitted an amendment for the inclusion of a Council of Intellectual Cooperation among the principal organs. Helms also supported the suggestion of the Delegate of Ecuador. In respect to the amendment of Uruguay, he expressed his sympathy for its purposes, but pointed out that it was not necessary.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.



REPORT OF SECOND MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

May 8, 1945 10:45 a.m.

Room 303, Veterans Building

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m. He commented on the total cessation of hostilities of war in Europe, and stated that at 11 o'clock by agreement of the officers of the Conference one minute of silence would be observed.

The Chairman explained that at an informal meeting of the officers of the Commissions and Committees it was decided to incorporate the 27 amendments of the sponsoring powers in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposal. In order to expedite the work of the Conference, he asked for the opinion of the Committee on this matter.

The delegate from Mexico favored this proposal, and suggested that the amendments of the sponsoring powers should have some right of priority. His remarks met with the approval of the delegate from Honduras.

The delegate from Egypt agreed that this procedure would expedite the work, but he pointed out that the question of voting had not yet been agreed upon. He pointed out that certain vital parts of the draft can be rejected only by a two-thirds majority. He favored embodying the 27 amendments in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, but thought they should be considered on the same basis as other amendments.



The delegate from Australia opposed the suggestion of the officers of Commissions and Committees. He thought that the amendments of the sponsoring powers should be considered on the same basis as those of other States, since the 27 amendments were not part of the agenda before the Conference so called.

The delegate from Cuba agreed with the delegate from Mexico and pointed out that the amendments of the sponsoring powers covered some of the amendments of other States. He suggested, however, that the Committee start with discussion of Chapter III to which no amendments had been offered by the sponsoring powers, so that this question would be avoided for the time being.

The delegate from New Zealand supported the Australian position.

The delegate from Belgium agreed that the proposal would expedite the work of the Conference. He stated that he did not understand the working of this Conference however, in which questions were put to the Committees first before going to the Steering Committee. He doubted whether this procedure may have speed.

He pointed out that the question of voting on amendments did not come up when the matter of embodying the 27 amendments into the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals had been considered by the officers of the Commissions and Committees. He favored going ahead with the discussion



since the amendments of the sponsoring powers were not concerned with membership.

The delegate from the Netherlands supported the Australian position. He pointed out that the amendments of the sponsoring powers had only recently been distributed. He suggested that the Committee proceed to discussion of Chapter III while the Steering Committee reached a decision on the matter.

The delegate from the United Kingdom pointed out that the matter should go back to the Steering Committee. He saw no reason why this Committee should not proceed immediately to Chapters III and IV.

The delegate from Ecuador stated that the 27 amendments had not been included in the agenda before the Conference convened. He supported the Australian position and agreed that the Committee should proceed to discussion of Chapter IV.

The motion of the delegate of the United Kingdom was seconded by the delegate from Czechoslovakia. The Committee unanimously voted to terminate this discussion and to proceed to Chapters III and IV.

The Chairman pointed out that a decision was needed on the matter of Chapter IV, Principal Organs. The question was whether the whole Chapter should be considered in principal, or whether only the reference to the Secretariat should be considered.

The delegate from Egypt stated that the Committee should concern itself with all of the principal organs and should consider the whole Chapter in principal.

The delegate from the United Kingdom raised a point of order. He asked that the Chairman proceed to Chapter III immediately. His motion was seconded by the delegate from Brazil.

The Chairman stated that he was in agreement with this motion, but pointed out that the 15 amendments to Chapter III were not in his possession at the present time.

The delegate from Honduras pointed out that the Committee could proceed to Chapter IV since the amendments were of a simple nature. The Chairman stated that the Committee would proceed to Chapter III.

The delegate from Australia spoke in behalf of the amendment to Chapter III offered by his delegation. He pointed out that the words "peace loving" used in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals were open to misunderstanding, and that clarification was essential. He felt that the procedure established for the admittance of States would insure the inclusion of only those accepting the obligations of the Charter.

The delegate from Norway spoke in behalf of the amendment of his delegation. He also felt that there was a need for clarification of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals on this point.



The delegate from Uruguay spoke in support of universal and compulsory membership. He felt that no State should be free to enter or leave the Organization as it pleased. He also suggested that a clear, precise definition of the criterion required for admission to the Organization was necessary.

The Chairman stated that the Committee would proceed to six additional statements on membership at its meeting May 9.

*Detailed draft  
for Secretariat use*

REPORT OF FIRST MEETING  
of  
COMMISSION I/2

Veterans' Building, Room 303, May 5, 1945, 3:15 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica), at 3:15 p.m.

Fellow delegates, following the decision of May 3, taken by the Chairman and officers of Commission I, we are holding our first meeting today. You have the minutes of that meeting before you. A great number of you ~~were~~ in attendance here were at that meeting.

It is unnecessary for me to underline the importance of our Committee.

The Chairman expressed the gratitude of his country for the appointment of Costa Rica to the Chairmanship and promised to do his best. He stressed the importance of expediting the work of the Committee.

The Chairman introduced the two Rapporteurs and the Secretary, who in turn introduced the Associate Executive Officers of Commission I and the Assistant Secretaries of Committee I/2. The Chairman explained that the Committee was composed of one or more representatives of each delegation. As regards the procedure of meetings, he suggested that this Committee should follow the rules fixed by the President of Commission I, Mr. Rolin, at the meeting of May 3. The Chairman pointed out that the terms of reference of this Committee were Chapters III, IV, X and XI of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. Chapter IV includes other questions which are not within the jurisdiction of this Committee. This Committee will deal only with the Secretariat



and other subsidiary organs. The Chairman further explained that the Committee must decide on the important question of relating to what matters fall within its jurisdiction, and within the jurisdiction of Committee II/1. Chapter V includes Admission, Suspension and Expulsion of Members. The Presidents of Commissions I and II, Mr. Rolin and Field Marshal Smuts, decided that the principles, conditions of admittance, and considerations of suspension and expulsion would be within the jurisdiction of Committee I/2. The competence of organs to decide on these matters would come within the jurisdiction of Committee II/2. The Chairman referred to a letter from Mr. Rolin to Field Marshal Smuts in which this recommendation was stated.

Mr. Rolin explained that he and Field Marshal Smuts had reached a tentative agreement on this matter and that they merely made this as a suggestion which, if agreeable to the two Committees concerned, they would refer to the Steering Committee for ratification.

The delegate from New Zealand stated that his country has an amendment to the effect that the Assembly should decide on the restitution of membership. He asked what Committee would be concerned with this matter.

Mr. Rolin said that Commission II, dealing with the Assembly, would take up this matter;

There was no objection to the suggestion made by Mr. Rolin and Field Marshal Smuts.

The Secretary explained that the basic documents of the Committee are the Dumbarton Oaks and Chinese Proposals and the comments submitted thereon by the governments, prior to midnight Friday, May 4. She explained that an index to these comments is being prepared and that all of the comments will be put together in one volume for the convenience of the delegates. She further explained that the Secretariat is at the disposal of the Committee in aiding its work, but that it would be ~~help~~ helpful if all delegates would bring such documents as they need to all meetings. The delegate from Brazil asked the meaning of the word "general" as it related to Committee I/2. The Chairman replied that this word covered matters dealing with in Chapters IV, X and XI.

The delegate from Egypt said that his delegation was offering an amendment making an Economic and Social Council a principal organ. And he wished to direct the attention of the Committee to this matter at this time. Mr. Rolin answered that other delegations were submitting similar amendments and that as a consequence there would be too important Councils, one dealing with specific cooperation and the second with the Security Council. This matter has already been taken up by Committee II/3 and Mr. Rolin said that he would speak further with Field Marshal Smuts. The detailed functions of the Economic and Social Council are within the jurisdiction of Commission II. He suggested that it would be wise to wait until that Commission terminates its



change their representation on the Committees. <sup>As</sup> ~~if~~/there are so many amendments, might it not be possible to make a preliminary sorting so that Committee members could get down to work immediately? The Chairman agreed with these comments and suggested that the Committee would have a clear understanding of its work by Tuesday.

The Chairman then commented on the procedure to be followed. He suggested that the meetings should open with a brief statement by the Rapporteur summarizing the work in hand, followed by comments from delegates who have submitted amendments, speaking in alphabetical order, and ~~that~~ then comments from other delegates, in g' alphabetical order.

The delegate from Greece did not favor following alphabetical order. He agreed that such procedure was satisfactory in large meetings; but in committee meetings such as this, where an interchange of views was necessary, such a procedure would be awkward. Therefore he recommended that the Chairman recognize speakers expressing a desire to speak on a particular point. The Chairman replied that his rule was to apply only if there was some ~~conflict~~ <sup>in</sup> conflict, but that here, as in other Committees, the suggestion of the delegate from Greece would be followed. He also pointed out that his rule might be followed in cases where several delegates asked for permission to speak before the convening of a meeting. In such a case he would follow the alphabetical order.

The delegate from Greece said that while he did not wish to press his point, he felt that in this latter case, the order in which the delegates applied would be a more satisfactory order to follow. The delegate from The Netherlands supported the view of the delegate from Greece. Otherwise the Committee would put debate in a harness. It would be more efficient to follow the usual procedure. The Chairman again said that he would use the alphabetical order only in those rare cases where there might otherwise be conflict and that the debate at the next meeting would not follow alphabetical order.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.



*Com. signed 4:15, Summary by Mr. Rolin at 8:10, sent in 8:15*

SUMMARY REPORT OF FIRST MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
Veterans' Building, Room 303, May 5, 1945, 3:15 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica), at 3:15 p.m.

The Chairman explained that the first meeting of Committee 2 of Commission I was being held in accordance with the decision of the President and other officers of Commission I taken on May 3. He expressed the gratitude of his country for the appointment of Costa Rica to the chairmanship of the Committee. The Chairman also stressed the importance of expediting the work of the Committee.

The Chairman introduced the two Rapporteurs, Mr. Liataud (Haiti) who was attending on behalf of Mr. Lescot, and Sayyid Jamil Daud (Saudi Arabia). The Chairman then presented the Secretary of the Committee, Miss Elizabeth Armstrong, who in turn presented the Associate Executive Officers of Commission I and the Assistant Secretaries of Committee 2.

The Chairman suggested that the Committee follow the rules of procedure which had been recommended at the meeting of the officers of Commission I on May 3 by Mr. Rolin, the President, ←

The Chairman pointed out that the terms of reference of Committee I/2 were Chapters III, IV, X and XI of the

Dumbarton Oaks Proposals dealing respectively with Membership, the Secretariat, and Amendments, together with relevant comments and observations on the subject matters of these sections, made in the official comments and observations of governments participating in the present Conference.

A matter of overlapping jurisdiction between Committee I/2 and Committee II/1 was <sup>noted</sup> ~~brought to attention~~ by the Chairman. Chapter V, which had been assigned to Committee II/1, included admission and suspension of members. The President of the Commission explained that since this was a matter related directly to Membership, he and the President of Commission II had consulted together and recommended that the provisions of Chapter V dealing with admission and suspension and expulsion of members should be assigned to Committee I/2, and that questions as to the competence of organs to decide on such matters, and as to voting, should be taken up by Committee II/1. If the Committees concerned agreed to this decision, the Presidents of the two Commissions would recommend to the Steering Committee that this clarification of the terms of reference be validated. The Committee agreed to the recommendation of the Presidents.

The Chairman explained that there would probably be three meetings a week, on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, in the afternoon. The next meeting would be held



on Tuesday, May 8, at an hour to be announced.

In regard to the possibility of having a list of all amendments to be considered by this Committee, it was pointed out that approximately fifty proposals had been received in the last twenty-four hours and that time would be required for translations, reproduction of copies, compilation and indexing. It was suggested, therefore, that in the meantime, the delegates take notes on such amendments as had been submitted and that the Chairman indicate in the Agenda of the Committee the topics which he proposed to take up at each meeting.

2 After discussion of the procedure to be followed in considering the commentaries and proposals of governments, it was agreed that delegates would speak in the order in which they asked for recognition, except that in rare instances where conflict might arise, the alphabetical order in English would be followed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15.

Doc. 142  
I/2/2 May 6, 1945

SUMMARY REPORT OF FIRST MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans' Building, Room 303, May 5, 1945, 3:15 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica), at 3:15 p.m.

The Chairman explained that the first meeting of Committee 2 of Commission I was being held in accordance with the decision of the President and other officers of Commission I taken on May 3. He expressed the gratitude of his country for the appointment of Costa Rica to the chairmanship of the Committee. The Chairman also stressed the importance of expediting the work of the Committee.

The Chairman introduced the two Rapporteurs, Mr. <sup>Liautaud</sup> ~~Liaud~~ (Haiti) who was attending on behalf of Mr. Lescot, and Sayyid Jamil Daud (Saudi Arabia). The Chairman then presented the Secretary of the Committee, Miss Elizabeth Armstrong, who in turn presented the Associate Executive Officers of Commission I and the Assistant Secretaries of Committee 2.

The Chairman suggested that the Committee follow the rules of procedure which had been recommended at the meeting of the officers of Commission I on May 3 by Mr. Rolin, the President.

The Chairman pointed out that the terms of reference of Committee I/2 were Chapters III, IV, X and XI of the



Dumbarton Oaks Proposals dealing respectively with Membership, the Secretariat, and Amendments, together with relevant comments and observations on the subject matters of these sections, made in the official comments and observations of governments participating in the present Conference.

A matter of overlapping jurisdiction between Committee I/2 and Committee II/1 was <sup>noted</sup> ~~brought to attention~~ <sup>at the Conference</sup> by the Chairman. Chapter V, which had been assigned to Committee II/1, included admission and suspension of members. The President of the Commission explained that since this was a matter related directly to Membership, he and the President of Commission II had consulted together and recommended that the provisions of Chapter V dealing with admission and suspension and expulsion of members should be assigned to Committee I/2, and that questions as to the competence of organs to decide on such matters, and as to voting, should be taken up by Committee II/1. If the Committees concerned agreed to this decision, the Presidents of the two Commissions would recommend to the Steering Committee that this clarification of the terms of reference be validated. The Committee agreed to the recommendation of the Presidents.

The Chairman explained that there would probably be three meetings a week, on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, in the afternoon. The next meeting would be held

on Tuesday, May 8, at an hour to be announced.

In regard to the possibility of having a list of all amendments to be considered by this Committee, it was pointed out that approximately fifty proposals had been received in the last twenty-four hours and that time would be required for translations, reproduction of copies, compilation and indexing. It was suggested, therefore, that in the meantime, the delegates take notes on such amendments as had been submitted and that the Chairman indicate in the Agenda of the Committee the topics which he proposed to take up at each meeting.

2 After discussion of the procedure to be followed in considering the commentaries and proposals of governments, it was agreed that delegates would speak in the order in which they asked for recognition, except that in rare instances where conflict might arise, the alphabetical order in English would be followed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15.



SUMMARY REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
Veterans Building, Room 303, 10:45 a.m., May 23, 1945

The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr. Bonilla Lara, at 10:45 a.m.

The Chairman outlined procedures for accelerating the work of the Committee in order that it may be able to report to the Commission at the earliest opportunity.

1. Report of the Rapporteur

The Rapporteur, Mr. Lescot (Haiti), reported on the discussion and decisions taken by the subcommittee on the question of withdrawal.

Decision: The Committee agreed to accept the report of the subcommittee.  
(See Document 529, I/2/33, May 23, 1945)

2. Consideration of Chapter X

The Chairman presented a plan for expediting discussion of this chapter and pointed out <sup>that since no amendments</sup> ~~there was no need~~ <sup>had been of them</sup> ~~for discussion or vote on the question of the creation~~

of a secretariat and provision for a Secretary-General, <sup>there would be no need for a discussion or vote on</sup> ~~The Committee discussed the question of the election~~

of the Secretary-General. Attention was called to the decision of Committee II/1, approving a motion stating that the Secretary-General should be elected by the General Assembly upon nomination by the majority of seven members of the Security Council. Several delegates suggested that nomination by the Security Council should not

require unanimity of the five permanent members and that the Assembly should have the right to reject the name of any candidate for Secretary-General. The delegate of the United Kingdom pointed out that since the same countries were represented on both Committees I/2 and II/1, that the decision of Committee I/2 might be expected to be the same as II/1.

Decision: The Committee agreed that in view of the fact that the method of election of the Secretary-General has been discussed and a decision taken in Committee II/1 this Committee <sup>did</sup> not, therefore, propose to enter into a further discussion of this matter.

The approval of this resolution was understood by the Committee as not constituting approval of <sup>the</sup> substance of the decision of Committee II/1.

The next question under consideration was the term of office of the Secretary-General. It was noted that Committee II/1 had considered this question and had voted approval of the amendment of the four sponsoring governments that the Secretary-General should be elected by the Assembly for a period of three years and that he should be eligible for re-election. The delegate of Uruguay withdrew <sup>the</sup> Uruguayan amendment for a five-year term of office for the Secretary-General.

Several delegates favored the omission <sup>from</sup> the Charter of <sup>a</sup> specific term of office for the Secretary-General, stating that the organization itself should deal with such ad-



ministration<sup>ve</sup> details. Some delegates indicated that they<sup>d</sup> would favor a longer term of office, <sup>as making for</sup> which they believed would result in greater efficiency. There was also some discussion of the term "election," which according to some delegates, conveys the idea of representation. It was explained that the Secretary-General is to be chief administrative officer, not a political representative; he <sup>will</sup> belongs to the international community and his loyalty <sup>would be</sup> is to the Organization.

The delegate of the United States proposed that in view of the fact that Committee II/1 had discussed and ruled on the questions of term of office and re-eligibility of the Secretary-General, ~~for re-election, that the Committee~~ <sup>should</sup> not discuss further or rule on these two questions. I/2

Discussion ensued on the intention and scope of this resolution. After several delegates had expressed the feeling that this resolution would restrict the freedom of the Committee to make recommendations on subjects within its competence, the resolution was withdrawn.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT OF FOURTEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2  
Veterans Building, Room 213, 6:15 p.m., May 26, 1945

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Bonilla Lara (Costa Rica) at 6:15 p.m.

1. Consideration of Rapporteur's Report on Chapter III

The Rapporteur, Mr. Lesot (Haiti), read a report summarizing the Committee's consideration of and decisions on membership, including the criteria and conditions of membership, withdrawal, suspension, and expulsion. After some discussion it was decided that, while the Committee agreed in principle with the report, the report should be further clarified and amplified and brought back to the Committee for a second reading.

In the course of the discussion the Soviet delegate stated that his delegation is communicating with the Executive Committee on the interpretation of the vote on the issue of expulsion which was taken in Committee I/2 on May 25. *The Chairman asked Mr. Rolin, President of Commission I, to take the chair, and* Mr. Bonilla Lara, speaking in his capacity as the delegate of Costa Rica, explained the matter of his casting the deciding vote in the special subcommittee on Chapter III.

*Mr. Rolin, as Chairman, ruled.* *since*  
~~The President of the Commission explained that~~ all provisions of the text of the Charter require a 2/3

majority to be adopted, *the vote of 15 to 13 by the Committee on May 24, of 15 to 13 on the question of reporting specifically to the Charter to Deputy Secretaries General was not sufficient for adoption*  
The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.



SUMMARY REPORT OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING OF COMMITTEE I/2

Veterans Building, Room 303, May 22, 3:45 P.M.

The meeting of the Committee was opened <sup>with</sup> by Mr. Rolin,  
President of Commission I, acting as Chairman.

1. Report of the Rapporteur on Chapter X.

The Committee was informed that the subcommittee on  
Chapter X had not completed its work and its report would  
be forthcoming after its next meeting.

2. Consideration of Chapter XI. (Amendments)

The discussion on Chapter XI continued from the previous  
meeting at which the Australian delegate had proposed <sup>the appointment of</sup> ~~that~~ a  
subcommittee consisting of fifteen members, including dele-  
gates of those nations which have submitted proposals on  
Chapter XI, ~~be appointed~~.

In discussing Chapter XI and the amendment of the  
Sponsoring Powers, several delegates emphasized that, if the  
veto applied to amendments, it would be necessary to differen-

tiate between amendments on purposes and principles of the Organization and on the rules governing the action of the Security Council, and other matters not affecting the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council. It was explained by several delegates opposed to the amending procedure suggested in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals and modified by the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers that <sup>the latter</sup> ~~such an~~ amending procedure ~~proposed by the Sponsoring Powers~~ was too inflexible. It was pointed out that <sup>any</sup> ~~even~~ one of the permanent members of the Council acting alone <sup>would</sup> ~~might~~ be able to prevent revision of the Charter. Several of the delegates argued on behalf of the qualified majority for ratification. Some delegates stated their preference for a periodic review of the Charter, while another delegate <sup>felt</sup> ~~said~~ that the Assembly could serve adequately as a public forum for the preliminary discussion of amendments.



It was stated that the <sup>entry</sup> coming into force of amendments would affect the sovereignty of states, and one delegate <sup>expressed</sup> offered the opinion that his State would accept the proposition that amendments might come into force before being ratified by all states concerned.

~~In defending the procedure for amendment discussed by the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals and the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers,~~ Several delegates argued that the amending procedure should be consistent with the principles on which the Charter is based; that is, that the permanent members of the Security Council will have special responsibility to carry out ~~these~~ vital decisions of the Organization; that a <sup>more</sup> ~~flexible~~ flexible procedure for amendment would undermine the stability of the Organization; that ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> amending procedure which might lead to placing very great responsibilities on the permanent members of the Security Council without their approval might lead to reopening the question of withdrawal.

The Cuban delegation proposed that paragraph three of the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers might be divided into four questions and each one discussed and voted upon in the Committee. This proposal was seconded by the United States and United Kingdom, and it was suggested that a vote might be taken on this question in this Committee.

After several speakers had expressed the arguments for and against Chapter XI of Dumbarton Oaks and the amendment of the Sponsoring Powers, the Chairman ruled that the discussion was closed. A vote was taken on the Australian motion.

Decision: The Committee agreed, by a vote of 19 to 18,  
that a special subcommittee of 15 members,  
including those who have submitted proposals  
for the amendment of Chapter XI, be appointed  
to consider the proposed amendments and sug-  
gestions made in discussion, and to report



to the Committee.

3. Appointment of Subcommittee

The Chairman announced that the subcommittee would include the President of Commission I, the Chairman of Committee I/2, the Rapporteur (Saudi Arabia) and delegates of *the* United Kingdom, *Soviet Union*, China, United States, France, Norway, Australia, Brazil, Ecuador, Canada, Mexico, Venezuela.

~~A meeting is scheduled for 2:20 on May 30.~~

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.