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HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Monday, 18 August 1947, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. F. El-Khoury (Syria).

Present: The representatives of the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Poland, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America.

308. Provisional agenda (document S/496)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Report to the Security Council of the Committee on the Admission of New Members (document S/479).

309. Adoption of the agenda

The President: We have received an application for membership in the United Nations from the representative of Pakistan. In order to introduce this item into our agenda for today, I should like the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Legal Affairs to read the application (document S/498).

Mr. Kerno (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Legal Affairs): The text of the cable of 15 August 1947 addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Government of Pakistan is as follows:

"On behalf of the Government of Pakistan, I have the honour to say that in my Government's view both the Dominions of India and Pakistan should become Members of the United Nations, automatically, with effect from 15 August. If,

See Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, Special Supplement No. 3.

309. Adoption of the order of the day

The President (translated from the English): Nous avons reçu une demande d'admission émanant du représentant du Pakistan. Afin de faire figurer cette question à l'ordre du jour de la présente séance, je vais prier Monsieur le Secrétaire général adjoint chargé des questions juridiques de donner lecture de cette demande (document S/498).

M. Kerno (Secrétaire général adjoint chargé des questions juridiques) (translated from the French): Voici le texte du télégramme, en date du 15 août 1947, adressé au Secrétaire général par le Ministre des Affaires étrangères du Pakistan:

"Au nom du Gouvernement du Pakistan, j'ai l'honneur de porter à votre connaissance que mon Gouvernement considère que les deux Dominions de l'Inde et du Pakistan devraient devenir automatiquement Membres de l'Orga-
However, this view is not accepted, I hereby apply for the admission of Pakistan as a Member of the United Nations. Pakistan is prepared to accept the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

The President: If there is no objection, I suggest that we insert this item on today's agenda.

Colonel Hodgson (Australia): I am not speaking on this particular point, but I should like to invite the attention of the President and the other members of the Council to the order of the meetings that are planned. I gather that the original intention of the President was that there should be another meeting tomorrow morning, on the admission of new Members. Of course, it all depends on the progress we make this afternoon, but my Government has in mind the urgency of the Indonesian question. We think it would be preferable to have a meeting tomorrow morning on the Indonesian question instead of on the question of new Members, because, according to our calculations, the time limit for the Council's report on new Members is 21 or 22 August—that is, Thursday or Friday—depending on the way in which the stipulated period of twenty-five days is calculated. We suggest that the second meeting on this subject should be held later this week and that a meeting on the Indonesian question should be held tomorrow.

The President: I do not think the remarks of the representative of Australia have any bearing on the agenda which we are now discussing. After the adoption of the agenda, he will have the opportunity to discuss the matter he has in mind.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I had intended to raise the question mentioned here by the Australian representative in connexion with the discussion of the agenda.

I think the Security Council is progressing too slowly in its consideration of the Indonesian question. We know that reports are being received from Indonesia to the effect that military operations have not still ceased there, but are continuing in certain places. We also know that political and diplomatic pressure is being brought to bear on the Government of the Indonesian Republic to force it to adopt a decision on arbitration questions which would really mean bypassing the United Nations and the Security Council.

Obviously, the Council must take appropriate measures to eliminate the uncertainty now prevailing with regard to certain aspects of the Indonesian question, and must take a decision commensurate with the gravity of this problem. I think, therefore, that we should arrange a meeting on the Indonesian question for tomorrow morning, at any rate, and certainly not later than tomorrow. Perhaps we might even meet this evening, if circumstances permit.

I do not suggest that the Indonesian question be put on the agenda for this meeting, since this
is apparently difficult to arrange. Nevertheless, I consider that this question must absolutely be included in the agenda for an evening meeting today or for tomorrow’s meeting of the Council.

The President: At the hundred and eighty-fifth meeting, it was proposed that the membership question should be placed on today’s agenda. We thought two meetings on the question would be necessary, and therefore we scheduled meetings for this afternoon and tomorrow morning. As the members of the Council know, the Security Council has to present its report on applications for membership twenty-five days before the session of the General Assembly. The date would therefore be the 21st of this month, and today is the 18th. However, as the members consider that the Security Council ought to have another meeting very soon on the Indonesian question, I have no objection to putting off the meeting on the membership question until Thursday and to having a meeting on the Indonesian question tomorrow morning.

If there are no objections, I shall consider that procedure adopted. We shall have the next meeting on the Indonesian question tomorrow morning.

The Security Council will now take up the application of Pakistan for membership, which is an urgent matter and should be included on today’s agenda.

The agenda was adopted with the additional item.

310. Discussion on the application of Pakistan

The President: With regard to the application of Pakistan for membership, which is an urgent matter and should be included on today’s agenda.

The agenda was adopted with the additional item.

310. Discussion de l’admission du Pakistan

Le Président: A propos de la demande d’admission du Pakistan, les membres du Conseil se rappelleront que l’article 59 de notre règlement intérieur déclare: “Le Secrétaire général porte immédiatement à la connaissance des représentants au Conseil de sécurité la demande d’admission. A moins que le Conseil de sécurité n’en décide autrement, le Président renvoie la demande d’admission à l’examen d’un comité du Conseil de sécurité. . .”; il est dit: à moins que le Conseil de sécurité n’en décide autrement.

Il n’est pas absolument nécessaire que chaque demande soit portée devant le Comité d’admission des nouveaux Membres. Le Conseil de sécurité peut en décider autrement et prendre une décision définitive sur la demande, sans renvoyer celle-ci au Comité. Je propose que le Conseil de sécurité soit traité ainsi la demande dont il s’agit, sans la renvoyer au Comité d’admission des nouveaux Membres, et en prenant lui-même une décision sur ladite demande.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (Royaume-Uni): Je suis entièrement d’accord. Je songeais moi-même à proposer au Conseil que les membres décident, dans ce cas particulier, de se dispenser de la formalité du renvoi de la demande du Pakistan au Comité d’admission des nouveaux Membres. Le cas qui nous occupe me paraît aussi simple et aussi clair qu’exceptionnel.

Je ne pense pas que le Comité éprouverait la moindre difficulté à convenir de recommander la demande; aussi, afin de gagner du temps, je...
suggest we might omit that formality and the Council might at some stage, either today or on Thursday, consider the matter without a recommendation by the Committee.

Mr. PARODI (France) (translated from French): I should like to support the proposal just made by the United Kingdom representative. The question of Pakistan seems to me to be a very special case, since this country was already in the United Nations when it constituted a part of India. We are therefore faced with a special and very clear situation which should not, I think, cause much discussion. I urge that we should deal with the question directly.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, we shall decide upon the case of Pakistan immediately.

As there is no objection to the admission of Pakistan, the Security Council may now decide to submit its recommendation on the admission of Pakistan to the United Nations in its report to the General Assembly.

As no objection is raised to this suggestion, we may consider it approved. Therefore, the admission of Pakistan is approved by the Security Council, whose recommendation on the subject will be included in its report to the General Assembly.

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): It is not quite clear to me what we are now deciding: the application for the admission of Pakistan or the inclusion in the agenda of the application for Pakistan's admission.

The PRESIDENT: The first step we took was to discuss this question and to place it on the agenda. As this was adopted, we passed to the next step, which was the admission of Pakistan to the United Nations. If there is any objection to that, we shall certainly not approve it at this time.

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I propose that these applications be considered in the order in which they were received.

The PRESIDENT: I said that if there were no objection, we should consider the admission decided upon, but as there is an objection, we shall postpone the question and consider the application of Pakistan in its chronological order along with the other applications.

We shall now deal with the next item on the agenda: the report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members.

311. Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Acha, Chairman of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, took his seat at the Council table.

Mr. ACHA (Chairman of the Committee on the Admission of New Members): On behalf of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, I propose that we dispense with this formality and that the Council, at a moment whenever, either today or on Thursday, examine the affair without a recommendation of the Committee.

M. PARODI (France): Je tiens à appuyer la proposition qui vient d'être faite par le représentant du Royaume-Uni. La question du Pakistan me semble se présenter dans des conditions très particulières, de sorte que, bien que ce pays ait déjà fait partie des Nations Unies, dans la mesure où il faisait partie de l'Inde. Nous sommes donc en présence d'une situation particulière et également extrêmement claire, qui ne doit pas, je pense, provoquer grande discussion. Dans ces conditions, il me semble que nous abordions directement la question.

Le PRÉSIDENT (traduit de l'anglais): S'il n'y a pas d'avis contraire, nous allons tout de suite décider du cas du Pakistan.

Comme il n'y a pas d'opposition à l'admission du Pakistan, le Conseil de sécurité peut maintenant décider de recommander, dans son rapport à l'Assemblée générale, l'admission du Pakistan à l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Puisque cette proposition ne soulève pas d'objection, nous pouvons la considérer comme adoptée. En conséquence, l'admission du Pakistan est approuvée par le Conseil de sécurité, et la recommandation de celui-ci sur l'admission du Pakistan comme Membre des Nations Unies figurera dans son rapport à l'Assemblée générale.

M. GROMYKO (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): Je ne vois pas très bien quel est en ce moment l'objet de notre discussion: est-ce la demande d'admission du Pakistan, ou l'inscription de cette demande à l'ordre du jour du Conseil?

Le PRÉSIDENT (traduit de l'anglais): Notre première démarche a consisté à discuter cette question et à l'inscire à l'ordre du jour. Comme ce point a été adopté, nous sommes passés à l'étape suivante: l'admission du Pakistan comme Membre des Nations Unies. S'il y a une opposition, nous ne donnerons certainement pas notre approbation cette fois-ci.

M. GROMYKO (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): Je propose d'examiner ces demandes dans l'ordre où elles nous ont été présentées.

Le PRÉSIDENT (traduit de l'anglais): J'avais déclaré que, sauf objection, nous considérerions l'admission comme décidée; au moment qu'il y a une opposition, nous retournons la question à plus tard: nous examinerons la demande du Pakistan à sa place dans l'ordre chronologique, en même temps que les autres demandes.

Nous aborderons maintenant le point suivant de l'ordre du jour: le rapport du Comité d'admission des nouveaux Membres.

311. Rapport du Comité d'admission des nouveaux Membres


M. ACHA (Président du Comité d'admission des nouveaux membres) (traduit de l'anglais): Au nom du Comité d'admission des nouveaux members...
have the honour to present to the Security Council the report of this Committee. The report is a résumé of the re-examination by the Committee of the applications for membership in the United Nations submitted by the People's Republic of Albania, Ireland, the Mongolian People's Republic, Portugal, and the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, in accordance with the decision of the Security Council at its hundred and fifty-second meeting. The Security Council did not make any recommendations on these applications last year.

The Committee has further examined the new applications referred to it by the Security Council, namely, those of Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Roumania, and Yemen.

The Committee has examined all of the eleven applications in the light of the requirements laid down in Article 4 of the Charter which requires, first, that the applicant State should be peace-loving; secondly, that the applicant State should accept the obligations of the Charter, and thirdly, that the State should be able and willing to carry out these obligations.

The Committee, with the efficient assistance of the Secretariat, collected all the information available in order to give the members of the Security Council sufficient basis to reach a decision on these applications. Each application was thoroughly discussed; the report which the Committee is submitting to the Council contains a résumé of all statements, and the statements in full of some members of the Committee as appendices. In presenting the report, the Committee hopes that it may help the Security Council in its discussion and decision.

The report also contains a summary of the discussion on each application, and a statement of the formal attitudes of various delegations regarding the desirability of the admission of applicant States.

Finally, the application of the Kingdom of Yemen having met with no objection in the Committee, the Committee considers that the Security Council may recommend to the General Assembly the admission of Yemen to membership in the United Nations.

As regards all the other applications, the members of the Security Council will note from the report that unanimity was not reached in the Committee.

312. Discussion on the admission of new Members

The President: I suggest we discuss the applications one by one in their chronological order. According to its date of submission, the first application is that of the People's Republic of Membres, j'ai l'honneur de présenter au Conseil de sécurité le rapport de nos travaux: ce rapport contient un résumé de l'examen auquel nous avons procédé, des demandes d'admission à l'Organisation des Nations Unies, émanant de la République populaire d'Albanie, de l'Irlande, de la République populaire de Mongolie, du Portugal et du Royaume hachémite de Transjordanie, que nous avons réexaminées aux termes de la décision prise par le Conseil de sécurité lors de sa cinquante-deuxième séance. Le Conseil de sécurité n'a pas fait de recommandations sur ces demandes l'an dernier.

Le Comité a, en outre, examiné les nouvelles demandes qui lui ont été renvoyées par le Conseil de sécurité, à savoir: celles de l'Autriche, de la Bulgarie, de la Hongrie, de l'Italie, de la Roumanie et du Yémen.

Le Comité a examiné ces onze demandes à la lumière des conditions posées par l'Article 4 de la Charte: Premièrement, l'Etat qui adresse une demande d'admission est-il un État pacifique? Deuxièmement, accepte-t-il les obligations de la Charte? Troisièmement, est-il capable de remplir ces obligations et disposé à le faire?

Le Comité, avec l'aide efficace du Secrétariat, a rassemblé tous les renseignements qu'il a été possible de réunir pour donner aux membres du Conseil de sécurité des éléments d'appréciation solides qui leur permettent de prendre une décision sur ces demandes. Chaque demande a été discutée dans le plus grand détail et le rapport que le Comité soumet aujourd'hui au Conseil comporte un résumé de toutes les déclarations qui ont été faites, ainsi que, en annexe, le texte in extenso des déclarations de certains membres du Comité. En présentant le rapport, le Comité espère pouvoir aider le Conseil de sécurité dans sa discussion et dans sa décision.

Le rapport contient aussi un résumé de la discussion sur chaque demande et définit la position officielle des diverses délégations en ce qui concerne l'opportunité de l'admission des États postulants.

Enfin, la demande du Royaume du Yémen n'ayant pas soulevé d'objection au sein du Comité, le Comité estime que le Conseil de sécurité peut recommander à l'Assemblée générale l'admission du Yémen à l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

En ce qui concerne toutes les autres demandes, les membres du Conseil de sécurité remarqueront, d'après le rapport, que l'unanimité n'a pu se faire au sein du Comité.

312. Discussion sur l'admission de nouveaux Membres

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Je propose que nous discutions les demandes l'une après l'autre, selon leur ordre chronologique. Dans ces conditions, la première est celle de la Répu-
Albania. Before I place the question of the application of Albania before the Council, I should like to suggest one thing. In order to be able to expedite our work and to submit our report to the General Assembly, I suggest that the views and attitudes which have already been presented during the meetings of the Committee on the Admission of New Members should not be repeated. Any delegation which has a different view from that already expressed or has a modification of its view or attitude will certainly be heard with pleasure. All the delegations have given their opinions very definitely, distinctly and carefully during the meetings of the Committee.

The attitudes of the delegations in reference to the application of Albania are noted in chapter III, sub-section 3(1) of the report. If there is no change in any of those attitudes, the Council need not discuss this matter any further.

I have one further remark which I wish to make. At the twenty-second meeting of the Committee, the Syrian delegation made a proposal, quoted in chapter V of the report, which would settle the entire problem. Because of the lack of time available to the Committee to discuss this proposal fully, the Syrian representative reserved the right of his delegation to bring up the proposal in the Security Council. If it should be accepted, there would be no need to discuss the matter further. The proposal is to admit the five nations which applied for membership last year and whose admission was not recommended to the General Assembly; and as regards the other five applicants, they would be admitted following the ratification of their peace treaties, without further discussion or consideration in the Committee.

If this proposal were accepted, the question would be settled. I notice, however, that the proposal was not supported by sufficient members in the Committee. If it is approved and supported by some of the members, it may be discussed here. Otherwise, as the representative of Syria, I should like to express my attitude in regard to each of the applications, separately.

Mr. Kerno (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Legal Affairs): On instructions from the Secretary-General, I should like to make the following statement to the members of the Security Council.

At the fifty-fourth meeting of the Security Council, held on 28 August 1946, the Secretary-General made a statement from which I wish to quote the following passage:

"... the founding Members of the United Nations and all the great Powers which form part of our Organization have agreed, on numerous occasions, that the United Nations must be as universal as possible. This is one subject on which there has never been a serious difference of opinion. For this reason, in my capacity as Secretary-General of the United Nations, I wish to support the text of the demand for admission, the proposal, and the Albanian People's application to the United Nations."

The Secretary-General and suggests that the Council recommend the admission of Transjordan and the Albanian People.

(a) The admittance of the Albanian, Yugoslav, Hungarian, Italian and Rumanian delegations to the United Nations

Colonel Honosos, President of the Committee's remarks, I would like to express my attitude in regard to each of the applications, separately.

If this proposal were accepted, the question would be settled. I notice, however, that the proposal was not supported by sufficient members in the Committee. If it is approved and supported by some of the members, it may be discussed here. Otherwise, as the representative of Syria, I should like to express my attitude in regard to each of the applications, separately.

Mr. Kerno (Secretary General adjoint chargé des questions juridiques) (traduit de l'anglais): Sur instruction du Secrétaire général, je voudrais faire au Conseil de sécurité la déclaration suivante:

Au cours de la cinquante-quatrième séance du Conseil de sécurité, tenue le 28 août 1946, le Secrétaire général a fait une déclaration dont je tiens à citer le passage suivant:

"... Les Membres fondateurs des Nations Unies et tous les grands pays qui font partie de notre Organisation sont convenus, et ont répété à maintes reprises, que l'Organisation des Nations Unies doit être aussi universelle que possible. C'est là un point sur lequel aucune sérieuse divergence de vues ne s'est manifestée. En ma qualité de Secrétaire géné-

1 See Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series, Supplement No. 4, Annex 6, for the text of the application.

2 See Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series, No. 4, 54th meeting.
wish to support the admission to membership of all the States which are applying today."

The Secretary-General adheres to this opinion and suggests that the Security Council should recommend to the General Assembly:

(a) The admission of Albania, Ireland, Mongolian People's Republic, Pakistan, Portugal, Transjordan and Yemen at once;

(b) The admission of Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Roumania as soon as the peace treaties with these countries have come into force.

Colonel Hodgson (Australia): From the President's remarks, I am not certain whether he still reserves the right to bring forward his proposal, in view of the declaration just made by the Assistant Secretary-General. If the proposal is to be brought forward at some stage, I think that it should be presented now, because it is going to affect the procedure just indicated; that is, taking up each country separately and voting on it. Therefore, if it is the President's intention to bring it forward again, I think that he should do so immediately.

The President: I thought that if this proposal were unanimously accepted, there would be no need to continue the discussion. In other words, there would be no need to discuss each application separately, as the Syrian proposal applies to all of them.

Mr. Tsiang (China): The proposal submitted by the representative of Syria is similar in spirit to the recommendation made by the Secretary-General. While we all wish to see membership in the United Nations as universal as possible, the Charter does contain certain conditions with regard to membership. It is the opinion of my delegation that the qualifications for membership should be examined one by one. Therefore, I should be opposed to the adoption of this resolution or the acceptance of the recommendation made by the Secretary-General. I favour a separate vote for each country.

The President: As long as this resolution is opposed by one of the permanent members of the Security Council, we shall not discuss it any further. We shall pass on to a discussion of the individual applications, beginning with that of Albania.

Application of Albania

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Government of the USSR supported the application of the Albanian People's Republic for admission to the United Nations last year. Unfortunately, the Security Council did not at that time deem it possible to take an affirmative decision on this application. This year also the USSR Government and the USSR delegation supported the application of the Albanian People's Republic for admission to the United Nations, as they consider that Albania meets the requirements demanded of the United Nations as universal as possible. Therefore, I should be opposed to the proposal submitted by the representative of Syria, because it is not in accordance with the conditions laid down in the Charter. For example, the Syrian proposal applies to the admission of all countries, whereas the Albanian proposal applies only to Albania. Moreover, the Albanian proposal is in accordance with the opinion expressed by the Secretary-General, who adheres to this opinion and proposes that the Security Council should consider the question of Albania's admission to the United Nations. The Secretary-General adheres to this opinion and proposes that the Security Council should consider the question of Albania's admission to the United Nations as universal as possible, the Charter does contain certain conditions with regard to membership. It is the opinion of my delegation that the qualifications for membership should be examined one by one. Therefore, I should be opposed to the adoption of this resolution or the acceptance of the recommendation made by the Secretary-General. I favour a separate vote for each country.

Mr. Tsiang (China): The proposal submitted by the representative of Syria is similar in spirit to the recommendation made by the Secretary-General. While we all wish to see membership in the United Nations as universal as possible, the Charter does contain certain conditions with regard to membership. It is the opinion of my delegation that the qualifications for membership should be examined one by one. Therefore, I should be opposed to the adoption of this resolution or the acceptance of the recommendation made by the Secretary-General. I favour a separate vote for each country.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Government of the USSR supported the application of the Albanian People's Republic for admission to the United Nations last year. Unfortunately, the Security Council did not at that time deem it possible to take an affirmative decision on this application. This year also the USSR Government and the USSR delegation supported the application of the Albanian People's Republic for admission to the United Nations, as they consider that Albania meets the requirements demanded of the United Nations as universal as possible. Therefore, I should be opposed to the proposal submitted by the representative of Syria, because it is not in accordance with the conditions laid down in the Charter. For example, the Syrian proposal applies to the admission of all countries, whereas the Albanian proposal applies only to Albania. Moreover, the Albanian proposal is in accordance with the opinion expressed by the Secretary-General, who adheres to this opinion and proposes that the Security Council should consider the question of Albania's admission to the United Nations. The Secretary-General adheres to this opinion and proposes that the Security Council should consider the question of Albania's admission to the United Nations as universal as possible, the Charter does contain certain conditions with regard to membership. It is the opinion of my delegation that the qualifications for membership should be examined one by one. Therefore, I should be opposed to the adoption of this resolution or the acceptance of the recommendation made by the Secretary-General. I favour a separate vote for each country.
During the war years, the Albanian People's Republic was on the side of the Allies. The Albanian people and the Albanian army of national liberation created during the war fought against the fascist invaders, and against the Italian and German troops, and inflicted considerable losses on the occupying forces. I shall confine myself to quoting two figures in this connexion. The Albanians put out of action 53,639 Italian and German soldiers and officers, killed, wounded and prisoners. In battles with fascist occupation troops, the Albanians themselves lost 28,800 men, of whom 12,600 were killed or wounded. As a result of enemy occupation, Albania sustained considerable material losses, estimated at 3,830 million francs.

I quoted detailed information on this question when Albania's application was discussed last year at the fifty-fifth meeting of the Security Council. The USSR member of the Committee on the Admission of New Members also gave detailed information on Albania's contribution to the common cause of the Allies in the struggle against the fascist aggressor States.

Statesmen of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the USSR have acknowledged Albania's contribution to the common cause of the Allies during the war. For instance, members of the Security Council are undoubtedly familiar with the statement made on 10 December 1942 by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, in which the following passage occurs:

"The Government of the United States is not unmindful of the continued resistance of the Albanian people to the Italian forces of occupation. The effort of the various guerrilla bands operating against the common enemy in Albania is admired and appreciated. The Government and people of the United States look forward to the day when effective military assistance can be given these brave men to drive the invader from their homes."

Members of the Council also know of a statement made by the former British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden. In reply to a question in the House of Commons on 17 December 1942, Mr. Eden said:

"His Majesty's Government sympathizes with the fate of the Albanians, a people among the earliest victims of fascist aggression. They wish to see Albania freed from the Italian yoke and restored to her independence . . ."

The Minister said on 22 December 1942 that the Albanian Government was conferring with the governments of other countries and that the French government was keeping in touch with the Albanian government. Such were the three questions of the three Allied newspapers. The Albanian people, whom Mr. Eden quoted, was fighting against the fascist invaders, and against the Italian and German troops. Albania sustained considerable material losses, estimated at 3,830 million francs.

During the war, the Albanian People's Republic was on the side of the Allies. The Albanian people and the Albanian army of national liberation created during the war fought against the fascist invaders, and against the Italian and German troops, and inflicted considerable losses on the occupying forces. I shall confine myself to quoting two figures in this connexion. The Albanians put out of action 53,639 Italian and German soldiers and officers, killed, wounded and prisoners. In battles with fascist occupation troops, the Albanians themselves lost 28,800 men, of whom 12,600 were killed or wounded. As a result of enemy occupation, Albania sustained considerable material losses, estimated at 3,830 million francs.

I quoted detailed information on this question when Albania's application was discussed last year at the fifty-fifth meeting of the Security Council. The USSR member of the Committee on the Admission of New Members also gave detailed information on Albania's contribution to the common cause of the Allies in the struggle against the fascist aggressor States.

Statesmen of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the USSR have acknowledged Albania's contribution to the common cause of the Allies during the war. For instance, members of the Security Council are undoubtedly familiar with the statement made on 10 December 1942 by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, in which the following passage occurs:

"The Government of the United States is not unmindful of the continued resistance of the Albanian people to the Italian forces of occupation. The effort of the various guerrilla bands operating against the common enemy in Albania is admired and appreciated. The Government and people of the United States look forward to the day when effective military assistance can be given these brave men to drive the invader from their homes."

Members of the Council also know of a statement made by the former British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden. In reply to a question in the House of Commons on 17 December 1942, Mr. Eden said:

"His Majesty's Government sympathizes with the fate of the Albanians, a people among the earliest victims of fascist aggression. They wish to see Albania freed from the Italian yoke and restored to her independence . . ."

1 See Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series, No. 4, 55th meeting.
2 Ibid., First Year, Second Series, Supplement No. 4, Appendices 3, 6 and 9; ibid., Second Year, Special Supplement No. 3, Appendices 1 and 2.
3 Ibid., First Year, Second Series, Supplement No. 4, Appendices 7, Addendum B.
4 Ibid., First Year, Second Series, Appendix 7, Addendum E.
5 Ibid., First Year, Second Series, Supplement No. 4, Appendices 3, 6 and 9; ibid., Second Year, Special Supplement No. 3, Appendices 1 and 2.
6 Ibid., Premiereannée, deuxième série, Supplement No 4, Appendice 7, Addenda B.
7 Ibid., Premiere année, deuxième série, Supplement No 4, Appendice 7, Addenda E.
The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR said on 22 December 1942 that the USSR Government was convinced that the Albanian people's struggle would become a part of the general struggle for the liberation of the other Balkan countries and that it would end with the Italian aggressors being successfully driven out of the country.

Such were the views held by the Governments of three Allied Powers about the efforts made by the Albanian people during the war years. The question now arises whether we can, two years after the end of the war, fail to take into account — not to say completely disregard — the efforts and the contribution made by the small Albanian nation to the common cause of the Allies and the United Nations against the aggressor States? The USSR delegation considers that we cannot, we have no right to, fail to take this into consideration, and still less to completely disregard this contribution.

It is sometimes said that Albania gave assistance to the Axis Powers. In this connexion, it has been pointed out that Albanian military units fought against Greek troops, but we must not forget that there was an Albania which waged war against the invaders on the side of the Allies, and that there were a few Albanian traitors who helped the invaders and waged war against the Allies. Those who assert that Albania helped the Axis Powers are confusing the people's Albania which fought on the side of the Allies with the Albania represented by an insignificant number of traitors who betrayed the interests of their own people and the Allies.

Incidentally, it should be mentioned in passing that some of these traitors who fought against the Allies and for the Axis Powers are even now in Greece and are actually giving active assistance in the fight against the Greek guerrillas. I think this is a fact that merits some attention.

I will not expatiate further on this question, since members of the Council have sufficient material — texts of relevant statements, memoranda and other documents — so that anyone who wishes to study the question is in a position to do so.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (United Kingdom): I hesitate to ask to be permitted to speak, in view of the request which the President addressed to members of the Council a short while ago that they should not repeat what had been said either last year or this year in the Committee. However, since the representative of the USSR has made a statement containing no new arguments, I do wish to make a short comment, if I may be allowed to do so.

In the first place, we consider it more important to look at Albania as she is than to consider what she did or may have done in the past. I must remind the Council that the present Albanian Government seemed to my Government to suffer under two disabilities. In the first place, the majority of the Council found that the present

1 See Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series, Supplement No. 4, Appendix 7, Addendum D.

Le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de l'Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques a déclaré, le 22 décembre 1942, que le Gouvernement de l'URSS est convaincu que la lutte albanaise s'intégrera dans l'effort commun pour la libération de tous les pays balkaniques, et que cette lutte se terminera par l'expulsion des envahisseurs italiens du territoire albanais1.

Tel est le jugement que les représentants de trois Puissances alliées ont porté sur les efforts déployés par le peuple albain pendant la guerre. Comment peut-on maintenant, deux ans après la fin de la guerre, négliger — et même oublier complètement — les efforts du peuple albain et la contribution apportée par cette petite nation à la cause commune des Alliés et des Nations Unies en lutte contre les États agresseurs? La délégation de l'URSS estime que nous ne pouvons pas et n'avons pas le droit de perdre de vue, voire d'ignorer, cette contribution.

On a affirmé parfois que l'Albanie avait prêté son concours aux Puissances de l'Axe. On a remarqué à ce propos que des unités albaines avaient combattu contre les troupes grecques. Mais nous ne devons pas oublier que, s'il y avait un petit groupe de traîtres albains quiaidaient les occupants et luttaient contre les Alliés, il y avait d'autre part une Albanie qui combattait les occupants fascistes aux côtés des Alliés. Ceux qui affirment que l'Albanie aurait aidé les pays de l'Axe, confondent l'Albanie populaire, qui avait pris cause pour les Alliés, avec un groupe insignifiant de personnes qui prétendaient agir au nom de ce pays, tout en trahissant ses intérêts ainsi que les intérêts des Alliés.

Je dois faire remarquer, à ce propos, qu'un certain nombre de ces traîtres, qui avaient combattu contre les Alliés et pour les pays de l'Axe, se trouvent encore maintenant en Grèce et que même ils prennent une part active à la lutte contre les partisans grecs. C'est là, me semble-t-il, un fait qui mérite de retenir notre attention.

Je ne m'étendrai pas davantage sur cette question, car les documents, déclarations et mémorandums dont dispose à ce sujet le Conseil de sécurité sont assez nombreux pour que ceux qui désirent voir clair dans la question puissent le faire.

Pour conclure, je veux vous faire observer que le rejet de la demande de l'Albanie serait, de la part du Conseil de sécurité, une décision injuste.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (Royaume-Uni) (traduit de l'anglais) : J'hésite, à demander la parole, car, il y a quelques instants, le Président a prié les membres du Conseil de ne pas répéter ce qui a été dit au sein du Comité l'an dernier ou cette année. Toutefois, puisque le représentant de l'URSS a fait une déclaration qui n'a rien apporté de nouveau, je tiens, si le Président le veut bien, à faire quelques très brefs commentaires.

En premier lieu, nous jugeons plus important de considérer ce que l'Albanie est aujourd'hui plutôt que ce qu'elle a fait ou peut avoir fait dans le passé. Je dois rappeler au Conseil que l'actuel Gouvernement de l'Albanie a paru, aux yeux de mon Gouvernement, souffrir de deux graves défauts. D'abord, la majorité du Conseil
Albanian Government must have been aware of the mining of the Corfu Channel. The actual terms of the report were that the Channel could not have been mined without the knowledge of the Albanian Government. In the second place, a majority of the Commission of Investigation appointed by the Security Council, which visited Greece and neighbouring countries, found that Albania, with two other Governments, was guilty of stirring up strife in Greece. That question is still sub judice, but for the moment there is in the report of the Commission of Investigation. In these circumstances, my Government could not agree here and now to the admission of Albania to the United Nations.

I apologize for breaking the President's rule, but I hope we shall be able to observe it in the further stages of this discussion.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): The United States delegation will have to oppose the application of Albania for membership in the United Nations for the reasons which were fully stated in the third, sixteenth and seventeenth meetings of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, and which are available in the Committee's report before us.

Those reasons are the same ones mentioned by the representative of the United Kingdom. There is one other reason which I believe the United Kingdom representative did not mention: the careless disregard which the present Government of Albania has for the international obligations which bound Albania with other countries before the war — for example, bilateral treaties regarding the most ordinary things, such as postal money orders and other matters of an administrative nature which have nothing whatever to do with commercial policy. Furthermore, in relation to any treaties the United States might have had with Albania, the United States would have been glad to consider any request for reconsideration from Albania, but we consider such a request inadmissible since Albania has repudiated those obligations unilaterally.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): The Polish delegation supports the admission of Albania. I am not going to enter again into the reasons for this attitude, since these were stated during the discussion last year. I wish simply to state that should Albania not be admitted for the reasons we have heard from the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, it would be contrary to the rules laid down in the Charter and the rules of procedure.

A vote was taken on the application with the following results:

Votes for: 25
Votes against: 0
Abstentions: 4

APPLICATION OF ALBANIA FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Johnson, second application of the Republic of Albania, in order to fulfil his mandate, there were certain statements which were made when the report of the Committee on New Members was presented and in the vote on admission of the United Nations.

Mr. Gromyko (USSR) (trans): It is impossible to consider this question under the rules, which provide to confine our procedure.

We are discussing certain countries whose application was not considered. I wish to do this not only for the purposes of this, but also for the purpose of sentences, which are in the document.

4 See documents S/CNM/3, S/CNM/5, S/CNM/6, and S/CNM/12; and Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, First Series, No. 35, 42nd meeting.

1 Voir les Procés-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Deuxième Année, Supplément No 10, Annex 22.
2 Voir les Procés-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Deuxième Année, Supplément spécial No 2 (document S/360).
We consider that Albania is a peace-loving country whose efforts helped to establish this Organization, and which would accept the formal obligations of the Charter. I do not wish to enter into the Corfu Channel dispute, or into the findings of the Balkan Commission of Investigation. Both cases are still sub judice, and we do not know what the result will be either in the International Court of Justice or in the Security Council. That cannot be a reason for barring Albania from membership.

Other reasons have been stated in the Committee on the Admission of New Members; for instance, the fact that Albania has refused admittance to the Sub-Commission, after her own investigation proved that the incidents were invented. It seems very peculiar to hear such reasons stated here, especially when there are Members who have refused to accept the recommendations of the General Assembly with regard to Spain, and other matters, and are doing it by general consent and without rebuke.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. The application was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

Votes for: Poland, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Votes against: Australia, Belgium, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Abstentions: Brazil, China, Colombia, France.

APPLICATION OF THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

The President: We shall now pass to the second application, that of the Mongolian People's Republic. I venture to repeat my first request that, in order to fulfill our responsibilities as a Security Council, there should be no repetition of the statements which received very wide publicity when they were made in the Committee or in other meetings. These statements are contained in the report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members and in other reports, in the minutes, and in the verbatim records of the United Nations.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I find it impossible to comply with the President's appeal to refrain from discussion, unless it is desired to confine our meeting to empty and formal procedure.

We are discussing the question of admitting certain countries to the United Nations. I think this question sufficiently serious to permit those who wish to do so to give their views. This does not mean that we need to talk about the conclusions, which are set forth at adequate length in the documents. Nevertheless, I think I should


Demande d'admission de la République populaire de Mongolie

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): Nous passons maintenant à la deuxième demande, celle de la République populaire de Mongolie. Je me permets de rappeler que le Conseil a déjà reçu toute la publicité désirée lorsqu’il a été formulée au sein du Comité ou dans d’autres réunions. Ces déclarations sont contenues dans le rapport du Comité d’admission des nouveaux Membres, ainsi que dans d’autres rapports, dans les minutes et dans les procès-verbaux de l’Organisation.

M. Gromyko (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): En dépit de l’appel du Président, je ne crois pas que nous puissions éviter une discussion, car, si nous l’évitions, nous risquerions de transformer notre réunion en une simple formalité.

Nous examinons en ce moment la question de l’admission d’un certain nombre de pays au sein de l’Organisation des Nations Unies. Cette question me semble être assez grave pour que nous permettions à ceux qui le désirent d’exprimer leur opinion. Cela ne signifie pas qu’il faille répéter les thèses qui ont déjà été exposées d’une
make the following limited comments in connexion with the consideration of the application of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The Mongolian People's Republic is a relatively young State. It emerged on the international scene only recently, and may be considered one of those countries which received their independence after a long and stubborn struggle. We all know that, in addition to the USSR, China also recognized the independence of the Mongolian People's Republic last year; later I shall deal briefly with China's attitude this year.

First, I wish to draw the Security Council's attention to the fact that the Mongolian People's Republic participated in the war against Japan. During the war, it sent its army to Manchuria along with the USSR armies. Thus, the Mongolian People's Republic took a direct part in the armed struggle of the Allies against Japan. I would remind members of the Council that the army of the Mongolian People's Republic which took part in that struggle numbered some 80,000 and it lost several thousand men killed.

The members of the Council know that, although China had previously not objected to the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations, but had supported it, this year it raised objections to it in the Committee on Admission of New Members. The USSR delegation considers that these objections are ill-founded, since the information published in China by the Chinese official agency, Central News, does not correspond with the facts. The incidents which took place on the frontier between the Mongolian People's Republic and China, on 9 June, were not provoked by the Mongolians. This is corroborated by the facts and by maps, since, according to all the maps available not only to the Mongolian People's Republic but to the USSR and, apparently, also to China, the district claimed by China is in the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic. It is, therefore, absolutely incomprehensible why the Chinese claim to be right in this matter, and are trying to prove the Mongolian People's Republic in the wrong and to refute its arguments.

Still less justified are the arguments used by certain other members of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, who have merely based their opinions on the position taken by the Chinese representative and adduced no facts of their own, to bar the Mongolian People's Republic from admission to the United Nations.

The facts I have adduced lead me to the conclusion that a negative decision by the Security Council on the application of the Mongolian People's Republic would be an incorrect decision. The USSR delegation considers that the Mongolian People's Republic fully meets the requirements laid down in the United Nations Charter for States applying for admission to the United Nations.

Mr. Tsurikov: I feel obliged to make a few comments with regard to the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic. I wish to draw your attention to the fact that it is not only a young State but also a peace-loving State.

The Passage of the Mongolian People's Republic through the territory of the USSR. I should like briefly to point out that the Soviet Union has always been an active supporter of the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations. The USSR delegation considers that these objections are ill-founded, since the information published in China by the Chinese official agency, Central News, does not correspond with the facts. The incidents which took place on the frontier between the Mongolian People's Republic and China, on 9 June, were not provoked by the Mongolians. This is corroborated by the facts and by maps, since, according to all the maps available not only to the Mongolian People's Republic but to the USSR and, apparently, also to China, the district claimed by China is in the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic. It is, therefore, absolutely incomprehensible why the Chinese claim to be right in this matter, and are trying to prove the Mongolian People's Republic in the wrong and to refute its arguments.

Still less justified are the arguments used by certain other members of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, who have merely based their opinions on the position taken by the Chinese representative and adduced no facts of their own, to bar the Mongolian People's Republic from admission to the United Nations.

The facts I have adduced lead me to the conclusion that a negative decision by the Security Council on the application of the Mongolian People's Republic would be an incorrect decision. The USSR delegation considers that the Mongolian People's Republic fully meets the requirements laid down in the United Nations Charter for States applying for admission to the United Nations.

La République populaire de Mongolie est un État relativement nouveau. Elle est apparue depuis peu sur la scène internationale, et c'est un pays qui a acquis son indépendance à la suite d'une lutte longue et acharnée. L'indépendance de la République populaire de Mongolie a été reconnue, non seulement par l'URSS, mais aussi, l'année dernière, par la Chine. Je dirai plus tard quelques mots au sujet de l'attitude qu'elle a prise en Chine, cette année.

Tout d'abord, je voudrais rappeler au Conseil de sécurité que la République populaire de Mongolie a pris part à la guerre contre le Japon. Aux côtés de l'armée de l'URSS, ses troupes ont lutté contre les Japonais en Mandchourie. La République populaire de Mongolie a donc pris une part active à la guerre menée par les Alliés contre le Japon. Je rappellerai également au Conseil que les forces de la République de Mongolie qui ont combattu les Japonais comprenaient quelque 80,000 hommes et qu'elles ont perdu plusieurs milliers de tués.

Bien que, précédemment, la Chine n'ait pas protesté contre l'admission de la République populaire de Mongolie à l'Organisation des Nations Unies et qu'elle ait même appuyé la candidature de ce pays, cette année elle a soulevé des objections devant le Comité d'admission. La délégation de l'URSS estime que ces objections sont dénuées de fondement, étant donné que les informations publiées en Chine par l'agence officielle chinoise Central News ne correspondent pas à la réalité. Ce n'est pas la Mongolie qui a provoqué les incidents à la frontière sino-mongole, et notamment celui du 9 juin. Il suffit de se reporter aux faits et aux cartes géographiques pour s'en convaincre. En effet, les cartes qui sont à la disposition de la République populaire de Mongolie, de l'Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques et de la Chine elle-même, indiquent que la région revendiquée par les Chinois fait partie du territoire de la République de Mongolie. Par conséquent, il est incompréhensible que la Chine veuille prouver qu'elle a raison, en s'efforçant de réfuter les arguments de la République populaire de Mongolie et en contestant son bon droit.

Les arguments dont usent certains autres représentants au Comité d'admission des nouveaux membres sont encore moins fondés, car ils ne disposent d'aucune information directe. Ils se contentent d'invoquer l'attitude prise par le représentant de la Chine pour s'opposer à l'admission de la République populaire de Mongolie à l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Ce que j'ai dit m'amène à conclure que, en refusant la demande de l'admission de la République populaire de Mongolie, le Conseil de sécurité prendrait une décision injuste. La délégation de l'URSS est d'avis que la République populaire de Mongolie satisfait pleinement aux conditions que la Charte des Nations Unies impose aux États désireux de devenir Membres de cette Organisation.

Mr. TSIANG (China): Since the representative of the USSR has chosen to speak on the subject, I feel obliged to reply. As is well known, Mongolia was a part of China. At the beginning of last year, we recognized the independence of Mongolia, with the old administrative boundary as the new boundary between that country and China. We wished Mongolia well; last year we favoured its admission.

This year, unfortunately, in the month of June, Mongolian troops invaded the border up to a place called Peitaishan. Peitaishan is well over one hundred kilometres inside the old administrative boundary. At the time of the recognition of its independence, Mongolia accepted that boundary without protest. Since then, we have not heard any expression of dissatisfaction with regard to that boundary. The first time that we heard of this boundary was in connexion with an armed incursion into Chinese territory to a depth of more than one hundred kilometers. People might think that this was simply an expression of nomadic instinct. That is not quite true, because this army incursion included a certain number of airplanes.

Therefore, I feel obliged to oppose the admission of Mongolia on the ground that it is not a peace-loving State.

The President: As there are no further comments, I shall put to a vote the application of Mongolia.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. There were 3 votes in favour, 3 against and 5 abstentions. The application was not adopted.

Votes for: Poland, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Votes against: China, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Abstentions: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, France.

The President: We shall now consider the third application, that of the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan.

Application of Transjordan

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Last year the USSR delegation did not feel it could support Transjordan's application for admission to the United Nations for reasons to which I shall refer later. For the same reasons we cannot support this application this year.

As we all know, Transjordan was a mandated territory. In the last two years, the United Kingdom has taken certain action with regard to Transjordan. This action was unilateral. The Government of the United Kingdom gave no

It is, therefore, not clear what has happened in the case of Transjordan. The United Kingdom states that Transjordan became an independent country after the United Kingdom had taken certain unilateral action, but, in any case, it is not clear what kind of independence Transjordan has received. Moreover, there are grave reasons for doubting the correctness of such a conclusion about the independence which Transjordan is alleged to have received from the United Kingdom.

The USSR delegation therefore considers that events in Transjordan have led to a very confused situation. First, it is not at all clear what has actually happened. Secondly, whatever did happen to Transjordan, was, as I have already pointed out, the result of unilateral action. As far as the USSR delegation is aware, the United Kingdom acted without anyone’s sanction. In view of these considerations I feel unable to support a decision to admit Transjordan this year.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (United Kingdom): With due respect to the suggestion of the President that we should not repeat at length previously-declared reasons, I shall confine myself to referring to statements made by myself or other representatives of my Government either in the Security Council last year or in the Committee on the Admission of New Members. Those statements answer all the points raised by the representative of the USSR, none of which are new.

My Government thinks that Transjordan should be admitted to the United Nations, and I think it would be very unjust to reject its application for admission.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): The United States is very glad to support this application. The opinions of other representatives on these applications for new membership are always extremely interesting to me, whether they support or oppose the applications. What is most interesting are the reasons which they give for their approval or opposition. I must say that in the case of Transjordan I listened very attentively to the representative of the USSR, and the reasons that he gave for not supporting the application of Transjordan, when viewed in the light of the reasons he gave for supporting the application of the Mongolian People’s Republic, leave me in a state of complete mental confusion.

The President: According to the explanations distributed by the Secretariat of the United Nations, I find before me a passage in document S/CNM/395 which reads as follows: “. . . on 9 February and 18 April 1946 respectively that the Assembly of the United Nations and that of the League of Nations adopted resolutions welcoming the end of the Mandate in Transjordan . . .” As the Mandate was given to the United Kingdom.

Royama-Uni n’a expliqué à personne quels étaient ses projets ni quelle était la nature de l’action qu’il avait entreprise à l’égard de la Transjordanie.

Ce qui est arrivé à ce pays n’est donc pas clair. Le Royama-Uni affirme que, à la suite de l’action unilaterale qu’il a entreprise, la Transjordanie est devenue un État indépendant. Mais il est pour le moins difficile de savoir quelle est cette indépendance qu’aurait acquise la Transjordanie. Il existe même des raisons sérieuses pour mettre en doute l’assertion selon laquelle le Royama-Uni aurait accordé l’indépendance à la Transjordanie.

La délégation de l’URSS estime donc que ce qui s’est produit en Transjordanie a créé une situation fort obscure. Précisément, on ne sait absolument rien sur ce qui s’est passé en réalité. Deuxièmement, quoi qu’il puisse être arrivé à la Transjordanie, c’est, comme je l’ai déjà dit, le résultat d’une action unilaterale. Autant que la délégation de l’URSS le sache, personne n’a chargé le Royama-Uni d’entreprendre cette action. C’est pour toutes ces raisons qu’il m’est impossible, cette année encore, d’appuyer la demande d’admission de la Transjordanie.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (Royama-Uni) (traduit de l’anglais) : Tenant compte de la suggestion formulée par le Président, et qui tend à ce que nous ne reprenions pas en détail des arguments déjà exposés, je me contenterai de rappeler que l’Assemblée du Conseil aux déclarations qui ont été faites par moi ou par d’autres représentants de mon Gouvernement, soit au Conseil de sécurité l’an dernier, soit devant le Comité d’admission des nouveaux Membres de la déclaration répondent point par point à celles du représentant de l’URSS, ce qui ne contient rien de nouveau.

Mon Gouvernement estime que la Transjordanie doit être admise à l’Organisation des Nations Unies, et je trouverais injuste que ce pays ne soit pas admis.

Mr. Johnson (Etats-Unis d’Amérique, traduit de l’anglais) : Les États-Unis ont grand plaisir à appuyer la demande de la Transjordanie. L’opinion des autres représentants sur ces demandes d’admission offre toujours un vif intérêt pour moi, qu’elle soit favorable ou non ; mais ce qui présente le plus grand intérêt, ce sont les raisons invoquées. Je dois dire que, dans le cas de la Transjordanie, j’ai écouté très attentivement le représentant de l’URSS, et les raisons qu’il a invoquées pour ne pas appuyer la demande de la Transjordanie, quand on les considère à la lumière de celles qu’il a invoquées pour appuyer la demande de la Mongolie extérieure, me laissent un sentiment de totale confusion intellectuelle.

by the League of Nations, the League of Nations confirmed the declaration of independence of Transjordan. I think this clarifies the situation on the point of the Mandate at any rate.

If there is no further comment, I shall put to a vote the application of Transjordan.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. There were 9 votes in favour, one against and one abstention. The application was rejected, the vote against being that of a permanent member of the Council.

Votes for: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Syria, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Vote against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstention: Poland.

The President: The Council will now consider the fourth application that of Ireland.

APPLICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): In considering an application to admit a particular country to membership in the United Nations we must, of course, take into account the way that country behaved before, or especially during, the war years. In considering the behaviour of Ireland during the war years, we cannot fail to observe the following:

As we all know, Ireland was on very good terms with the Axis Powers and gave no assistance whatever to the Allied nations in their struggle against the fascist States. Apart from this, Ireland has not and has never had normal relations with the USSR, whose part in the war against the aggressor States and in gaining victory over them is well known.

For these reasons the USSR delegation feels unable, again this year, to support the proposal that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (United Kingdom): My comment on that is exactly the same as the comment I made on the application of the Mongolian People's Republic. The arguments used by the representative of the USSR are not new; they have been rebutted already. Neither of his principal arguments is really relevant because those are not the criteria in the Charter for the admission of a State to the United Nations.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. There were 9 votes in favour, one against and one abstention. The application was rejected, the vote against being that of a permanent member of the Council.


1 See Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series, Supplement No. 4, Appendices 15 and 17.


des Nations, qui avait confirmé ce mandat au Royaume-Uni, a par là confirmé la déclaration d'indépendance de la Transjordanie. Je pense que ce texte clarifie la situation, tout au moins en ce qui concerne le mandat.

S'il n'y a pas d'autre commentaire, je vais mettre aux voix la demande de la Transjordanie.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Il y a 9 voix pour, une voix contre et une abstention. La voix contre étant celle d'un membre permanent du Conseil, la demande d'admission n'est pas acceptée.

Votent pour: Australie, Belgique, Brésil, Chine, Colombie, France, Syrie, Royaume-Uni, États-Unis d'Amérique.

Vote contre: l'Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

S'abstient: la Pologne.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Le Conseil passe maintenant à la quatrième demande: celle de l'Irlande.

DEMANDE D'ADMISSION DE L'IRLANDE

M. Gromyko (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): Lorsque nous examinons la demande d'admission d'un pays, il est évident que nous devons prendre en considération l'attitude de ce pays et, tout d'abord, son attitude pendant la guerre. Or, en examinant le comportement de l'Irlande au cours de la guerre, nous ne pouvons manquer de remarquer ce qui suit.

Comme on le sait, l'Irlande a entretenus des relations très amicales avec les Puissances de l'Axe, et n'a aucunement aidé les Alliés dans leur lutte contre les États fascistes. D'autre part, l'Irlande n'a pas et n'a jamais eu de relations normales avec l'URSS dont le rôle dans la guerre contre les États agresseurs et dans la victoire remportée sur ces États n'a pas besoin d'être rappelé.

C'est pourquoi la délégation de l'URSS n'estime pas possible, cette année encore, d'appuyer la proposition tendant à admettre l'Irlande à l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (Royaume-Uni) (traduit de l'anglais): Sur cette question, je ferai exactement le même commentaire que sur la demande de la République populaire de Mongolie. Les arguments invoqués par le représentant de l'URSS n'apportent rien de nouveau; il y a déjà été répondu. En fait, ni l'un ni l'autre de ces principaux arguments n'a de rapport avec le sujet, puisqu'ils ne reprennent aucun des critères posés par la Charte en ce qui concerne l'admission d'un État comme Membre des Nations Unies.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Il y a 9 voix pour, une voix contre et une abstention. La voix contre étant celle d'un membre permanent du Conseil, la demande d'admission n'est pas acceptée.

1 Voir les Procès-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Première Année, deuxième série, Supplément No. 4, Appendices 15 et 17.

Votes for: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Syria, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Vote against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstention: Poland.

The President: The Council will now pass on to the fifth application, that of Portugal.

APPLICATION OF PORTUGAL

Colonel Hodgson (Australia): I should just like to say this: If the representative of the USSR is going to exercise the veto on these States, I should like to ask him to spare us another series of speeches with the same old arguments. They are fully set out in the Committee's report; we have listened to them for over a year and they have all been rebutted, as has been said. I think we should at least be spared that.

The President: This is the last one. The representative of the USSR is certainly free to express his opinion.

Mr. de Souza Gomez (Brazil) (translated from French): Although I have every wish to comply with the President's request that we should not prolong a fruitless discussion on the reasons which lead us to support requests for admission or to refuse them our support, I feel I must take the floor to-day—the President will understand my motives for doing so—so that my delegation warmly supports Portugal's request for admission to the United Nations.

Last year, in the Committee on the Admission of New Members, my delegation gave the reasons on which it based its opinion; I do not think I need repeat them here. I should, nevertheless, like to add that my delegation thinks the United Nations would benefit by the experience of Portugal, if this country were admitted as a Member. That is the least I can say regarding a State of Portugal's merit and past history.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): Although the Polish delegation has great admiration for the cultural achievements of Portugal, at the present moment we are unable to support its application for membership in the United Nations.

We have very grave doubts whether Portugal, because of its present position, would be able to fulfil all the requirements of the Charter. We all remember the aid which it gave to Italy and Germany, during the rebellion against the legal government in those countries by Franco Spain. Had we put forth our opposition to the Security Council's recommendations, Poland would not have been admitted to the United Nations.

Mr. J. de Souza Gomes (Brazil): The United Nations is the symbol of universal solidarity, and the Allied Nations are responsible for material and moral help to the Portuguese Republic.

I do not think the Polish delegation is well advised in opposing the admission of Portugal. It would be better if it were to witness and to confirm Portugal's qualifications, rather than to lend us support to the admission of the Federal German Republic.

Portugal has always been friendly to the Allies, all the more so since the German occupation. Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland) said that it is not only a State of great value, but of the past, which might be a State of the future. Nevertheless, the United Nations only admitted to membership the State of Germany, which is not a member of the League of Nations.

It is evident that Portugal would be able to respond to all the demands of the Charter, and it is useless to discuss this question any longer.

The President: The last one.

Mr. K. Manchot (France): I should like to ask him to spare us another series of repetitions. The representative of the USSR is certainly free to express his opinion.

Le colonel Hodgson (Australie) (traduit de l'anglais): Je vous prie simplement de ne pas nous répéter les mêmes arguments que vous avez déjà présentés. Ces derniers ont été largement développés dans le rapport du Comité; nous les entendons depuis plus d'un an; et, ainsi qu'on l'a déjà fait remarquer, il a été répondu à tous. Je pense que cette répétition au moins devrait nous être épargnée.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Le cas du Portugal est le dernier que nous ayons à examiner. Le représentant de l'URSS est certainement libre d'exprimer son opinion.

M. de Souza Gomez (Brésil): Bien que j'aie le plus vif désir de m'incliner devant la demande du Président tendant à ce que nous ne prolongions pas une discussion—d'ailleurs bien inutile—sur les raisons qui nous portent à soutenir les demandes d'admission, ou à leur refuser notre appui, je ne puis m'empêcher de demander aujourd'hui la parole—peut-être le Président comprendra-t-il le motif qui m'y incite—pour indiquer que ma délégation appuie chaleureusement le désir du Portugal d'être admis à l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

L'an dernier, au Comité d'admission des nouveaux Membres, ma délégation a donné les raisons sur lesquelles elle fondait son avis; je crois inutile de les répéter ici. Je voudrais ajouter cependant que ma délégation estime que les Nations Unies trouveraient avantage à bénéficier de l'expérience du Portugal, si elles admettaient ce pays parmi elles. C'est le moins que je puisse dire d'un État ayant la valeur et le passé du Portugal.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): En dépit de l'admiration que la délégation polonaise éprouve pour l'ancienne culture portugaise, nous sommes actuellement dans l'impossibilité d'appuyer la demande que fait le Portugal pour être admis comme Membre des Nations Unies.

Nous avons des doutes extrêmement sérieux quant à la possibilité pour le Portugal, étant donné sa position actuelle, de faire face à toutes les obligations de la Charte. Nous nous rappelons tous l'aide apportée par le Portugal à l'Italie et à


Government of Spain and during the foreign intervention in Spain. Its present association with Franco Spain will definitely make Portugal unable to fulfill all the requirements which have been put forth in regard to Franco Spain by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Conference at San Francisco. For these reasons, Poland will vote against the admission of Portugal to the United Nations.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): The United States warmly supports the application of Portugal, with which my country has had a traditional friendship since our birth as a nation.

I should also like to pay a very brief tribute to the sympathy which Portuguese people had for the Allied cause during the war, and for the very material help which in many ways their Government was able to give our cause. They did not aid the Axis, and they did aid us.

The reasons given by the representative of Poland for voting against the application of Portugal are very unfair, to put it quite soberly. Portugal is a neighbour of Spain along half of its frontier, the other half being on the ocean. Its ties with Spain are very close, and regardless of the merits of the country, I do not think the relations of Portugal with Spain should be judged in a particularly critical manner when we consider the application of Portugal for membership in the United Nations.

I do not think any educated person in his right mind would ever accuse Portugal of being aggressive or of not being peace-loving. It is eminently qualified for membership in the United Nations, in contrast with some of the countries which the representative of Poland has supported, and it is simply impossible for a person with even a small amount of reason to understand or to rationalize the position of the Polish representative.

Portugal was not pro-Axis during the war, as Ireland was accused of being. Portugal helped the Allies when many other people were helping the Germans.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I think it is not only desirable but essential for any representative on the Security Council who objects to the admission of a particular country to explain his position. Taking the application for the admission of Portugal to the United Nations on its merits, I feel unable, this year, as last year⁴, to support the Portuguese request. We know that Portugal let the United States use a naval base during the war years, but that still does not constitute sufficient grounds for her admission to the

² Ibid., page 75.
⁴ See documents S/C/N/8 and S/C/2/SR.19: Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series, No. 5, 57th meeting; ibid., First Year, Supplement No. 4, page 74; ibid., Second Year, Special Supplement No. 3, pages 16-17.

¹ Voir les Procès-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Première Année, première série, Supplément spécial, édition revue, rapport du Sous-Comité chargé de la question espagnole, pages 6-12 et 77.
² Ibid., page 75.
⁴ Voir les documents S/C/N/8 et S/C/2/SR.19; les Procès-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Première Année, deuxième série, No 5, 57ème séance; ibid., Première Année, Supplément No 4, page 74; ibid., Deuxième Année, Supplément No 3, pages 16-17.
United Nations, because Portugal maintained during the war, and still maintains, close ties with the Franco regime in Spain. We cannot disregard this fact.

During the war years, Portugal maintained close ties with Franco, who was entirely on the side of the Axis States, and it was closely associated with him. In addition, as we all know, Portugal has seen fit not to enter into normal relations with the USSR. All this forces me to conclude that Portugal, like Ireland, does not meet the requirements incumbent upon States wishing to be admitted to the United Nations.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): I regret to intervene again, but I should like to do so in view of some remarks made by Mr. Gromyko. I did not argue at all that Portugal should be admitted to the United Nations because it had made a military base available to the United States. I mentioned that only because of the importance Mr. Gromyko apparently attaches to this fact. Portugal was not. That base which was made available to the United States was of great indirect benefit to the USSR as were other facilities given by Portugal; they all contributed to the same end.

Mr. Gromyko has a right to oppose the admission of Portugal if he wishes to, but I do not argue at all that Portugal should be admitted to the United Nations because it had made a military base available to the United States. I mentioned that only because of the importance Mr. Gromyko apparently attaches to the fact that a country was or was not sympathetic toward the Axis; it was to demonstrate that Portugal was not. That base which was made available to the United States was of great indirect benefit to the USSR as were other facilities given by Portugal; they all contributed to the same end.

Mr. Gromyko has a right to oppose the admission of Portugal if he wishes to, but I do not argue at all that Portugal should be admitted to the United Nations because it had made a military base available to the United States. I mentioned that only because of the importance Mr. Gromyko apparently attaches to the fact that a country was or was not sympathetic toward the Axis; it was to demonstrate that Portugal was not. That base which was made available to the United States was of great indirect benefit to the USSR as were other facilities given by Portugal; they all contributed to the same end.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): I regret to intervene again, but I should like to do so in view of some remarks made by Mr. Gromyko. I did not argue at all that Portugal should be admitted to the United Nations because it had made a military base available to the United States. I mentioned that only because of the importance Mr. Gromyko apparently attaches to this fact. Portugal was not. That base which was made available to the United States was of great indirect benefit to the USSR as were other facilities given by Portugal; they all contributed to the same end.

I want to point out that, at the twenty-third meeting of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, I made a proposal that an enquiry should be made with the Government of Portugal to see whether, if it were admitted to membership, it would be prepared to adhere to the resolution of the General Assembly which recommended that members should sever their relations with Franco Spain. That proposal was rejected by the majority of the members of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, including the representative of the United States. Had that enquiry been made, and a reply received in the spirit of the resolution, the attitude of my delegation might have been different.

With regard to the reasons why the admission of Portugal is not warranted by the Charter, I believe that the reasons stated by the representative of Portugal do not confirm that, because Portugal and Spain, Portugal, if not be in a position to withdraw from the Charter.

A vote was taken, and there were 9 votes in favour. The motion was rejected, on a permanent basis.

Votes for: Austrália, Colombia, France, Suisse, United States of America.

Votes against: Poland, Republics.

Applications of Albania, Austria, Italy, Roumania.

The President: The second category of applications, those of Italy, Roumania, and Austria, was that of Hungary.

The discussion in connection with the admission of New Member applications was difficult. Many of the reasons why we did not wish to admit the new states when the ratification of the treaties was still pending; some of these reasons might be admitted. The treaties to be ratified for each should be admitted if they were ratified, without waiting for the Committee on the Admission of New Members to take the final decision in the Committee.

I do not believe that these applicants to the United Nations have the right to be admitted just. A vote at this time is not the right way to admit these applicants to the United Nations, in respect to these countries. Voters on the countries pending should be determined by the application of the treaties.

Mr. Gromyko (Ukraine) (transl.: I do not believe that these applicants to the United Nations have the right to be admitted just. A vote at this time is not the right way to admit these applicants to the United Nations, in respect to these countries. Voters on the countries pending should be determined by the application of the treaties.

1 See article 4 of the United Nations Charter.
2 See article 6 of the United Nations Charter.
With regard to the question of whether or not the reasons are within the framework of the Charter, I believe that the reasons that have been stated by the representative of the United States confirm that, because of the geographical situation of the country and the long frontiers with France, Spain, Portugal, if admitted to membership, would not be in a position to fulfill the requirements of the Charter.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. There were 9 votes in favor and 2 against. The application was rejected, one vote against being that of a permanent member of the Council.

Votes for: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Syria, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Votes against: Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

APPLICATIONS OF AUSTRIA, BULGARIA, HUNGARY, ITALY, ROUMANIA AND YEMEN

The President: We shall now consider the second category of applications; that is, the new applications, those of Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Roumania, and Yemen. We shall begin with that of Hungary.

The discussion in the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning these new applications was different from the other discussion. Many of the members of the Committee did not wish to discuss these applications at the time when the ratification of their peace treaties was still pending; some members said these applicants might be admitted without waiting for the treaties to be ratified; and other members said they should be admitted as soon as the peace treaties were ratified, without any further discussion in the Committee on the Admission of New Members. Those are the different opinions which were voiced in the Committee.

I do not believe voting on the admission of these applicants to the United Nations would be just. A vote at this time would be premature. I believe a different course of action must be taken in respect to these new applications. I believe a vote on the countries whose peace treaties are still pending should be deferred until after ratification of the treaties.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I suggest not taking a vote on the applications received from Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Roumania since the treaties with these countries have not yet come into force and the treaty with Austria has not even been drawn up. We have, therefore, no legitimate grounds for considering these applications, still less for taking definite decisions regarding these countries in the Security Council.

Quant à savoir si les raisons invoquées décou­lient de la Charte, je crois que celles qu'invoque le représentant des États-Unis confirment que, en raison de la situation géographique du pays et de sa longue frontière avec l'Espagne fran­quiste, le Portugal, s'il était admis comme Mem­bre, ne serait pas en mesure de se conformer aux obligations de la Charte.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Il y a 9 voix pour et 2 voix contre. Une des voix contre étant celle d'un membre permanent du Conseil, la demande d'admission n'est pas acceptée.

Votes for: Australie, Belgique, Brésil, Chine, Colombie, France, Roumanie-Union, Syrie, États-Unis d'Amérique.

Votes against: Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

DEMANDES D’ADMISSION DE L’AUTRICHE, DE LA BULGARIE, DE LA HONGRIE, DE L’ITALIE, DE LA ROUMANIE ET DU YEMEN


Les discussions du Comité d’admission des nouveaux Membres sur ces nouvelles demandes se sont déroulées d’une manière quelque peu différente de celle dont s’étaient déroulées les discussions précédentes. De nombreux membres du Comité n’ont pas jugé souhaitable de discuter ces demandes tant que la ratification des traités de paix n’était pas encore intervenue; d’autres ont estimé que l’on pouvait admettre ces candidats sans attendre la ratification des traités; d’autres enfin ont estimé que les candidats devraient être admis dès la ratification des traités de paix, sans que cela donne lieu à aucune autre discussion au sein du Comité d’admission des nouveaux Membres. Telles sont les opinions qui ont été exprimées au Comité.

Je pense qu’il serait injuste et prématuro de voter sur l’admission de ces candidats comme Membres des Nations Unies. J’estime qu’il faut procéder d’une manière différente en ce qui concerne ces nouvelles demandes, et qu’il convient de retarder jusqu’au moment où les traités auront été ratifiés le vote intéressant les pays avec qui cesdits traités ne sont pas encore conclus.

M. Gromyko (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): Je propose de ne point mettre aux voix les demandes d’admission que nous avons adressées l’Autriche, la Bulgarie, la Hongrie, l’Italie et la Roumanie. En effet, les traités de paix conclus avec ces pays ne sont pas encore entrés en vigueur; quant au traité de paix avec l’Autriche, il n’a même pas encore été préparé. Nous n’avons donc aucune raison légitime qui nous permette d’examiner ces demandes et, moins encore, de prendre des décisions à leur égard au sein du Conseil de sécurité.


I propose, therefore, that we do not vote on these applications, but postpone them until an appropriate time.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): My delegation is opposed to this postponement for reasons already given. We think that these applications should be voted upon individually. We gave our reasons in great detail during the meetings of the Committee.

There is nothing which imposes on the Security Council the obligation to postpone consideration of membership applications until the entry into, the completion of, and enforcement of, peace treaties.

In the case of Austria, the USSR has retarded the making of a treaty. Austria is not even an ex-enemy State. All of the principal Allies have ratified the peace treaty with Italy with the exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I do not see why we cannot proceed to take up the question of the application of these countries individually. As was agreed years ago, Austria should not be treated like an enemy State. If it had been an enemy State, I do not know how it could have been treated much worse than it has been.

Colonel Hodgson (Australia): My delegation supports the proposal that we should deal with these cases separately. The circumstances are particular and different for each of these applications. In fact, in regard to two of them, my delegation has a particular proposal to put before this Council. For that reason alone, we should like these questions to be dealt with separately.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (United Kingdom): I suppose it is true, technically, that none of these States could effectively become Members of the United Nations pending the entry into force of the respective peace treaties. However, I should have no objection to considering them separately, and even to reaching, if need be and if the Council can do that, a provisional or hypothetical recommendation, as it were.

I should like them examined separately because, as the representative of the United States pointed out, I think they are in different categories. I think Italy is in a category by itself. It became a belligerent, and really the entry into force of the peace treaty with Italy has been held up for reasons that are not clear. Austria is in a position of its own. Therefore, for those two different reasons, I think that those two countries are in a special position.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I do not intend to speak on the substance of the applications of the five States or to enter into the merits of each of them. At the moment, I believe we have to decide whether we can make any recommendation with regard to the five applications.

In my opinion, any decision or recommendation which might be made by this Council would be illegal and would carry any weight. The

C'est pourquoi je propose de ne point mettre aux voix ces demandes et d'ajourner leur examen à un moment plus opportun.

M. Johnson (Etats-Unis d'Amérique) (traduit de l'anglais): Ma délégation s'oppose à voir renvoyer la question pour les raisons qui viennent d'être indiquées. Nous pensons qu'il faut procéder à un vote pour chacune de ces demandes. Nous avons exposé nos raisons en détail, au cours des séances du Comité.

Il n'y a rien qui impose au Conseil de sécurité l'obligation de remettre l'examen des demandes d'admission jusqu'à l'entrée en vigueur des traités de paix.

Dans le cas de l'Autriche, l'URSS a retardé la rédaction du traité. L'Autriche n'est même pas un pays ex-ennemi. Sauf l'URSS, tous les principaux Alliés ont ratifié le Traité de paix avec l'Italie. Je ne vois pas pourquoi nous ne pourrions pas prendre l'une après l'autre les demandes de ces divers pays. Il y a deux ans, tout le monde a été d'accord pour dire que l'Autriche ne devait pas être traitée comme un Etat ennemi. Si elle avait été un Etat ennemi, je ne sais d'ailleurs pas comment elle aurait pu subir un traitement plus défavorable que celui qu'on lui a réservé.

Le colonel Hodgson (Australie) (traduit de l'anglais): Ma délégation appuie la proposition tendant à ce que nous examinions séparément les diverses demandes. Chacune de celles-ci se présente sous un jour particulier et différent. En fait, en ce qui concerne deux d'entre elles, ma délégation a une proposition à soumettre au Conseil. Ne fût-ce que pour cette raison, nous sommes désireux que ces questions soient traitées séparément.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (Royaume-Uni) (traduit de l'anglais): Du point de vue juridique, je crois exact qu'aucun de ces États ne peut effectivement devenir Membre des Nations Unies avant la conclusion et l'entrée en vigueur d'un traité de paix. Toutefois, je ne vois pas d'objection à ce que chaque cas soit examiné séparément, ni même à ce que nous allions, si besoin en est, si c'est possible au Conseil, jusqu'à formuler provisoirement ou hypothétiquement, une recommandation.

Je voudrais voir ces cas examinés séparément parce que j'estime — comme l'a fait observer le représentant des États-Unis — qu'ils appartiennent à des catégories différentes. L'Italie, à elle seule, constitue une catégorie à part. Elle a été cesse de combattre et, en fait, l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de paix avec l'Italie a été entravée pour des raisons qui m'échappent. L'Autriche aussi est dans une situation particulière. Pour ces deux raisons, j'estime donc que ces deux pays sont dans une situation spéciale.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Je n'ai pas l'intention de parler sur le fond des demandes des cinq États ni d'entrer dans les circonstances particulières de chacun de ces derniers. À l'heure actuelle, je crois que nous avons à décider si le Conseil peut formuler une recommandation en ce qui concerne ces cinq demandes.

A mon avis, toute décision ou recommandation prise ou formulée par le Conseil serait illégale et dénuée de poids. L'Organisation des Nations
Organization of the United Nations is composed of sovereign States. None of these five States is sovereign until its peace treaty has been ratified by the major Allies and by the State itself.

I believe that every discussion entered into here will be merely a theoretical and academic discussion on the merits of each of the countries. I do not think it is necessary to enter into such a discussion, especially in view of the fact that our recommendation would not be a legal one from the point of view of the Charter. I believe it was the representative of Australia who first pointed that out, and who opposed the sending of these applications to the Committee on the Admission of New Members1.

I feel that we should adopt the USSR proposal and take up a discussion of the last application on the agenda for today.

The President: Will the representative of the USSR, who submitted the proposal, kindly explain whether he wishes these applications to be voted on and discussed separately, or as a whole?

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): All these countries, except Austria, may be included in one category. Peace treaties with them have been drawn up, but these peace treaties have not yet come into force. Hence, there are no legitimate grounds for decisions by the Council to admit them to the United Nations.

I wish to draw the Council's attention to the fact that, by supporting the proposal to admit these countries to the United Nations, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom are departing from decisions jointly agreed by the Council of Foreign Ministers, decisions which are reflected in the preambles to these peace treaties.

Mr. Gromyko read the following text in English:

"Whereas the Allied and Associated Powers . . . are desirous of concluding a treaty of peace, which, in conformity with the principles of justice, will settle questions still outstanding as a result of the events hereinbefore recited and will form the basis of friendly relations between them, thereby enabling the Allied and Associated Powers to support . . . application to become a Member of the United Nations . . ."

Mr. Gromyko then continued in Russian:

This preamble states outright that the conclusion of the peace treaties and the settlement of questions still outstanding with regard to these peace treaties will create certain conditions which will make it possible to support these countries' applications for admission to the United Nations.

By supporting an application for admission before the peace treaties have come into force, the United States representative is departing from this agreement, although, as you know, the text . . .

1See Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, First Series, No. 34, 41st meeting.

1Voir les Protocoles officiels du Conseil de Sécurité, Première Année, première série, No 34, 41ème séance.
of the preamble was ratified by the United States. The same applies also to the preamble of the Austrian treaty, where it is stated:

"Whereas the Allied and Associated Powers and Austria desire for these purposes to conclude the present treaty, which shall constitute the basis of friendly relations between them, thereby enabling the Allied and Associated Powers to support Austria's application for admission to membership of the United Nations . . ." Here again it is stated that the Allied and Associated Powers will be enabled to support Austria's application for admission to the United Nations after the treaty has been concluded. On this point the preambles to the treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Roumania, as well as to the treaty with Austria, are quite specific.

The United States representative has pointed out that the USSR is the only country which has not ratified the treaties. Agreed. What difference does it make? Even if this is the case, even if the USSR is the only country which has not ratified the treaties, it follows that they have not come into force. What is the force of that argument? It has no force whatsoever.

I think that countries such as Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Roumania should be considered together, as they are in the same category. But we do not infer from that, that if the Council nevertheless decides to consider these applications, they should not be considered separately. They can be considered separately too. I thought it highly desirable, however, to refer again to the fact that we have no legitimate basis for taking decisions on admitting these countries to the United Nations. Needless to say, at the appropriate time, when the treaties with these countries come into force, the USSR will support the applications of all or, at any rate, of some of these countries for admission to the United Nations.

As I have already pointed out, Austria's case is quite special. There is not even any treaty with Austria.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): My delegation cannot agree with the representative of the USSR that these States are all in the same category. It simply is not consonant with the facts. For instance, the Allied controls were terminated in Italy in January 1947, and I may say they were terminated with the consent of the USSR. There is a great variation as regards the factual status of each of these countries. That is why the United States delegation states that this situation should be taken into account, and that these applications should be examined and treated on an individual basis. In fact, even though the treaties are not ratified, which is a juridical point, the factual situation is different in those countries. Nor is there anything in the preambles of the treaties or in the armistice agreements which would preclude consideration of these applications before the signing of the peace treaties. There is nothing which forbids that, nor is there anything in the preambles which forbids it.

The President: It is not a question of the facts; it is a question of the member state whether he has voted on some occasions and not on others.

Mr. GROMYKO: (U.S.S.R.) (transl.): This is a technical question of procedure and is not a question of the fact that the United States has or has not ratified.

The President: It is a question of membership of a member state whether he has voted on some occasions and not on others.

Mr. GROMYKO: (U.S.S.R.) (transl.): It is a technical question of procedure and is not a question of the fact that the United States has or has not ratified.

The President: It is a question of the votes on some occasions and not on others.

A vote was taken on the resolution proposing an amendment, with 20 votes in favor, 11 against, and 10 abstentions.

Mr. KATZ-SUPINSKY: (Poland) (transl.): Poland does not have any special interests in support of Austria's admission as a member of the U.N. The only objection Russia has raised against the admission of Hungary and the other three states is the fact that we do not consider the peace treaties valid for any of them.

On the other hand, Poland is not abdicating its interests against Hungary's admission as a member of the U.N. because of its attitude toward Hungary, which is a country to which it is related by many ties of friendship. I would say on this point that the only objection previously raised by Russia against the admission of Hungary and the Middle Eastern states is that they have not been ratified.

Unfortunately, there are still countries which have not been ratified. In these cases, Poland's position will be that everything will be done to support Austria's admission.

The President: I shall vote on this resolution in favor of the application of the Austrian treaty now, I shall vote in favor of the application of the peace treaties also.

Mr. JOHNSON: (U.S.A.) (transl.): My delegation supports the Austrian treaty now. We do not consider the treaties ratified, and the U.S.A. will go on supporting the application of the treaties now.
forbids that, nor is there anything in the Charter which forbids it.

The President: If there are no further comments on the motion of the representative of the USSR, the members will vote on it. He did not state whether he would agree to have the applications voted on separately; so they will be voted on as a whole.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The motion is to postpone consideration of all these applications.

The President: We shall put to the vote the motion to postpone the discussion of these five applications until a subsequent meeting, when it will be more appropriate.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. The proposal was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

Votes for: Poland, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Votes against: Belgium, Brazil, France, United States of America.

Abstentions: Australia, China, Colombia, United Kingdom.

The President: These applications are to be studied separately, one by one. The Council will begin by considering the application of Hungary.

Application of Hungary

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): My delegation does not have any objection to Hungary’s being admitted as a Member of the United Nations. The only objection we have is the one we stated previously. Inasmuch as the peace treaty between Hungary and the Allies has not yet been ratified, we do not consider Hungary a sovereign State within the meaning of the Charter.

On the other hand, I wish to point out that, by abstaining from a vote, our action is not directed against Hungary, with which we had very close ties of friendship before and during the war, because of its attitude toward the Polish refugees whom it helped to cross the frontiers and helped to join the Polish Army in the United Kingdom and the Middle East.

Unfortunately, the treaty has not yet been ratified. In these circumstances, the Polish delegation will abstain from voting.

The President: It is not clear whether we shall vote on postponing the discussion of the application of Hungary, or whether we shall vote on recommending to the General Assembly its admission now.

I prefer to put to the vote the postponement of the application of Hungary.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): We are now actually discussing these countries one by one, and whether or not they should be admitted, are we not?

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): Si la motion du représentant de l’URSS ne suscite pas d’autres commentaires, je vais la mettre aux voix. Le représentant de l’URSS n’a pas indiqué s’il consentait à ce que l’on votât sur les demandes prises séparément; nous voterons donc sur elles en une seule fois.

Mr. Gromyko (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): La motion que j’ai proposée tend à reporter à une date ultérieure l’examen de toutes ces demandes.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): Nous allons mettre aux voix la motion tendant à reporter la discussion de ces cinq demandes à une séance ultérieure, quand les circonstances s’y prêteront davantage.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Par 4 voix contre 3, avec 4 abstentions, la proposition est rejetée.

Votent pour: Pologne, Syrie, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

Votent contre: Belgique, Brésil, France, Etats-Unis d’Amérique.

S’abstiennent: Australie, Chine, Colombie, Royaume-Uni.


Demande d’admission de la Hongrie


D’autre part, je tiens à faire observer que, en nous abstenant lors du vote, nous ne prenons pas position contre la Hongrie, avec qui nous avons eu des liens d’amitié très étroits avant et pendant la guerre, parce que ce pays a aidé les réfugiés polonais à franchir les frontières et à rejoindre les armées polonaises stationnées au Royaume-Uni et dans le Moyen-Orient.

Malheureusement, le traité n’a pas encore été ratifié. Dans ces conditions, la délégation polonaise s’abstiendra.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): Je ne discernais pas clairement si nous allions voter sur le renvoi de la discussion concernant la demande de la Hongrie ou bien sur une recommandation proposant à l’Assemblée générale l’admission immédiate de ce pays.

Je préfère mettre aux voix la question du renvoi.

M. Johnson (Etats-Unis d’Amérique) (traduit de l’anglais): Je croyais que nous discutions en ce moment, en examinant tels cas séparément, la question de savoir si ces pays doivent ou non être admis.


The President: Yes, that is true, but there are some cases where it is not possible to vote definitely now because the matter depends on some other event which is not forthcoming. For instance, I should vote now for Hungary, if the peace treaty was ratified. I cannot do so as long as the peace treaty is not ratified. That is the reason why I should prefer to postpone the matter indefinitely.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): As regards Hungary, I could agree, because I should not be able to vote for the admission of Hungary; but I should not like to see that same rule applied to some of the other countries that we are going to discuss, because I think they are in different situations.

The President: The vote will be different also.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): Yes.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): Could we have a legal opinion here from the Secretariat as regards whether or not it is possible, at the present time, to recommend to the General Assembly the admission of any of these five countries to membership?

The President: I do not think there is any necessity for a legal opinion. We now have to vote on the postponement of the application of Hungary.

Mr. Tsang (China): I wish to speak on a point of order. I do not see how we could vote on that sort of question, that is, postponement of consideration. That has been voted upon and not carried. These countries all have applied for membership. This Council will decide whether we shall recommend them for membership or not. Those who hesitate to vote, not because of the merits of the cases, but for technical reasons, may state those reasons and explain the vote, but if a vote is taken, it must be, if it seems to me, on their admission or non-admission to membership.

The President: In fact, the motion for postponement was not carried because it was taken on all five applications together. When they are taken separately, the attitude of the representatives may be different in respect to each.

However, if the Council wishes a vote taken on the admission or non-admission of the applicant, I should like to make this statement: This action does not mean that the application is rejected definitively. When the peace treaty with the applicant State has been ratified, that State may apply again for membership, and it will be considered then. If the application is rejected now and a new application is submitted after the ratification of the treaty, that new application may be considered.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I have not had a reply to my question as to whether the recommendation of this Council, if it should recommend the admission of any of these States, could be transmitted from the Council to the General Assembly.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): C’est exact, mais il y a des cas où il n’est pas possible de procéder immédiatement à un vote définitif, parce que la situation dépend d’événements futurs et incertains. Par exemple, je voterai maintenant pour la Hongrie si le traité de paix était ratifié. Je ne puis le faire tant que le traité n’est pas ratifié. C’est pourquoi, je préférerais remettre la question jusqu’à nouvel ordre.

M. Johnson (Etats-Unis d’Amérique) (traduit de l’anglais): En ce qui concerne la Hongrie, je pourrais donner mon accord, car je ne serais pas en mesure de voter pour l’admission de ce pays; mais je ne voudrais pas voir appliquer la même règle à plusieurs autres pays dont nous allons discuter le cas; j’estime en effet que leur situation est différente.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): Le vote sera également différent.

M. Johnson (Etats-Unis d’Amérique) (traduit de l’anglais): Bien.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l’anglais): Pourriez-vous avoir un avis juridique de la part du Secrétariat sur la question de savoir s’il est ou non possible actuellement de recom­mender à l’Assemblée générale l’admission comme Membre de l’un de ces cinq pays?

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): Je ne pense pas qu’un avis juridique soit nécessaire. Nous avons maintenant à voter sur le renvoi de l’examen de la demande de la Hongrie.

M. Tsang (Chine) (traduit de l’anglais): Je tiens à soullever une question d’ordre. Je ne vois pas comment nous pourrions voter sur l’ajournement de l’examen des demandes: nous avons déjà rejeté par un vote une motion faite en ce sens. Tous ces pays ont demandé à être admis comme Membres. Au Conseil de décider s’il doit reconnaître ou non leur admission. Ceux qui, sans équivoque, jette des mérites des États, hésitent cependant parce que des raisons d’ordre technique, peuvent exposer ces raisons et expliquer leur vote; mais, s’il procède à un vote, ce doit être, il me semble, sur la question de l’admission ou de la non-admission de ces États comme Membres.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): En fait, la motion de renvoi n’a pas été adoptée, parce qu’elle portait sur les cinq demandes à la fois. Si l’on examine celles-ci séparément, l’attitude des représentants pourra être différente en ce qui concerne chacune d’elles.

Toutefois, si le Conseil désire procéder à un vote sur l’admission ou la non-admission des candidats, je tiens à déclarer qu’un tel vote ne signifie pas que la demande est rejetée définitivement. Lorsque le traité de paix avec l’État en question aura été ratifié, cet État pourra de nouveau demander à être admis comme Membre, et sa demande sera alors réexaminée. Au cas où la demande serait rejetée maintenant, si une nouvelle demande est présentée après la ratification du traité, cette nouvelle demande pourra être prise en considération.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l’anglais): Je n’ai pas encore obtenu de réponse à la question que j’avais posée: si le Conseil formule une recommandation en faveur de l’admission de l’un quelconque de ces États, cette recommandation pourra-t-elle être transmise par le Conseil à l’Assemblée générale?
Mr. Kerno (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Legal Affairs): It is very difficult to give a definite legal opinion on the question asked by the representative of Poland. But at first sight, it seems to me that the application of the provisions of the Charter concerning new membership is a privilege of the Security Council and of the General Assembly. In each case, I think that the Security Council is entitled to examine each application and to say whether or not, in the opinion of the Security Council, the conditions laid down in the Charter are fulfilled.

Therefore, even in these cases, I think that the Council is quite free to say that the conditions of the Charter are or are not fulfilled. If, for instance, the Council should decide now, by a vote, to say that Hungary or another of these five applicants fulfils the conditions of the Charter, then this recommendation of the Council has to be forwarded to the Assembly.

The President: In the present situation, I shall put to vote the postponement, unless this ruling is challenged.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I do not intend to challenge the President's ruling. I want to challenge the legal opinion expressed in reply to my question.

I do not think the Security Council is the body which lays down the rules about the acceptance of Members. The rules in regard to the admission of new Members have been laid down by the Charter; and a decision of a majority of the Security Council, even in cases where certain States muster a majority, cannot change rules laid down by the Charter.

I believe that the principal rule of the Charter about admission of new Members is that the State applying for membership should be a sovereign State. I do not think that any one of these States, as long as the peace treaties have not been ratified, is a sovereign State. Neither is Austria a sovereign State. Austria is not an ex-enemy State, but Allied troops are occupying it, and no one can state today that it is sovereign. The fact that Allied troops are occupying Austria, and that there exists an Allied Council in charge of administration of Austria, is contradictory to the sovereignty of Austria.

The same is true of other applicants; and as long as the peace treaties are not ratified and are not in force, in the opinion of the Polish delegation, any resolution in this respect would be contradictory to the Charter.

The President: We shall now vote on the postponement of the application of Hungary.

A vote was taken by show of hands. There were 5 votes in favour, none against, and 6 abstentions. The proposal was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of seven members.

Votes for: Australia, China, Poland, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstentions: Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, France, United Kingdom, United States of America.

The President: I shall now put to vote the admission of Hungary to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. Kerno (Secretary général adjoint chargé des questions juridiques): (traduit de l'anglais): Il est très difficile de donner un avis précis sur la question juridique soulevée par le représentant de la Pologne. Mais, à première vue, il me semble que l'application des dispositions de la Charte en ce qui concerne les demandes d'admission comme Membres appartiennent au Conseil de sécurité ainsi qu'à l'Assemblée générale. Je pense que, dans chaque cas, le Conseil de sécurité est qualifié pour examiner les demandes et pour dire si, à son avis, les conditions posées par la Charte sont ou non remplies.

Par conséquent, même dans ces cas, j'estime que le Conseil est tout à fait libre de dire que les conditions de la Charte sont ou ne sont pas remplies. Si, par exemple, le Conseil décide maintenant par un vote de déclarer que la Hongrie ou tel autre des cinq candidats remplit les conditions de la Charte, cette recommandation du Conseil devra être transmise à l'Assemblée.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Dans ces conditions, je vais mettre aux voix le renvoi, à moins que cette décision ne soulève des objections.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Je n'entends pas élever d'objection contre la décision du Président, mais contre l'avis juridique qui a été donné en réponse à ma question.

Je ne pense pas que le Conseil de sécurité soit l'organisme qui pose les règles en ce qui concerne l'admission des Membres. Ces règles ont été posées par la Charte; et une décision de la majorité du Conseil de sécurité, même dans le cas où certains États obtiendraient cette majorité, ne peut changer les règles posées par la Charte.

Je crois que la principale règle de la Charte en ce qui concerne l'admission des nouveaux Membres est que l'État qui fait acte de candidature soit un État souverain. Je ne pense pas qu'aucun de ces États, tant que les traités de paix n'ont pas été ratifiés, soit un État souverain. L'Autriche n'est pas non plus un État souverain. Elle n'est pas un État ex-ennemi, mais les troupes alliées l'occupent, et personne ne peut prétendre aujourd'hui qu'elle soit souveraine. Le fait que les troupes alliées occupent l'Autriche et qu'il existe un Conseil allié chargé de l'administration de ce pays ne permet pas de considérer l'Autriche comme un pays souverain.

Il en est de même des autres candidats; et tant que les traités de paix ne sont pas ratifiés et ne sont pas en vigueur, la délégation polonaise estime que toute résolution prise à cet égard serait en contradiction avec la Charte.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Nous allons maintenant voter sur le renvoi de la demande de la Hongrie.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Il y a 5 voix pour et 6 abstentions. N'ayant pas obtenu le vote affirmatif de sept membres, la motion d'ajournement n'est pas adoptée.

Votent pour: Australie, Chine, Pologne, Syrie, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

S'abstiennent: Belgique, Brésil, Colombie, France, Royaume-Uni, États-Unis d'Amérique.

Sir Alexander Cadogan (United Kingdom): A point of order. I am not absolutely clear as to what we are really voting on. If, for example, our first vote on admission happened to be in the affirmative, that, I suppose, would mean that the Security Council was intimating to the Assembly that it was in favour of the admission of the country as soon as the disability imposed upon its admission by the non-ratification of the peace treaty is removed. It is a conditional recommendation, I presume.

I wish to state here, in explanation of my vote, that quite apart from that point, I would not vote for the admission of Hungary unless I were more assured than I am that the present Hungarian regime will abide by the guarantees of human rights as set forth in the draft peace treaty. But I wanted to ask on that point: If the Council votes in the affirmative, is that an intimation it is prepared to recommend the admission directly that condition is fulfilled, that is, directly the treaty comes into force?

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): I should like to state that my delegation does not share the view expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom on this particular point. We think that the Council can recommend, if it chooses, without qualifications, and not conditionally. We understand that the Council can recommend unconditionally, if it chooses to do so.

The President: I am not very clear on this subject, and it seems that the situation is not clear to most of the members. I suggest that the discussion on these five States should be postponed until the next meeting, which will be on Thursday, so that some arrangements may be made. If there is no objection to this procedure, we shall now pass on to the last two States, Yemen and Pakistan. The Committee on the Admission of New Members, at its twenty-third meeting, unanimously agreed to recommend that the Security Council should give a favourable report on Yemen.

Application of Yemen

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): The Polish delegation supports the application of Yemen. We see in this application a further step in the emancipation of the peoples of the Middle East. We believe that admitting Yemen will help to maintain its independence and to remain a self-governing State without becoming a pawn of the power politics of the Middle East.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. The application was approved unanimously.

The President: We shall now consider the application of Pakistan. A letter has been received from the representative of India, which I shall ask the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Legal Affairs to read.

Application of Pakistan

Mr. Kerho (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Legal Affairs): This is a letter (document S/499) dated 18 August 1947, which the President of the Security Council received a few moments ago. It is a letter from the Government of the United Nations. The text reads:

"On 15 August 49, the Prime Minister of Pakistan telegraphed the United Nations:"

"The Government of Pakistan is interested in the admission of the United States of America to the Security Council and to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

"The Government of Pakistan understands that the United Nations is a freely elected body, and that it represents the will of the peoples of the world. It wishes to participate in the affairs of the United Nations in order to advance the cause of peace and to work for the betterment of mankind.

The President: The application of Yemen has been approved unanimously. It seems to me that the application of Pakistan will also be approved.

Colonel Hume (United Kingdom): The Pakistan application has been approved unanimously.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): I think it is quite evident that the application of Pakistan will be approved.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I think it is quite evident that the application of Pakistan will be approved.

The President: The Pakistan application has been approved unanimously.

Mr. Kerho (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Legal Affairs): The letter from the Government of India is dated 18 August 1947. It reads:

"DEMANDE D’ADMISSION DU YEMEN"


Il est procédé au vote à main levée. A l’unanimité, la demande d’admission est acceptée.


Nous avons reçu une lettre du représentant de l’Inde, que je vais demander à Monsieur le Secrétaire général adjoint chargé des questions juridiques de nous lire.

"DEMANDE D’ADMISSION DU PAKISTAN"

M. Kerho (Secrétaire général adjoint chargé des questions juridiques) (traduit de l’anglais): La lettre dont il s’agit (document S/499) porte la date du 18 août 1947; le Président du Conseil..."
moments ago from the Permanent Liaison Officer of the Government of India with the United Nations. The text is as follows:

"On 15 August 1947, the Government of Pakistan telegraphically applied for membership in the United Nations (document S/498, dated 16 August 1947)."

"The Government of India is particularly interested in expediting the decision of the Security Council on this petition in order to enable Pakistan to be admitted during the forthcoming session of the General Assembly.

"I have, therefore, been directed to apply for the privileges of Article 31. The interests of the Government of India in this matter are obvious and well known; but, more particularly, I would emphasize that apart from geographical proximity, the two countries have been linked for centuries past by social, cultural and economic bonds. It is expected that these common ties will continue in the future.

"The Government of India's interest in ensuring early admission of Pakistan as a Member State is therefore paramount, and it has accordingly appointed Mr. P. P. Pillai to present the Government of India's views at the discretion of the Council under Article 31."

The President: If the members of the Council consider that the interests of India are especially affected by the matter under discussion, the admission of Pakistan, I shall invite Mr. Pillai to participate in the meeting.

Colonel Hodgson (Australia): There is a doubt in my mind as to whether Article 31 applies. Moreover, is there any point in hearing a statement? I have not heard, nor do I anticipate, any opposition whatever to this application, and it seems to me rather unnecessary to invite the representative of India to the table.

The President: I am of the same opinion. However, I have received this letter from the representative of India in which he asks to be invited to sit at the Council table.

Mr. Nisot (Belgium) (translated from French): Nevertheless, in order to avoid the risk of creating a precedent, we should find out if India's interests are particularly affected, as we did when the Philippine Republic made an identical request. Members of the Council will remember that a second memorandum was submitted to us on that occasion on the basis of which we were able to issue the invitation.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): I think it is quite understandable that the representative of India wishes to come to the Council table and say some kind words about the State which has just been born of his country. I understand and sympathize with that feeling.

I do not believe there will be any objection voiced in regard to the application for membership of the United Nations (document 5/498, dated 16 August 1947)."

"The Government of India wishes to come to the Council table in the future.

"It is quite understandable that the representation of India is particularly affected by the matter under discussion, the admission of Pakistan, I shall invite Mr. Pillai to present the Indian views at the discretion of the Council under Article 31."

The President: If the members of the Council consider that the interests of India are especially affected by the matter under discussion, the admission of Pakistan, I shall invite Mr. Pillai to participate in the meeting.

Colonel Hodgson (Australia): There is a doubt in my mind as to whether Article 31 applies. Moreover, is there any point in hearing a statement? I have not heard, nor do I anticipate, any opposition whatever to this application, and it seems to me rather unnecessary to invite the representative of India to the table.

The President: I am of the same opinion. However, I have received this letter from the representative of India in which he asks to be invited to sit at the Council table.

Mr. Nisot (Belgium) (translated from French): Nevertheless, in order to avoid the risk of creating a precedent, we should find out if India's interests are particularly affected, as we did when the Philippine Republic made an identical request. Members of the Council will remember that a second memorandum was submitted to us on that occasion on the basis of which we were able to issue the invitation.

Mr. Johnson (United States of America): I think it is quite understandable that the representative of India wishes to come to the Council table and say some kind words about the State which has just been born of his country. I understand and sympathize with that feeling.

I do not believe there will be any objection voiced in regard to the application for membership of the United Nations (document 5/498, dated 16 August 1947)."

"Par conséquent, le Gouvernement de l'Inde a le plus grand intérêt à voir le Pakistan admis rapidement comme État Membre. Il a donc désigné M. P. P. Pillai pour exposer, conformément à l'article 31, l'opinion du Gouvernement de l'Inde, lorsque le Conseil le jugera utile."

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Si les membres du Conseil estiment que les intérêts de l'Inde sont particulièrement affectés par la question dont nous discutons, à savoir: l'admission du Pakistan, j'inviterai M. Pillai à participer à la séance.

Le colonel Hodgson (Australie) (traduit de l'anglais): Je ne suis pas sûr que l'article 31 s'applique à ce cas. D'autre part, est-il utile d'entendre une déclaration? Je n'ai pas entendu dire qu'il y ait eu la moindre opposition à cette demande d'admission, je ne crois pas davantage qu'il doive y en avoir: il me semble donc assez inutile d'inviter le représentant de l'Inde à cette table.

Le président (traduit de l'anglais): Telle est aussi mon opinion. Il reste que j'ai vu cette lettre dans laquelle le représentant de l'Inde demande à être invité à prendre place à la table du Conseil.

M. Nisot (Belgique): Nous devons tout de même rechercher, afin de ne pas courir le risque de créer un précédent. Si les intérêts de l'Inde sont particulièrement affectés — comme nous l'avons fait lors-que les Philippines nous ont présenté une demande identique. Vous vous rappellerez que, à cette occasion, un second mémoire nous avait été soumis, dont les données nous ont permis de procéder à l'invitation.

M. Johnson (États-Unis d'Amérique) (traduit de l'anglais): Je comprends parfaitement que le représentant de l'Inde tienne à prendre place à la table du Conseil pour prononcer quelques mots d'amitié à l'égard de cet État qui vient de naître de l'Inde. J'éprouve la plus vive sympathie pour cette attitude.

Je ne crois pas qu'on ait élevé la moindre objection contre la demande d'admission du Pakis-

1 See above, pages 2027-28.

1 Voir ci-dessus, pages 2027-28.
of Pakistan. The United States Government would certainly warmly welcome Pakistan as a Member of the United Nations.

If a majority of the members of the Council wishes to give the representative of India the opportunity to make a statement with which we all sympathize, my delegation would have no objection, however, I believe there are legal doubts as to whether Article 31 applies in this case. I do not think those doubts are important enough to make a point of not allowing the representative of India to sit at the Council table. This would not necessarily be a precedent.

The President: I believe that the invitation to the representative of India to sit at the Council table, and the fact that the representative of India supported the application of Pakistan in a statement before the Council, would have a good effect on India itself and on Pakistan.

Mr. Parodi (France) (translated from French): The Belgian representative was right to remind us of the examination of texts. I think that there can be no doubt that India is directly concerned in the question with which we are dealing. It is now merely a question of expediency. I think that we should have proceeded to a vote at once, but, out of courtesy to India and in the existing circumstances, we ought, in view of the Indian representative's wish, to accede to his request to be heard. I myself am in favour of doing so.

Mr. Nisot (Belgium) (translated from French): The Belgian delegation sympathizes fully with the Indian representative's concern. I, too, think we should invite him to the Council table, but let us do so on the grounds of rule 35 of our rules of procedure and not on the basis of Article 31 of the Charter. There is a fundamental difference in this, but it is one which, under the circumstances, can in no way restrict the freedom of speech of the representative of India.

At the invitation of the President, the representative of India took his seat at the Council table.

Mr. Pillai (India): The Indian delegation is very grateful to the Council for its kindness, notwithstanding certain initial hesitations, in permitting me to sit at this table. My only point in asking to be heard on this occasion is, as has been pointed out by some of the members present, to stress the great interest that we in India have in prosecuting the application of Pakistan for membership in the United Nations.

India's interest is obvious. I should have thought that, in an assembly of this character, that interest would hardly have been questioned. Pakistan, which all of us welcome into the family of nations, came into existence on the fifteenth of this month. The territories of which this country is composed were, until that time, integral parts of India.

The great Moslem community of India, which was desirous of building up its own political institutions as a completely separate and independent nation, now sees its dreams fulfilled and we, as Pakistan's next-door neighbours, wish the new State all prosperity and happiness.

It is apparent from our historic associations and geographical propinquity that we have the closest possible relations with our Eastern neighbour. India and Pakistan are linked in history, in language, and in race. The Indian delegation is closely concerned in the question of the representation of India at the United Nations.

Mr. Pillai (India) (translated from French): La délégation indienne est très reconnaissante au Conseil de m'avoir permis, malgré certaines hésitations initiales, de prendre place à cette table. Comme l'ont fait observer certains des membres présents, je n'ai demandé à être entendu ici que pour souligner le grand intérêt que l'Inde porte à voir procéder à l'admission du Pakistan comme Membre des Nations Unies.

Cet intérêt est évident. Je ne crois pas qu'une assemblée comme la vôtre aurait pu le contester. Le Pakistan, que nous accueillons tous avec plaisir dans la famille des nations, est né le 15 de ce mois. Les territoires dont il se compose formaient, jusqu'à cette date, partie intégrante de l'Inde.

La grande communauté islamique de l'Inde, qui désirait édifier ses propres institutions politiques pour vivre en nation entièrement indépendante, voit maintenant ses rêves réalisés. En tant que plus proches voisins du Pakistan, nous souhaitons au nouvel État la plus grande prospérité et le plus grand bonheur.

Notre association dans le passé et la proximité géographique montrent que nous avons, avec les
closest possible economic, cultural and social relations with the territories of Pakistan. We cherish the hope that the problems inherent in the fact of India and Pakistan living side by side as independent entities, will create an interdependence between us which will be all the stronger for the fact that there will be no further political constraint of any kind on either side to create mutual suspicion or distrust.

My only point in asking to be permitted to sit here today was to request this Council to waive its ordinary rules of procedure so as to allow Pakistan to be represented at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly.

From the discussions which have taken place here, it is perfectly clear to me that the application of Pakistan has evoked the greatest sympathy from all concerned, and that this Council is prepared to waive its ordinary rules of procedure and formalities in order to enable Pakistan to be represented at the next session of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: We shall vote on the question of admitting Pakistan to membership in the United Nations.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. The proposal was adopted unanimously.

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): I wish to point out that the vote we have taken here in regard to Pakistan cannot be used as a precedent to omit consideration of these matters by the Committee on the Admission of New Members. The state of affairs is not clear to us. We do not fully know whether Pakistan was born out of India or whether two new States have come into being. Of course, we accept India as a Member and we welcome Pakistan, but this precedent cannot be cited in the future as a justification for another State should split up into several States and all of those should ask for automatic admission, thereby depriving the Security Council of the privilege of making recommendations with regard to new Members.

The PRESIDENT: The next meeting on the admission of new Members will be held Thursday morning, at 10.30.

The Security Council will meet tomorrow, at 10.30 a.m., at which time we shall again discuss the Indonesian question. In the afternoon we shall meet to discuss the Greek question.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.