### TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Two hundred and sixth meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>369.</td>
<td>Provisional agenda</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370.</td>
<td>Opening remarks by the President</td>
<td>2452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371.</td>
<td>Adoption of the agenda</td>
<td>2452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372.</td>
<td>Continuation of reconsideration of the applications for admission to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Roumania and of consideration of the application of Finland</td>
<td>2452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373.</td>
<td>Announcements pertaining to the Indonesian question</td>
<td>2480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Documents

The following document, relevant to the two hundred and sixth meeting, appear as follows:

*Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, Special Supplement No. 2:*


### TABLE DES MATIERES

**Deux-cent-sixième séance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>369.</td>
<td>Ordre du jour provisoire</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370.</td>
<td>Déclaration préliminaire du Président</td>
<td>2452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371.</td>
<td>Adoption de l’ordre du jour</td>
<td>2452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372.</td>
<td>Suite du nouvel examen des demandes d’admission à l’Organisation des Nations Unies émanant de la Bulgarie, de la Hongrie, de l’Italie et de la Roumanie et examen de la demande d’admission de la Finlande</td>
<td>2452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373.</td>
<td>Communications relatives à la question indonésienne</td>
<td>2480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Documents

Le document se rapportant à la deux-cent-sixième séance figure dans la publication suivante:

*Procès-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Deuxième Année, Supplément spécial No 2:*

Rapport présenté au Conseil de sécurité par la Commission d’enquête sur les incidents survenus à la frontière grecque (document S/360).
TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTH
MEETING

 Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Wednesday, 1 October 1947, at 3 p.m.

 President: Sir Alexander CADOGAN
(United Kingdom)

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

369. Provisional agenda
(document S/Agenda/206)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Cablegram dated 19 September 1947 from the
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland ad­
dressed to the Secretary-General (document
S/559).1
3. Reconsideration of the applications for admis­
sion to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Hun­
gary, Italy and Roumania:
   (a) Letter dated 20 September 1947 from the
alternate representative of the United States
of America, addressed to the President of the
Security Council (document S/562);2
   (b) Letter dated 22 September 1947 from the
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Poland ad­
dressed to the President of the Security Coun­
cil (document S/563).3
4. The Indonesian question:
   (a) Interim report dated 22 September 1947
from the consular representatives in Batavia
(document S/573).4

1 See Official Records of the Security Council, Second
Year, No. 90, 204th meeting.
2 Ibid., No. 90, 204th meeting.
3 Ibid., No. 90, 204th meeting.
4 Ibid., No. 91.

DEUX-CENT-SIXIEME SEANCE

 Tenue à Lake Success, New-York,
le mercredi 1er octobre 1947, à 15 heures.

 Président: Sir Alexander CADOGAN
(Royaume-Uni).

 Présents: Les représentants des pays suivants:
Australie, Belgique, Brésil, Chine, Colombie,
France, Pologne, Syrie, Union des Républiques
socialistes soviétiques, Royaume-Uni, États-Unis
d’Amérique.

369. Ordre du jour provisoire
(document S/Agenda/206)

1. Adoption de l’ordre du jour.
2. Télégramme en date du 19 septembre 1947,
adressé au Secrétaire général par le Ministre
des Affaires étrangères de Finlande (docu­
ment S/559).1
3. Nouvel examen des demandes d’admission à
l’Organisation des Nations Unies émanant de
la Bulgarie, de la Hongrie, de l’Italie et de la
Roumanie:
   a) Lettre, en date du 20 septembre 1947,
adressée au Président du Conseil de sécurité
par le représentant suppléant des
États-Unis (document S/562);2
   b) Lettre, en date du 22 septembre 1947,
adressée au Président du Conseil de sécurité
par le Ministre des Affaires Étrangères
de Pologne (document S/563).3
4. La question indonésienne:
   a) Rapport intérimaire des représentants
consulaires à Batavia, en date du 22 sep­
tembre 1947 (document S/573).4

1 Voir les Procès-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité,
Deuxième Année, No 90, 204ème séance.
2 Ibid., No 90, 204ème séance.
3 Ibid., No 90, 204ème séance.
4 Ibid., No 91.
370. Opening remarks by the President

The President: I believe it is customary in the Security Council for the incoming President to express, on behalf of the Council, his appreciation for the manner in which the outgoing President conducted the affairs of the Council during his tenure of office. I gladly do so with regard to my predecessor, Mr. Gromyko; and I am sure that, in so doing, I have the support of all the other members of the Council.

I do not always see eye-to-eye with Mr. Gromyko as representative of the USSR, but I have great respect for him as President of the Council and I have great friendship for him as an individual. I think he is to be congratulated in that his period of office coincided with a time when there was a marked reduction in the volume of work, which had tended to become excessive. I can only express the hope that I shall be even more fortunate than he was.

I think we are all agreed that Mr. Gromyko maintained the dignity of his office well and did all that was possible to assist the proper dispatch of our business. I am sure we are all very grateful to him.

371. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

372. Continuation of reconsideration of the applications for admission to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Roumania and of consideration of the application of Finland

The President: The members of the Council will remember that, at an earlier meeting, we agreed to proceed by discussing separately and in chronological order the various applications before us, and thereafter to proceed to a vote on each one of those applications. The discussion has already progressed to a certain degree. At the two hundred and fifth meeting, there was some discussion on the application of Roumania, but I think it was concluded. If there are no further speakers on the application of Roumania, I shall open the discussion on the application of Bulgaria.

APPLICATION OF BULGARIA

Mr. Austin (United States of America): In its desire to conclude a peace treaty with Bulgaria, the United States of America had hoped that, by forming a basis of friendly relations between Bulgaria and all the Allied and Associated Powers, it would be enabled to support Bulgaria’s application for membership in the United Nations.

However, during the past year Bulgaria has clearly demonstrated that it still does not wish to have friendly relations with Greece, Yugoslavia and other countries, in according them the late war status, in supporting their claims against the Greek and Italian governments, in interfering against the activities of the International Control and Investigation Commissions, and in assisting the Greek and Italian nationals in their efforts to return to their homes in the former Greek and Italian territories. Bulgaria is, therefore, not an eligible candidate for membership in the United Nations.

373. Declaration of the President

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais): Les membres du Conseil se rappelleront que, au cours d’une séance précédente, il a été convenu d’examiner séparément et, par ordre chronologique, les diverses demandes d’admission dont le Conseil avait saisi, puis de mettre aux voix chacune de ces demandes. Les travaux ont déjà progressé dans une certaine mesure. Au cours de la deuxième séance, nous avons quelque peu discuté la demande d’admission de la Roumanie, et je crois que nous avons épuisé la question. Si personne ne désire prendre la parole au sujet de l’admission de la Roumanie, j’ouvrirai la discussion sur la demande de la Bulgarie.

Demande d’admission de la Bulgarie

M. Austin (Etats-Unis d’Amérique) (traduit de l’anglais): Désirant conclure un traité de paix avec la Bulgarie, les États-Unis d’Amérique espéraient qu’en jetant les bases de relations amicales entre la Bulgarie et toutes les Puissances alliées et associées, ils pourraient appuyer la demande d’admission de ce pays aux Nations Unies.


Voir Procès-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Deuxième Année, No 90, 204ème séance.

To have friendly relations with Greece, Yugoslavia and other countries, in according them the late war status, in supporting their claims against the Greek and Italian governments, in interfering against the activities of the International Control and Investigation Commissions, and in assisting the Greek and Italian nationals in their efforts to return to their homes in the former Greek and Italian territories. Bulgaria is, therefore, not an eligible candidate for membership in the United Nations.
to have friendly relations with one of its neighbours, Greece, which it invaded and occupied during the late war. On the contrary, by its actions in supporting the guerrillas who are fighting against the Greek Government and in hampering the activities of the United Nations Commission of Investigation concerning Greek frontier incidents, the Bulgarian Government has, in fact, acted in a manner which constitutes a threat to the peace.

Nine of the eleven members of the Security Council recently found that the conduct of Bulgaria constituted such a threat. My Government cannot consider that Bulgaria is eligible for membership in the United Nations as a peace-loving State. In addition to the Bulgarian Government's antagonistic attitude towards its neighbours and, indeed, towards certain other Members of the United Nations, it has foisted itself upon the Bulgarian people and, by assuming sweeping dictatorial powers, has effectively denied the people their fundamental human rights, as guaranteed in the Treaty of Peace.

In accordance with its agreement with its two Allies at Yalta, and in order to prevent the imposition of such a police State on the people of Bulgaria, my Government has vainly endeavoured over the past three years to assist them in attaining at least a modicum of representative government. The United States had hoped, through those efforts, that the Bulgarian Fatherland Front Government would be widened to include members of other political parties more truly representative of the Bulgarian people themselves. The elections held in 1946 were anything but free and untrammeled, but at least provision was made for the seating in the Bulgarian Parliament of a number of opposition deputies. Since that time, the Government has systematically eliminated these deputies from political life and, in so doing, has entirely disregarded the human rights provisions of the Treaty of Peace which it signed in February 1947.

The wave of political arrests of the opposition leaders and the trial and execution of Nikola Petkov have shocked the civilized world. These arrests are continuing. With the arbitrary dissolution of the Agrarian Union Party by the Assembly, virtually every voice which had been raised against the dictatorship of the small Communist minority in Bulgaria has been stilled. These repressive measures are in violation of the human rights provisions of the Treaty of Peace.

In the light of this record, the present Bulgarian Government cannot be considered to meet the qualifications for membership set forth in Article 4 of the Charter. It cannot, on its record, be fairly considered to be a peace-loving State, and its attitude towards international obligations must create serious doubt as to its willingness to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter. Furthermore, the failure of the Bulgarian Government to give a forthright reply to the request of the First Committee of the General Assembly as to whether Government was ready to apply the principles and rules of the Charter in settlement of the

---

1See Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, No. 79, 188th meeting.
Greeks are young, and have recently accentuated our misgivings regarding the willingness of Bulgaria to carry out the obligations of the Charter.

The United States therefore opposes the admission of Bulgaria to the United Nations.

Mr. PARODI (France) (translated from French): The French delegation has expressed support for the various applications which are before us. I have already pointed out that we were making an exception in the case of Bulgaria.

Unfortunately, an extremely regrettable event recently occurred in that country to which the United Nations cannot remain indifferent.

By virtue of the letter of the Charter, and not only of the letter, we are the guardians of certain principles and basic rules of international law and public law in general.

The event to which I allude—the execution of which has taken place in Bulgaria—deeply offends our consciousness of these basic rules. The French delegation considers that this event precludes, in the present circumstances, Bulgaria's admission to membership in the United Nations.

I should merely like to add that it is our hope that, in more propitious circumstances, at some other point in Bulgaria's history, we may be able to reconsider her application more favourably.

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): The Polish delegation supports the application of Bulgaria for admission to the United Nations. We believe, once again, that Bulgaria is in the same position as the four other former satellites of the Axis and that, by virtue of the signature of the Peace Treaties and their entry into force, as well as by virtue of the present regimes in those five countries, they are eligible for membership in the United Nations within the meaning of the terms laid down by the Charter.

My delegation believes that, after many years of dictatorship and many years of existence under a reactionary régime, Bulgaria for the first time is on the road to democracy.

Several allegations have been made here against Bulgaria. It is very difficult to discuss or to deny those allegations, in view of the fact that none of them have been supported here by any facts.

The allegation has been made that the Government of Bulgaria is composed of a Communist minority, and that opposition parties are being threatened and deprived of their rights. Let us see what the composition of the Government really is. At the moment there is a Government which is composed of nine representatives of the Communist Party, five representatives of the Agrarian Party, two representatives of the Social Democratic Party, two representatives of the Zveno Party and one independent non-party member. I cannot find in this composition any Communist majority or Communist-dominated Government.

The question as to whether the Bulgarian people have or have not decided to include some parties favoured by some of the great Powers cannot influence the members of the Security Council in their attitude to the admission of Bulgaria to the United Nations.

Mr. PARODI (France): The delegation of the Poles appuies la demande d'admission de la Bulgarie à l'Organisation des Nations Unies. Nous estimons que la Bulgarie se trouve dans la même situation que les quatre autres pays qui furent satellites des Puissances de l'Axe, et que ces satellites sont qualifiés par leur ratification des traités de paix actuels, que par la nature des régimes qu'ils connaissent actuellement, à être admis à l'Organisation des Nations Unies, au sens même des dispositions de la Charte.

Ma délégation estime qu'après avoir connu de nombreuses années de dictature et récentes, pendant de nombreuses années sous un régime réactionnaire, la Bulgarie, pour la première fois dans son histoire, s'est engagée sur le chemin de la démocratie.

Plusieurs accusations ont été portées ici contre la Bulgarie. Il est très difficile de discuter ou de les réfuter, étant donné qu'elles ne sont étayées par aucun fait.

On a prétendu que le gouvernement est uni par un parti communiste minoritaire, et que les partis d'opposition sont l'objet de menaces et se trouvent privés de leurs droits. Voyons quelle est, en réalité, la composition du gouvernement. En ce moment, le gouvernement comprend neuf représentants du parti communiste, cinq représentants du parti agraire, deux représentants du parti social-démocrate, deux représentants du parti Zveno et un membre indépendant n'appartenant à aucun parti. Je ne vois pas comment l'on peut dire qu'il s'agit là d'un gouvernement à majorité communiste ou dominé par les communistes. Que le peuple bulgare, ou n'a pas, décidé d'inclure certains partis qui jouissaient de la faveur de certaines grandes puissances, cela ne peut peser sur l'attitude de
their attitude towards the applications for membership.

We have every reason to believe that Bulgaria will become a good and useful Member of the United Nations. At the present time, the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria is working on the preparation of a new constitution. The draft constitution provides that Bulgaria will be a people's republic with a representative government; the head of the State will be elected president for a four-year term, and may serve only two terms. A single national assembly is to be elected for four years, and that assembly is to elect a president and a prime minister. This assembly is to have full control of the affairs of the State. The draft constitution proclaims the equality of all people, freedom of the Press, freedom of assembly and freedom of speech. It gives protection to private enterprise, property, labour and savings and declares at the same time that the land belongs to those who work on it.

After the recent elections, which have been so strongly criticized, the last provision was, in large measure, confirmed, in a clear and unequivocal manner, that he would move in the Constituent Assembly the inclusion of article 8 of the draft constitution. This article states that the private property of peasants, artisans, manual workers and intellectuals, as well as the rights of inheritance, are confirmed and guaranteed to the owners of property and to their heirs forever.

I really do not see how anyone can accuse a country which is preparing a constitution in that spirit of having a minority dictatorship.

Let us remember another thing, namely, that on 8 September 1944, Bulgaria declared war on the Axis and that Bulgarian troops participated in the fighting in Austria.

There are two more points which I should like to mention. One is that the United States representative cites Bulgaria's attitude towards Greece and the Commission of Investigation as one of the reasons for barring the entry of Bulgaria into the United Nations. It is worth reminding the members of the Council that, during the Peace Conference in Paris, it was Greece which claimed territory from Bulgaria and not Bulgaria which claimed any territory from Greece. It is worth noting that the nations assembled at the Peace Conference in Paris rejected that demand of Greece.

The question as to whether Bulgaria is helping the partisans in Greece is still being discussed by the First Committee. We know the terms in which the report of the Commission of Investigation was worded. Without going into my attitude towards the report as a whole, I wish to point out that even that part which deals with the aid allegedly given by the Bulgarian Government to the partisans and to the democratic army of Greece is worded very vaguely; the Commission indicates that it was able to find very little evidence to that effect.

As I have already said, we are still discussing the question in the First Committee, and we do adopter par les membres du Conseil de sécurité quant à la demande d'admission de la Bulgarie à l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Nous avons tout lieu de penser que la Bulgarie deviendra, dans cette Organisation, un membre utile et conscient de ses devoirs. A l'heure actuelle, l'Assemblée nationale de la République bulgare prépare une nouvelle constitution. Aux termes de ce projet, la Bulgarie sera une république populaire disposant d'un gouvernement représentatif; le chef de l'État sera un président élu pour quatre ans et rééligible une fois seulement. Il n'y aura qu'une assemblée nationale, élue pour quatre ans; c'est elle qui élit le président et le premier ministre. Elle exerce un contrôle absolu sur les affaires publiques. Le projet de constitution proclame l'égalité de tous devant la loi, la liberté de la presse, les libertés de réunion et de parole. Il protège l'entreprise privée, la propriété, le travail et l'épargne, et déclare en même temps que la terre appartient à ceux qui la travaillent.

Après les récentes élections, qui ont été si fortement critiquées, cette dernière disposition a été confirmée, dans une large mesure. Le Premier Ministre et chef du Front national a déclaré nettement et sans équivoque possible qu'il proposait à l'Assemblée constituante, d'inclure dans la constitution l'article 8 du projet. Par cet article, les paysains, les artisans, les travailleurs manuels et les intellectuels se voient confirmer et garantir à perpétuité, pour eux et pour leurs héritiers, le droit de propriété et le droit d'héritage.

Je ne vois vraiment pas comment quiconque peut accuser un pays, qui prépare une constitution dans cet esprit, d'être une dictature de la minorité.

N'oublions pas non plus que le 8 septembre 1944 la Bulgarie a déclaré la guerre aux Puisances de l'Axe, et que les troupes bulgares ont combattu en territoire autrichien.

J'aurais eu de mentionner deux autres points. Tout d'abord, le représentant des États-Unis, pour barrer l'admission de la Bulgarie à l'Organisation des Nations Unies, a invoqué, notamment, l'attitude adoptée par ce pays à l'égard de la Grèce et de la Commission enquête. Il est bon de rappeler aux membres du Conseil qu'à la Conférence de la paix à Paris, ce n'est pas la Bulgarie qui a réclamé des territoires à la Grèce, c'est la Grèce qui a réclamé des territoires à la Bulgarie. Il est également bon de noter que les nations réunies à la Conférence de la paix à Paris, ont rejeté la demande de la Grèce.

La Première Commission discute toujours la question de savoir si la Bulgarie vient en aide aux partisans en Grèce. Nous connaissons les termes dans lesquels le rapport de la Commission d'enquête a été rédigé. Sans vouloir donner mon avis sur l'ensemble du rapport, je désire cependant faire remarquer que même la partie du rapport relative à l'aide qui le Gouvernement bulgare a censé avoir fournir à l'armée démocratique et aux partisans grecs est rédigée en termes très vagues; la Commission signale qu'elle n'a pu réunir que très peu d'éléments d'information à ce sujet.

Comme je l'ai déjà dit, nous discutons encore de cette question au sein de la Première Com-


not know what the decision of the First Committee will be. I consider, therefore, that an argument which still remains to be decided by the representatives of fifty-seven nations cannot be used in this Council as a reason for denying to Bulgaria the right of admission to the Organization of the United Nations.

There is a very surprising difference between the attitude of the United States representative in the Council and his attitude in the First Committee. When Bulgaria and Albania demanded to be heard and to be allowed to participate in the discussions of the First Committee in order to be able to reply to various allegations made by the Greek Government against their respective Governments, it was the United States representative who demanded that a condition should be imposed, namely, that Bulgaria should undertake to adhere to the principles of the Charter with regard to settling that dispute. I do not understand why the representative of the United States considered Bulgaria fit to accept those obligations in the First Committee and not fit to adhere to them as a member of the United Nations.

I believe that, if we wish to act in the spirit of the Charter, we cannot accept the reasons which have been given here by the representative of the United States and that we must vote in favour of the application of Bulgaria for membership in the United Nations.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The USSR delegation supports the Bulgarian Government’s request that Bulgaria should be admitted to membership in the United Nations. In so doing my delegation bases itself on the obligations assumed by the Government of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics under the Potsdam Agreement as well as under the Peace Treaty concluded with Bulgaria, which has now come into force.

I must draw the Council’s attention to the fact that the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and also France are violating the obligations they assumed under the Peace Treaties. In the preambles to the Peace Treaties it is pointed out that the signatory States shall undertake to adhere to the principles of the Charter with regard to settling disputes. I do not understand why the representative of the United States considered Bulgaria fit to accept those obligations in the First Committee and not fit to adhere to them as a member of the United Nations.

Under the Potsdam Agreement, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States have to support the applications for admission to the United Nations of the countries with which peace treaties are concluded, to wit, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Italy and Roumania. Now, in objecting to the admission of these countries, or of most of them, the United States and the United Kingdom are violating the obligations they have assumed. This is not the first time they have violated obligations which they have assumed; nevertheless I feel I must point out that they are doing so here again, in connexion with the consideration of the admission of these five countries to the United Nations.

Il y a une différence étonnante entre l’attitude prise par le représentant des États-Unis à ce Conseil et celle qu’il a adoptée au sein de la Première Commission. Lorsque la Bulgarie et l’Albanie ont demandé à être entendues et à prendre part aux débats de la Première Commission, afin d’être en mesure de répondre aux diverses accusations formulées par le Gouvernement grec contre leurs Gouvernements respectifs, c’est le représentant des États-Unis qui a demandé que l’on impose comme condition à la Bulgarie d’adhérer aux principes de la Charte en ce qui concerne le règlement de ce différend. Je ne comprends pas pourquoi le représentant des États-Unis a jugé que la Bulgarie était capable d’assumer ces obligations à la Première Commission, et incapable de les respecter en tant que Membre de l’Organisation des Nations Unies.

Je crois que si nous voulons agir dans l’esprit de la Charte, nous ne pouvons admettre les raisons données ici par le représentant des États-Unis, et qu’il nous appartient de voter en faveur de l’admission de la Bulgarie à l’Organisation des Nations Unies.


Par l’Accord de Potsdam, l’URSS, le Royaume-Uni et les États-Unis sont tenus d’appuyer les demandes d’admission des États avec lesquels les traités de paix étaient signés ; il s’agit de la Bulgarie, de la Finlande, de la Hongrie, de l’Italie et de la Roumanie. En s’opposant maintenir à l’admission de ces pays, ou de la plupart d’entre eux, les États-Unis et le Royaume-Uni violent les obligations qu’ils ont assumées. Ce n’est pas la première fois qu’ils le font, mais néanmoins j’estime nécessaire de le relever une fois de plus, à l’occasion des débats sur l’admission de ces cinq pays au sein de l’Organisation...
applications for admission to the United Nations of these five countries. I cannot pass over this fact without drawing it to the attention of the Security Council.

The United States representative tried here to justify his position with regard to the Bulgarian application by stating that Bulgaria is to blame for the deterioration in the relations between Bulgaria and Greece. The grounds for these charges are contained in the statement—a completely unfounded statement—of the Greek Government and in the equally baseless assertions of the representatives of the United States Government both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. But as is well known, opinions on this point differ. The USSR Government and the representatives of the USSR in the General Assembly and in the Security Council have pointed out that the reason for the deterioration in the relations between Greece and her northern neighbours is the behaviour of the Greek authorities and of those countries which have extended their political and economic control over Greece and over the foreign and domestic policies of the Greek Government.

Thus, when the United States representative asserts, as though it were a fact, that Bulgaria is to blame for the unsatisfactory relations which exist between Bulgaria and Greece, he, like the other United States representatives in the United Nations, merely misrepresents the true position. I repeat, opinions on this point differ, and the opinion of the USSR Government and of its representatives as to who is right and who is to blame with regard to this so-called Greek problem is completely at variance with that of the United States in this connection.

The United States representative referred to certain facts which concern the internal affairs of Bulgaria. His statement leaves no doubt as to the fact that the United States Government still regards it as normal practice to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, including countries with which Peace Treaties have been concluded. The facts referred to relate to the internal affairs of Bulgaria. It is for Bulgaria and the Bulgarian people to arrange their internal affairs as they wish. Bulgaria is a peace-loving country which desires to collaborate with other States and with the United Nations, in the interests of strengthening international peace and developing friendly relations between nations. Bulgaria has already demonstrated that it knows quite well how to settle matters with war criminals who have brought so much misery to the Bulgarian people, and in that respect it has set an example to certain other States, including some Allied States. It would not be a bad idea if certain other States were to follow that example.

As regards various other matters relating to the situation in the Bulgarian Parliament and to party life and the activities of political parties in Bulgaria, it is the business neither of the United States nor of any other country to dictate to Bulgaria and the Bulgarian people how they are to solve their political problems, what relations they should establish between various political parties and how they should organize the national, political and economic life of that country. The people of Bulgaria have shown that they stand in des Nations Unies, car je ne puis passer ce fait sous silence et ne pas attirer là-dessus l'attention du Conseil.

Le représentant des États-Unis a tenté d'expliquer son attitude à l'égard de la demande de la Bulgarie en prétendant que ce pays est responsable de la détérioration de ses relations avec la Grèce. Ces accusations se fondent sur la déclaration absolument injustifiée du Gouvernement grec ainsi que sur les affirmations également injustifiées des représentants du Gouvernement des États-Unis au Conseil de sécurité et à l'Assemblée générale. Ainsi, comme on le sait, les avis divergent sur ce point. Le Gouvernement de l'URSS et les représentants de l'URSS à l'Assemblée générale et au Conseil de sécurité ont indiqué que la cause de la détérioration des rapports entre la Grèce et ses voisins du Nord réside dans l'attitude des autorités grecques, ainsi que dans l'attitude des États qui ont assumé le contrôle politique et économique de la Grèce, de même que le contrôle de sa politique intérieure et extérieure.

Quand le représentant des États-Unis affirme que la Bulgarie est responsable des mauvaises relations qui existent entre ce pays et la Grèce, il ne fait que déformer les faits véritables, comme le font aussi les autres représentants des États-Unis à l'Organisation des Nations Unies. Les avis, je le répète, diffèrent au sujet de la question dite "grecque", et l'opinion du Gouvernement de l'URSS et de son représentant se distingue radicalement de celle du Gouvernement des États-Unis sur la question de savoir qui a raison et qui a tort dans cette affaire.

Le représentant des États-Unis a mentionné certains faits se rapportant au domaine de la vie intérieure de la Bulgarie. Sa déclaration ne permet pas de douter que le Gouvernement des États-Unis estime toujours qu'il est normal de s'ingérer dans les affaires intérieures des autres États, y compris les États avec lesquels les traités de paix ont été conclus. Les faits mentionnés sont du domaine intérieur de la Bulgarie. C'est à la Bulgarie et au peuple bulgare qu'il appartient d'organiser leurs affaires intérieures comme bon leur semble. La Bulgarie est un État pacifique qui désire coopérer avec les autres pays et avec l'Organisation des Nations Unies afin de consolider la paix internationale et de développer les relations amicales entre États. La Bulgarie a déjà montré qu'elle est parfaitement capable de régler le sort des criminels de guerre, qui ont été la cause de beaucoup de souffrances pour le peuple bulgare; elle a ainsi donné un exemple dont d'autres États devraient s'inspirer, y compris certains États alliés. Il ne serait pas mauvais que certains autres États suivissent l'exemple de la Bulgarie.

Quant à telles autres questions concernant la situation au Parlement bulgare, l'évolution intérieure et l'activité des partis politiques en Bulgarie, il faut dire qu'il n'appartient pas aux États-Unis d'Amérique, ni à aucun autre pays, de dicter à la Bulgarie et au peuple bulgare la politique qu'ils doivent suivre, ni de déterminer les relations qu'ils doivent établir entre les partis politiques, ni de décider de quelle façon ils doivent organiser la vie politique et économique du pays. Le peuple bulgare a montré qu'il n'a pas
no need of lessons of the kind that certain States, more particularly the United States, are trying to give them. The Bulgarians are a mature people and have shown in practice not only that they can successfully wipe out the consequences of the war, but also that they can successfully build up peace in collaboration with other States, with the USSR and other European States and with all other States, both Members and non-members of the United Nations, if such collaboration is based on mutual appreciation of each other's interests.

The USSR delegation cannot possibly accept the completely baseless assertions that are being repeated at nearly every meeting, whenever the applications for admission to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Roumania and certain other States come up for discussion. The Bulgarian people have shown that they can successfully settle accounts with enemies who sacrifice the interests of Bulgaria by championing the interests of other States. The points at which the United States representative hinted would be elaborated, but I do not think that that would strengthen his position, rather the opposite. Bulgaria is settling accounts with the enemies of the Bulgarian people who are at the same time enemies of other countries which are striving genuinely to strengthen international peace. If these enemies possess friends and champions abroad, that can only be a matter for regret. Bulgaria and the Bulgarian people, however, must be guided not by the opinions of the friends and champions of such people but by the fundamental, basic national interests of their State, which coincide—and cannot but coincide—with the interests of the United Nations.

The USSR supports the proposal to admit Bulgaria to the United Nations, holding that Bulgaria is certainly able to carry out the obligations of peace with Italy would enable the signatories to support the applications for admission, and he said that if you remove one country, you do not thereby qualify in all other respects.

After the peace treaties, all States that occurred in Bulgaria and among its friends and champions of such people, but by the fundamental, basic national interests of their State, which coincide—and cannot but coincide—with the interests of the United Nations.

The USSR supports the proposal to admit Bulgaria to the United Nations, holding that Bulgaria is certainly able to carry out the obligations of peace with Italy would enable the signatories to support the applications for admission, and he said that if you remove one country, you do not thereby qualify in all other respects.

The President: I should like to say a few words as representative of the United Kingdom.

I had not thought that I should be called upon again to repudiate and refute the allegation which has been made, namely, that my Government, with other Governments, has violated both the Potsdam Declaration and the Treaties of Peace. The representative of the USSR has not quoted exactly the terms either of the Potsdam Declaration or of the Treaties of Peace. The Potsdam Declaration stated that the conclusion of a treaty of peace with Italy would enable the signatories to support the applications for admission of any country which becomes a Member of the United Nations.

Mr. Gromyko said that under the Potsdam Declaration we promised that we "shall support" the applications for admission, and he said that in the proclaims to the Peace Treaties we "have to support" them. I have in front of me the text of the preamble to the Peace Treaty with Bulgaria, which says: "Whereas the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria are desirous of concluding a treaty of peace which . . . will . . . form the basis of friendly relations between them, thereby enabling the Allies and Associated Powers and Bulgaria to support a Member of the United Nations.

That imposes no obligation on Bulgaria to support other Members of the United Nations. Another of the disputed treaties was that they would not agree to no peace treaties with Italy. But, as I have said before, if you remove one country, you do not thereby qualify in all other respects.

In the view of my Government, there is no reason to doubt that the action of the United States, and of the other members of the United Nations, is in accordance with the purposes and principles stated in the Charter and in particular with the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. I would like to quote a sentence in the Potsdam Declaration which says: "The people of the United Nations, if such collaboration is based on mutual appreciation of each other's interests, would make it possible for the signatories to support the admission of Bulgaria, holding that Bulgaria is certainly able to carry out the obligations of peace with Italy would enable the signatories to support the applications for admission, and he said that if you remove one country, you do not thereby qualify in all other respects.

In regard to the question of the admission of Bulgaria to the United Nations, there is one upon which it is that the State
thereby enabling the Allied and Associated Powers to support Bulgaria's applications to become a Member of the United Nations.

That imposes no obligation to support the admission of Bulgaria to the United Nations; what it does is to remove one of the disqualifications. Another of the disqualifications of all these countries was that they were still technically at war, that no peace treaties with them had come into force. But, as I have pointed out twice before, if you remove one common disqualification, you do not thereby qualify these countries absolutely in all other respects.

After the peace treaty had been drafted, events occurred in Bulgaria which certainly would justify us in considering its case on its merits, as it presents itself to us now. We are under no obligation whatever to support Bulgaria's admission.

In the view of my Government, there is grievous reason to doubt the eligibility of Bulgaria, if only because of that country's behaviour in respect of the Greek question. In particular, I would mention the manner in which Bulgaria has flouted and obstructed the work and the authority of the Council as far as the activities of the Subsidary Group in Greece are concerned.

Moreover, as other representatives have already pointed out, recent acts of the Bulgarian Government, especially the execution of Mr. Petkov, who was formerly imprisoned by the Nazis as a Bulgarian patriot, are clearly incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter, and in particular with the human rights and fundamental freedoms which Bulgaria undertook to observe in the Treaty of Peace to which Mr. Gromyko makes reference.

In these circumstances, my Government opposes the application of Bulgaria for admission to the United Nations.

Mr. Tsiang (China): I am sure the Council does not wish that this discussion should be protracted unduly. I shall state, very simply and briefly, the stand of my delegation on the admission of Bulgaria.

I favour the principle of universality so ably advocated here by the representative of Syria, but we can try only to approach universality. A mechanical and mathematical universality is not possible and was never intended by the authors of the Charter, as is evidenced by the fact that the Charter lays down conditions for admission to as well as conditions for expulsion from the United Nations.

However, it is my belief that, in applying the relevant Articles, we should be liberal and objective. Where there is a legitimate ground for doubt, the benefit of the doubt should be given to the applicant.

In regard to the conditions for membership, there is one upon which I think we must insist. It is that the State must be peace-loving, because permitting such as the United Nations and Associated Powers to support Bulgaria's applications for admission to the United Nations. I point out twice before, if you remove one common disqualification, you do not thereby qualify these countries absolutely in all other respects.

In these circumstances, my Government opposes the application of Bulgaria for admission to the United Nations.

Mr. Tsiang (China): I am sure the Council does not wish that this discussion should be protracted unduly. I shall state, very simply and briefly, the stand of my delegation on the admission of Bulgaria.

I favour the principle of universality so ably advocated here by the representative of Syria, but we can try only to approach universality. A mechanical and mathematical universality is not possible and was never intended by the authors of the Charter, as is evidenced by the fact that the Charter lays down conditions for admission to as well as conditions for expulsion from the United Nations.

However, it is my belief that, in applying the relevant Articles, we should be liberal and objective. Where there is a legitimate ground for doubt, the benefit of the doubt should be given to the applicant.

In regard to the conditions for membership, there is one upon which I think we must insist. It is that the State must be peace-loving, because permitting such as the United Nations and Associated...
the primary, basic and irreducible minimum objective of this Organization is the keeping of peace.

In applying this test to Bulgaria, or to any other State, we should not judge subjectively as to whether it has or has not the intention of keeping the peace. But we should not close our eyes to acts which have disturbed the peace. It is very true that the Assembly has not passed a resolution on that question, but the majority of the Commission sent by the Security Council to Greece has made a report which points out that the Bulgarian Government has violated the Greek frontier. The report of the Subsidiary Group is to the same effect.

On that ground, therefore, and on that ground alone, my delegation finds it impossible to support the admission of Bulgaria to the United Nations.

Mr. EL-KHOURI (Syria): I am not going to deny the accusations that have been made against the Government of Bulgaria by the representatives of the United States, nor shall I deny the justification and defence of Bulgaria made by the representatives of Poland and the USSR. I shall discuss this matter from another angle.

I suppose that there are certain ways of remediating a situation by not adhering very strictly to formalism in explaining and interpreting the requirements of the Charter. The conditions for membership which are laid down in the Charter may be divided into two categories. The first is that the State should be peace-loving; that means, as I understand it, that the State should be devoted to the maintenance of international peace and security. The other requirement is that the State should be willing and able to fulfill the requirements of the Charter; that would mean adherence to the principles and purposes of the Charter, especially those concerning human rights and the various freedoms—freedom of speech, of assembly, of religion and any other kind of freedom which ought to be respected by all the Members of the United Nations and by those who wish to be admitted to membership in the United Nations. I consider that any violation of these fundamental rights is a serious crime and should be remedied in some way.

We have to find measures by which such evils may be remedied or corrected and readjusted. We should ask ourselves whether a non-member State out of the Organization of the United Nations is a better way to correct its position and defects than to admit it to membership in the United Nations and have it correct its faults within the Organization. If the governing party of a State were molesting the freedom and rights of the opposition party, and if that State remained outside the United Nations, there would be no way to have the complaint remedied and no way to make an accusation. If the State were a Member of the United Nations, there would be some way to correct such abuse. There are evils of humanity which should be taken into consideration; and I consider that the United Nations is required to find some way to correct these evils.

Assuming that all the defects attributed today for that Assembly to the Bulgarian Government were a Member of the United Nations, there would be some way to correct such evils and no way to make an accusation. If the State were a Member of the United Nations, there would be some way to correct such abuse. There are evils of humanity which should be taken into consideration; and I consider that the United Nations is required to find some way to correct these evils.

M. EL-KHOURI (Syrie) (traduit de l'anglais): Je ne vais pas contester les accusations portées contre le Gouvernement bulgare par le représentant des Etats-Unis, pas plus que je ne contesterai les arguments présentés par les représentants de la Pologne et de l'URSS pour la justification et la défense de la Bulgarie. J'aborderai la discussion de la question sous un autre angle.

Je suppose que l'on peut par certains moyens remédier à une situation, en se tenant à une formule trop strict, quand il s'agit d'expliquer et d'interpréter les prescriptions de la Charte. On peut classer en deux catégories les conditions d'admission posées dans la Charte. La première condition est que l'Etat soit pacifique; cela signifie — c'est ainsi que je le comprends — que l'Etat doit être désireux d'assurer le maintien de la paix et de la sécurité internationales. L'autre condition est que l'Etat soit désireux et capable d'assumer les obligations de la Charte; cela implique les principes et buts de la Charte, en particulier à ceux qui ont trait aux droits de l'homme et aux diverses libertés: liberté de parole, de réunion, de religion et toute autre liberté, qui doivent être respectées par tous les Membres de l'Organisation des Nations Unies et par ceux qui désirent le devenir. Je considère que toute violation de ces droits fondamentaux est un délit grave et qu'il convient d'y porter remède d'une manière ou d'une autre.

Nous devons trouver des moyens permettant de remédier à ces maux ou d'en corriger et d'en atténuer les effets. Nous devons demander si, pour permettre à un Etat non Membre de modifier son attitude et de s'amender, il vaut mieux le laisser en dehors de l'Organisation des Nations Unies, ou au contraire l'y admettre et lui faire corriger ses défauts au sein de l'Organisation.

The Pitzi: I am sorry to hear that the Greek Government has violated the Bulgarian frontier. The report of the Subsidiary Group is to the same effect.

Mr. Katz-Sueur (Bulgaria): I see that there is a way to speak, and we can.

Nothing really new in the statement of the representatives who opposed Bulgaria. However, one point of view of the statement of the representative of Poland is that the admission of Bulgaria to the United Nations in the present council is an act of Party politics. I say with the representative of America. This after all the discussion of the United Nations with, and upon the responsible of the representative of the United States, and the relations of the United Nations with the United States, and the relations of the United Nations and the United States, and the relations of the United States with the United Nations, and the relations of the United Nations and the United States, and the relations of the United States with the United Nations. It is a question that the Federal Republic of Bulgaria, if it is a question of the organization of the United Nations, we should be able to see it in a different way from the present one. We should be able to see it in a different way from the present one. We should be able to see it in a different way from the present one. We should be able to see it in a different way from the present one.

Application to the President: A point of view of the statement of the representative of America. This after all the discussion of the United Nations with, and upon the responsible of the representative of the United States, and the relations of the United Nations with the United States, and the relations of the United Nations and the United States, and the relations of the United States with the United Nations. It is a question that the Federal Republic of Bulgaria, if it is a question of the organization of the United Nations, we should be able to see it in a different way from the present one. We should be able to see it in a different way from the present one. We should be able to see it in a different way from the present one. We should be able to see it in a different way from the present one.
to the Bulgarian Government do exist, should we permit them to continue to exist? If we refuse to admit Bulgaria to membership in the United Nations, would that refusal aid in the correction of these faults and these evils, supposing that they do exist? Would not admitting Bulgaria to the United Nations give us a strong hand in making it correct these evils afterwards? I believe that a Member State would feel more bound to respect the principles of the United Nations and of the Charter than would a State which is outside the Organization.

If I look at the question from that point of view, I think I can convince myself of the correctness of the principle of universality. I do not adhere to strict formalism in interpreting the requirements for membership. The object and goal of all our work is to eliminate evils and injustices from the world as far as possible; and I consider that the admission of any State into the Organization of the United Nations would facilitate the work and prepare the ground to enable us to attain that end.

For these reasons, the Syrian delegation still adheres to the principle of universality.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I shall be very brief. I see that there is no one else who wishes to speak, and we can proceed.

Nothing really new was said by those representatives who oppose the admission of Bulgaria. However, one point strikes me as puzzling, in view of the statement which has been made here by the representative of the United States of America. This afternoon the Acting Secretary of State of the United States announced that his Government was entering into diplomatic relations with, and appointing a diplomatic representative to Bulgaria. I believe that diplomatic relations are as important as membership in the United Nations and that, by entering into diplomatic relations, the United States has recognized the necessity for collaboration with Bulgaria; it could therefore fully support the application of Bulgaria before this Council.

**Application from Finland**

The President: As no other member wishes to speak on the Bulgarian application, the discussion on that application is closed.

The next application before the Council is that on behalf of Finland. Before I open the discussion on that application, I ought perhaps to remind the Council that at the two hundred and fourth meeting, the question was raised as to whether, in the ordinary course of affairs, that application should not first be referred—as the others were and as this one has not been—to the Committee on the Admission of New Members. But I think the sense of the Council was then, and I hope it is now, that that formality could perhaps be dispensed with. Unless I hear any opinion to the contrary, I shall assume that the Council thinks we can at once initiate a discussion here on the Finnish application without going


Si j'envisage la question sous cet angle, je puis me convaincre, me semble-t-il, de la justesse du principe de l'universalité. Je ne suis pas partisan d'un formalisme étroit dans l'interprétation des conditions d'admission. L'objet de notre travail est de supprimer dans le monde les maux et les injustices autant que faire se peut, et j'estime que l'admission d'un Etat qui, à son tour, serait membre de l'Organisation des Nations Unies, faciliterait cette tâche et préparerait le terrain en vue de la réalisation de nos fins.

Pour ces raisons, la délégation de la Syrie reste toujours partisan du principe de l'universalité.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Je serai très bref. Je constate que personne d'autre ne désire prendre la parole, nous pouvons donc aller de l'avant.

Rien de réellement nouveau n'a été dit par les représentants qui s'opposent à l'admission de la Bulgarie. Cependant un point m'intrigue, après avoir entendu la déclaration faite ici par le représentant des États-Unis d'Amérique. Cet après-midi, le Secrétaire d'Etat par intérim des États-Unis a annoncé que son Gouvernement avait noué des relations diplomatiques avec la Bulgarie et avait accédité un représentant dans ce pays. J'estime que les relations diplomatiques sont aussi importantes que l'admission à l'Organisation des Nations Unies, et qu'en nouant des relations diplomatiques, les États-Unis ont reconnu la nécessité d'une collaboration avec la Bulgarie; aussi pourraient-ils, selon nous, appuyer pleinement devant le Conseil la demande d'admission de la Bulgarie.

**Demande d'admission de la Finlande**

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Aucun membre ne demandant plus la parole au sujet de la demande d'admission de la Bulgarie, je déclare la discussion close.

La demande d'admission suivante dont le Conseil est saisi est celle de la Finlande. Avant d'ouvrir la discussion sur cette demande, je devrais peut-être rappeler au Conseil qu'au cours de la deux-cent-quatrième séance, on avait soulevé la question de savoir si, comme de coutume, il n'y aurait pas lieu que la demande fût d'abord remise au Comité d'admission des nouveaux membres, comme l'ont été les autres et comme celle-ci ne l'a pas été. Mais je crois que le Conseil avait alors estimé, et j'espère qu'estime encore, que l'on pourrait peut-être se dispenser de cette formalité. Sauf avis contraire, je tiendrai pour acquis que le Conseil de sécurité est d'avis que nous pouvons immédiatement entamer la discus-
through the process of first remitting it for examination to the Committee, on the Admission of New Members.

I might perhaps remind the members of the Council that the situation is governed by rule 59 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council. Rule 59 states in part: "Unless the Security Council decides otherwise, the application shall be referred by the President to a committee of the Security Council..."

As there is no objection to the procedure I proposed, I now open the discussion on the Fin

As there is no objection to the procedure I proposed, I now open the discussion on the Finnish application.

Mr. Austin (United States of America): The United States Government is pleased that Finland's application for membership in the United Nations has been received. It believes that Finland meets fully the qualifications for membership set forth in Article 4 of the Charter.

Finland has satisfactorily fulfilled its obligations under the Armistice and its general international obligations. Since the Armistice of September 1944, Finland has participated in meetings of the International Labour Organization and other international gatherings, with the approval of many nations. Finland has been interested in extending its friendly contacts with other nations and has renewed diplomatic relations with numerous countries. Evidence since the date of the signing of the Armistice indicates that Finland has firmly adopted a policy of peace with its neighbours and with all Members of the United Nations.

The recent ratification of the Finnish Treaty of Peace terminated the state of war which existed between Finland and certain Members of the United Nations. Finland's entry into the United Nations, desired by the Government and people of Finland, will be an appropriate completion of Finland's integration into peaceful international life.

In the light of these considerations, my Government favours the admission of Finland into the United Nations.

I should like to take this opportunity to note, for the record, that although the Council is not now reconsidering the applications of Austria, Ireland, Portugal and Transjordan, my Government continues to feel that these nations, as well as Finland, are qualified for admission to the United Nations.

It is to be hoped that the General Assembly will take some action to secure proper reconsideration of these applications.

Mr. Tsang (China): I wish simply to state that my Government would welcome the admission of Finland to the United Nations.

Mr. El-Khoury (Syria): I am delighted to hear it stated that Finland has the qualifications for admission to membership in the United Na-
The Syrian delegation will vote for a resolution containing the recommendation that Finland should be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) : In proposing the admission of the five former satellites, my Government was motivated by a desire to wipe out the consequences of the war, which left those five States outside the Organization of the United Nations.

We considered that those five satellites fell within one group, a group bound together by a common fate in the past war and now returning to normal life and normal relations with all the Members of the United Nations.

We considered it to be the duty of the Security Council to facilitate the admission of those five States and to enable them to maintain close relations with the United Nations and to enjoy the benefits which membership in this Organization confers.

At the two hundred and fifth meeting, when speaking on the application of Italy, I unfortunately had to point out that the intention of the Polish Government was being misunderstood here, and that the Polish draft resolution was being misused for the purpose of dividing nations into various groups. I do not think the Council has the duty or the right to divide nations or to group them into camps and to treat some with favour and others with disfavour.

In this situation, I am afraid the Polish delegation is not in a position to support the application of Finland. We repeat that we submitted a draft resolution containing the recommendation that Finland should be admitted to membership in the United Nations, and to enjoy the advantages which membership in this Organization confers.

The people of Finland know the attitude which the Government of Poland and the people of Poland have towards Finland and its people. Soon after the signing of the Armistice and the normalization of conditions inside Finland, Poland established normal diplomatic relations and trade relations with Finland. The Finnish people still remember who their friends are. The experience of the years 1940 and 1941 has shown the Finnish people who their friends are and how badly advised they were by those who tried to use Finland as a tool for their own purposes. We do not want a repetition of that period. That is why we shall vote for the acceptance of the five States, but we cannot, in a separate vote, support the application of Finland.

1 See Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, No. 91.
Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): In accordance with the Potsdam Agreement, as well as with the obligations which the Government of the USSR accepted in respect of the five States whose applications are under discussion, the USSR delegation supports the application for admission to the United Nations of Finland just as it supports the applications of the four other States. In so doing the USSR Government bases itself on the fact that there are no reasons for doubting that these five States are anxious and able to fulfil the obligations devolving on countries which become Members of the United Nations.

We consider that all these five States, including Finland, are not only willing but are capable of discharging the obligations devolving upon them as Members of the United Nations. Needless to say, we take the view that no single country can be placed in a class by itself and that all the five countries, including Finland, deserve to be admitted to the United Nations.

Mr. Muniz (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation supports the admission of Finland. The record of that country and of the present government fully satisfies the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and qualifies the Finnish State for admission as a Member of the United Nations.

I wish to call the attention of the Council to the fact that the Brazilian delegation also would favour reconsideration by the Security Council of the admission of Austria, Ireland, Portugal and Transjordan, countries which we think are equally qualified for admission.

In the case of Portugal, the Brazilian delegation thinks that the refusal to admit into our Organization one of the oldest historical peoples of Europe, a peace-loving people if ever there was one, constitutes a gross injustice to which I cannot fail to call the attention of the Council.

The President: As the representative of the United Kingdom, I should just like to say that my Government supports this application and hopes to be able to welcome Finland into the United Nations.

Speaking now as President, I would say that, since there are no other speakers, we have now concluded the discussion on these five applications. In accordance with the procedure already agreed upon, we should proceed to vote on them separately in the order in which they were discussed, namely, Hungary, Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria and Finland.

Mr. van Langenhove (Belgium) (translated from French): Divergent views have been expressed during our last two meetings as to the method by which the Council should decide on the five applications submitted to it. Before we proceed to vote on them in the order the President has just mentioned, I think the implications of these votes should be made clear. I therefore have the honour to submit the following proposal to the Security Council:

M. Gromyko (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): Conformément à l'Accord de Potsdam, ainsi qu'aux obligations assumées par le Gouvernement de l'URSS à l'égard des cinq États dont nous examinons maintenant les candidatures, la délégation de l'URSS appuie la demande d'admission à l'Organisation des Nations Unies présentée par la Finlande, de même qu'elle appuie les demandes des quatre autres États. Le Gouvernement de l'URSS estime qu'il n'y a aucune raison de douter de la capacité ou du désir de ces cinq États de remplir les obligations qui incombent aux Membres de l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Nous estimons que ces cinq États, y compris la Finlande, sont à la fois désireux et capables d'assumer les obligations qui leur incombent en tant que Membres de l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Mr. Muniz (Brésil) (traduit de l'anglais) : La délégation du Brésil appuie la demande d'admission de la Finlande. La façon dont cette nation s'est comportée et l'attitude de son Gouvernement actuel répondent entièrement aux principes fixes par la Charte des Nations Unies, et elles donnent à l'État finlandais les titres voulus pour son admission comme Membre de l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais) : En ma qualité de représentant du Royaume-Uni, je désirerais seulement déclarer que mon Gouvernement appuie la demande d'admission de la Finlande et qu'il espère pouvoir accueillir la Finlande au sein de l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Mr. van Langenhove (Belgique) : Des vues divergentes ont été exprimées au cours de nos deux dernières séances sur la méthode suivant laquelle le Conseil doit statuer sur les cinq demandes d'admission soumises à ses délibérations. Il importe, me semble-t-il, de clarifier les implications de ces votes avant que le Président vienne de parler, la portée de ces votes a été clairement précisée. C'est pourquoi j'ai l'honneur de soumettre au Conseil de sécurité la proposition suivante:
"The Security Council resolves to hold a separate and final vote on each application for membership."

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): At the two hundred and fifth meeting of the Council we had a short discussion on the question of voting procedure. I understand that many members found it difficult to vote on the Polish draft resolution and considered the possibility of finding certain methods of voting which would enable them to express their opinions more easily. I fully understand their difficulties and appreciate their attempts to arrive at a solution which, although partial, would at least settle the problem in respect of some of these States.

Nevertheless, at the two hundred and fourth meeting of the Council, the Polish delegation submitted a draft resolution covering the collective admission of the five States1; that draft constitutes a whole and I cannot see any possibility of dividing it into five separate parts. The Council is seized of that draft resolution. Every member of the Council has the right to submit a draft resolution, whether or not it is later accepted by the majority. I do not agree with the procedure suggested at the two hundred and fifth meeting of the Council by the representative of the United Kingdom, namely, that a vote should be taken to decide as to whether or not we should vote on the draft resolution. Such a procedure would make it impossible for a draft resolution to be submitted to the Council by a minority, no matter which States may constitute the minority now or may constitute the minority in the future, because the proportion is not permanent, but may change later.

At the moment, however, understanding what the difficulties are, I should like to suggest a procedure which I think the members of the Council can easily accept. I propose that we should take a vote on the Polish draft resolution as a whole, as a complete and separate resolution. If that resolution is not passed, I propose that we then proceed to vote on the five applications separately. The voting would not be on any resolution, but on each of the applications; and the result of each vote would be a reply to that application. In other words, let us first dispose of the Polish draft resolution. I fully agree that we should then proceed to vote on each application separately. I believe that procedure could be accepted by all the members of the Council and I really do not see how it could cause any difficulties.

I therefore ask the representative of Belgium to withdraw his proposal, so that the Council may vote on the Polish draft resolution.

Mr. Van Langenhove (Belgium) (translated from French): I regret that I cannot withdraw my proposal. On several earlier occasions I explained that I considered the collective admission of several States as not in conformity with the Charter.

Mr. Van Langenhove (Belgium): Je regrette de ne pas pouvoir retirer ma proposition. J’ai déjà eu l’occasion, à plusieurs reprises, d’expliquer que je considérais que l’admission en bloc de plusieurs États n’était pas conforme à la Charte.
The President: I think I stated correctly what was agreed upon at the two hundred and fourth meeting of the Council, when it was suggested that we should vote separately on each application. The representative of Belgium has now introduced a proposal, which, as the representative of Poland has stated, he has a perfect right to do. By its very terms, that proposal, which is to the effect that the Council decides to hold a separate and final vote on each application, would have to be put before the Council before we proceed to separate votes. I therefore feel bound to put the Belgian proposal to the vote now.

Mr. Parodi (France) (translated from French): I see no great difference in the way in which the voting takes place, whether we vote first on the various applications separately and then on the Polish draft resolution, or vice versa. But I would recall, as the President has just done, that we have already taken a decision on this point: we decided to discuss and vote separately on the various applications for membership.

I must say I had taken that decision to mean that we were to discuss and vote on each case one by one. At the last meeting, a different—and quite admissible—interpretation was accepted, namely, that we should discuss all the applications separately, one after another, and thereafter vote on them, likewise separately and successively. That decision was taken by the Security Council and I see no reason to alter it. I think, therefore, that we should abide by it.

In these circumstances, we should consider the proposal submitted by the Belgian representative and decide on it.

In practice, I say once again, all this will not affect the result and I do not see any point in this discussion. If we vote separately on each application and after that on the Polish draft resolution, our vote on the latter will be the consequence of our earlier decision on each separate case.

If we follow the other procedure, we should, first, be taking a decision on the Polish draft resolution and then separate decisions on each application.

I repeat, all that seems to me to amount to the same thing. I urge that we adhere to the decision already taken by the Security Council.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): When I suggested a voting procedure today, I took into consideration the special difficulties which certain representatives pointed out at our last meeting. I understood that the Polish draft resolution would in any case be put to the vote, and I felt that, after certain applications had been rejected or accepted, it would be very difficult to proceed to a vote on the draft as a whole. That is why I proposed today that we should vote first on the whole draft resolution. Precedents for such a procedure have already been established; draft resolutions have already been submitted to the Council for the collective admission of several States. One was introduced last year in our discussion of the admission of Iraq, and another last August, of Egypt. It was proposed that we should vote first on the whole draft resolution.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Je crois avoir exposé correctement ce qui a été décidé à la deux-cent-quatrième séance du Conseil lorsqu'il a été proposé que nous votions séparément sur chaque demande. Le représentant de la Belgique a maintenant déposé une proposition, ce qu'il a parfaitement le droit de faire, comme l'a dit le représentant de la Pologne. En raison de ses termes mêmes, cette proposition d'après laquelle le Conseil déciderait de procéder à un vote définitif et distinct sur chaque demande, doit être soumise au Conseil avant que nous procédions à des scrutins séparés. Je crois donc devoir mettre aux voix maintenant la proposition de la Belgique.

M. Parodi (France): Je ne vois pas une très grande différence quant à la façon dont les votes interviendraient, soit que nous votions d'abord sur les différentes candidatures séparément, puis sur le projet de résolution de la Pologne, ou inversement. Mais je rappelle, comme le Président vient de le faire, que nous avons déjà pris une décision sur ce point: nous avons décidé de discuter et de voter séparément sur les différentes demandes d'admission.

D'après cette décision, j'avais compris, je dois le dire, que nous aurions discuté et voté cas par cas. Au cours de la dernière séance, une interprétation différente, d'ailleurs tout à fait correcte et possible, a été admise. C'est que nous discutions séparément et successivement toutes les candidatures et qu'ensuite nous procédions au vote sur celles-ci, également de façon séparée et successive. Cette décision a été prise par le Conseil de sécurité. Je ne vois aucune raison de la modifier. Je pense donc qu'il faut s'en tenir là.

Dans ces conditions, la proposition présentée par le représentant de la Belgique doit être examinée par nous. Nous devons prendre parti sur sa proposition.

Pratiquement, encore une fois, tout cela ne changera pas le résultat. Je ne vois pas bien l'intérêt de cette discussion. Si nous votions séparément sur chaque candidature et si, ensuite, nous prononçons sur le projet de résolution de la Pologne, le vote que nous émettrons sur celui-ci sera la conséquence de ce qui aura été décidé d'abord séparément.

Dans l'autre cas, nous serions amenés à prendre une première décision sur le projet de résolution de la Pologne et ensuite des décisions distinctes sur chaque candidature.

Encore une fois, tout cela me paraît revenir au même. J'insiste pour que nous nous en tenions à la décision déjà prise par le Conseil de sécurité.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Lorsque j'ai proposé aujourd'hui une procédure de vote, j'ai pris en considération les difficultés spéciales que certains représentants ont soulignées à notre dernière séance. J'ai supposé que le projet de résolution de la Pologne devait être soit mis au vote d'une façon, soit mis à l'ordre du jour, qu'il m'aurait semblé qu'il serait très difficile de procéder par un scrutin sur l'ensemble du projet après que certaines demandes auraient été rejetées ou acceptées. C'est pourquoi j'ai proposé aujourd'hui que nous votions d'abord sur l'ensemble du projet. Il existe des précédents: des projets de résolutions ont déjà été présentés au Conseil, tendant à admettre conjointement plusieurs États, notam-

Mr. El Greco: I do not understand how the procedures of the Council can be altered when the whole draft resolution is already on the agenda when the particular applications are rejected or accepted. If it is the intention to reject any particular application, then we would have to keep in mind its eventual integration into any future draft resolution of the same nature. If the intention is to accept any particular application, then it would be better to accept all applications of the same nature without taking any vote.

The Polish representative said that the Polish draft resolution is not a general one, but a special one, and it has the same purpose as the previous one, when the Council voted on the draft resolution of the United States. The Security Council cannot be permitted to decide on one application, and then for another; they must have the same purpose and destiny before being voted on.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I consider that the proposed draft resolution, as submitted by the representative of Poland, can be precised in its application of the principle of a collective admission of the various States. As it has been pointed out by Sir Lytton and the United States, it is practically impossible for the Council to make a decision on each separate application. If it be at all possible for the Council to make a decision on each separate application, the result would be to reject the whole draft resolution, and it would be difficult to proceed with a draft resolution which is not definite in its application. I am not sure whether the practical effect of the decisions taken by the Council would be the same as that of the procedures it voted for; it is essential to vote for the whole draft resolution, and not for each separate application.

Incidentally,
cussion of membership applications. One was even introduced this year by the representative of Syria, but it was not discussed because there were too few in the Council who favoured its acceptance. Consequently, in thus submitting our draft resolution, I do not see that we are doing anything which conflicts with the terms laid down by the Charter for admitting States to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. EL-KHOURI (Syria): I support the proposal submitted by the representative of Belgium.

I do not agree with the representative of Poland on the procedure which he suggested. I know there is a general principle according to which, when the whole is rejected, its component parts are rejected with it. If we took it that, by associating the applications of the States concerned, there was a unity of destiny or a unity of principle between the applicants, we could consider and vote on their applications en bloc. But there is no relation between them. If a vote is taken on their applications, and if these are rejected by the Security Council, we shall not fail to hear objections to the effect that parts of this draft resolution have been rejected and that we have no right to vote on them again. I do not want the Security Council to be exposed to such objections.

The matter is quite clear. If the Polish draft resolution is put to the vote, I shall vote against it. I shall do so not because I have abandoned my principle of universality but because, as a method of voting and as a matter of procedure, I believe it would be sounder to proceed in accordance with the proposal of the Belgian representative, without taking any vote on the Polish draft.

The Polish draft resolution is irregular. It cannot be permitted that so many States should have to share the same fate, a fate linking good fortune with bad, a good attitude with a bad one, when there is no relation at all between them. The States are separate and distinct one from another; they cannot be bound by the same fortune and destiny. Their applications should therefore be voted upon separately.

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Polish draft resolution is before the Security Council and as it has not been withdrawn it should, like any other, be put to the vote. The question arises as to when this resolution is to be voted upon, whether at the beginning, before the vote on each separate application, or at the end, after the vote on each separate application. It seems to me that it would be more logical if we first put to the vote the more general proposal, namely, the Polish draft resolution, and if we then voted on the application of each country separately. I repeat, the practical result, it seems to me, would be the same, but from the point of view of order and procedure it would appear more correct and logical to vote first on the Polish draft resolution.

Incidentally, I am not quite clear as to the
Mr. AUSTIN (United States of America): I want to refer to what the record shows on this matter. It is a record that we cannot disregard because of being perfectly unreasonable and, in my opinion, unlawful.

There are certain fundamental rights in any parliamentary body, and one of them is the right to express oneself by a vote. If there is anything which is regarded as precious and necessary to protect, it is this sovereign equality of every State, whether great or small, to express its choice, especially in a matter of this kind where we are considering the admission of new Members to this very important Organization.

What does the record show as to the position of the United States? By its statements in the Council in the course of the discussions of each separate case, even before we reached the voting stage, the United States, without threatening to use a veto, without stating whether it would ever use a veto in such a situation, has, nevertheless, made its position clear; as regards three of these countries, the United States is opposed to their admission on the grounds stated; as regards two others, it is in favour of their admission on the same grounds.

What would be the effect of putting this Polish draft resolution to a vote? It would be the most absurd thing in the world to force the United States to vote against itself.

No matter when it is put to the vote, such a draft resolution, in view of this record, is unlawful and unconstitutional. It is against the rights which every individual Member State here possesses under the Charter, because it would force that Member State to give up one of its rights. If the United States were forced to vote on this draft resolution, it would contradict itself in three cases if it voted for the draft; it would contradict itself in two cases. We cannot be so absurd as to allow any such parliamentary procedure.

In this situation, I believe that a point of order raised against this draft resolution would prevail, and lawfully prevail; but I prefer to handle the matter in the way suggested by the representative of Belgium. I shall therefore support the Belgian proposal.

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): I am really very grateful to the representative of the United States for reminding the Council of certain sovereign rights which exist here, and of the freedom to express one’s opinion in the Council. I believe that this right is being denied to the Polish delegation.

Rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure...
of the Security Council provides that a draft resolution shall be divided into parts and those parts shall be voted on separately only when the original mover agrees thereto. That is one of the rights which is being denied to the Polish delegation.

In agreeing that the draft resolution should be discussed and put to the vote in parts, the representative of Poland stated precisely the following—I quote from the record of 25 September:

"On the question of procedure, I should like to state that I have no objection to the vote being taken separately, that is, that each country be dealt with separately. But after that, I shall ask the President to submit the whole resolution to a vote."1

That was a conditional acceptance of the proposal that the draft resolution should be put to the vote in parts.

I must again refer to the record. In the meeting of 29 September, I stated:

"The Polish delegation agreed at the last meeting to accept the procedure of separate votes on its resolution only because it wished to reach an agreement; it thought that would help in the deliberations. I now see that that agreement, and our attempt at a compromise, have been misused here as an instrument for discrimination against one or another country. I reserve the right of the Polish delegation to withdraw its agreement that separate votes be taken on the resolution."2

Before the Council, there is only one draft resolution, namely the Polish draft of 25 September. No other draft resolution has been submitted; and we must now proceed, in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure, to vote on resolutions in the order in which they were introduced.

On behalf of the Polish delegation, I request that the Polish draft resolution be voted upon in toto and not in parts.

The representative of the United States asks why he should not have the right to express his opinion. I ask the same question: why should not the Polish delegation have the right to express its opinion?

We expressed our attitude by submitting a draft resolution, the motivation of which was explained in several statements made at three meetings of the Security Council. Our vote for it would be an expression of our opinion; again, a vote against it by the United States delegation would be an expression of the opinion of the United States, namely, that it is opposed to the collective admission of the five applicants for membership and that it considers that the voting should proceed in a different way.

I claim the right of the Polish delegation to express its opinion.

The President: I hope I may be permitted to say one or two words, in the hope that I may clarify the situation a little.

1 See Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, No. 90, 204th meeting.
2 Ibid., No. 91.
This begins to sound very complicated, but in my opinion it is actually comparatively simple. Some delegations are of the opinion that the admission to the United Nations of a particular applicant, or of two or three applicants, may be made to depend on the admission of other applicants. Other delegations, of which the United Kingdom delegation is one, consider that that is not so, that all applications have to be taken separately, judged on their merits and decided upon separately.

All the various procedural proposals of which we have been seized have been put forward by one side or the other in order to maintain its point of view.

I was not contradicted when I said today that at a previous meeting it was agreed that we should first of all take separate votes on the several applications. I think that the idea of the Polish representative then was that his draft resolution should be put to the vote after the separate votes. I shall be perfectly frank with the Polish representative and tell him that, if we had agreed to that procedure then, after taking the several individual votes, from which we should know exactly what the case was in regard to each of the applicants, I should have declared his draft resolution out of order. For the Polish draft resolution is simply a way of stating that these applications are interdependent and that we must either accept all of them as a whole or reject all of them. I do not believe that that is procedurally correct. I think it is contrary to the Charter. I do not think we can claim that the admission of one State is dependent upon the admission of any other applicants.

The Polish representative has suggested, in fact, he has demanded, that his draft resolution should be voted on before we proceed to the separate votes on the various applications. I personally should not mind doing that, provided it is quite understood that the rejection of the Polish draft resolution, if that occurred, would not bar us subsequently from electing one or more of the applicants. I thought that the Belgian proposal was perhaps a neater and easier way of achieving the same result, which is, I confess quite frankly, the defeat of the Polish draft resolution. I think that the Polish representative had no right to submit it and that it is contrary to the Charter. We have not come to it yet, but, as I have told the representative of Poland frankly, if we had followed that procedure, I should have given a ruling to that effect.

If he disagrees with my ruling, the remedy is open to him.

Mr. Muniz (Brazil): I wish to call the attention of the representative of Poland to what I think is a misunderstanding on his part in connexion with his draft resolution. It is customary for the Council to vote separately on the different paragraphs of a draft resolution and then to take a final vote on the resolution as a whole; that is in accordance with rule 32 of our provisional rules of procedure. That holds true, however, only in the case of a draft resolution which has a certain unity of character, a resolution of which the different paragraphs are not wholly independent. That holds true, however, only in the case of a draft resolution which has a certain unity of character, a resolution of which the different paragraphs are not wholly independent. That holds true, however, only in the case of a draft resolution which has a certain unity of character, a resolution of which the different paragraphs are not wholly independent.

Mr. Muniz (Brésil) (traduit de l'anglais): Je désire attirer l'attention du représentant de la Pologne sur ce que je considère comme sa partie, au sujet de son projet de résolution. Il est de procédure courante au Conseil de voter sur les différents paragraphes d'un projet de résolution et de procéder ensuite à un vote définitif d'ensemble; cette façon de procéder est conforme à l'article 32 du règlement intérieur provisoire du Conseil. Toutefois, cette procédure n'est applicable que s'il s'agit d'un projet de résolution qui est homogène et où les paragraphes ne sont pas indépendants les uns des autres.
ferent paragraphs are parts of a homogeneous whole.

The Polish draft resolution, however, is not in that category. The Polish draft resolution is not homogeneous; on the contrary, it is a plurality of resolutions. That is why most of the members of the Council find it impossible to take a single vote on that draft resolution. In view of that fact, I think there is no other course to follow but the one recommended by the representative of Belgium, namely, to take a final vote on each of the applications for admission.

Mr. VAN LAGENHOVE (Belgium) (translated from French): I wish to raise a point of order. I think that this discussion is being needlessly prolonged. It could easily be brought to an end if the Council were to take a decision on the proposal I have submitted.

The President: There are two speakers who have asked to be heard. After they have spoken, I propose to put the Belgian proposal to a vote in accordance with the point of order which has just been raised. I beg those speakers to confine their remarks to the smallest possible compass.

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): I shall be very brief. First of all, I wish to assure the Council that, when I proposed the procedure which I did propose a short while ago, it was not my intention to make the deliberations of the Council any more difficult. My delegation understands that time presses and we know how heavy is the agenda of the General Assembly. However, we are trying to find a way to express our opinion.

I cannot agree that a vote should be taken on the Belgian proposal. I believe that the Belgian proposal is completely out of order and is in violation of rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure. Under this rule any original mover has the right to object to having his draft resolution voted on in separate parts.

To make our position easier, however, and to enable us to proceed to a vote, I am prepared to submit to the President's ruling. But I reserve the right, after the separate votes, to decide as to the proposal on the action to be taken with regard to the Polish draft resolution. It is understood that the vote on each application for admission is not a vote on the Polish draft resolution; it is a vote on the application and it is a reply, in the form of a vote, to each of the applicants.

Colonel Hodgson (Australia): I withdraw my request for permission to speak, in view of the statement just made by the representative of Poland.

Mr. PARODI (France) (translated from French): I should like to speak on a point of order. Am I right in believing that the Polish representative's statements bind him alone and do not imply any decision by the Council on what he has just said?

The President: I propose to put to the vote the proposal submitted by the representative of Belgium, présenté une certaine unité et dont les différents paragraphes constituent un tout homogène.

Or, le projet de résolution de la Pologne ne répond pas à cette condition. Il ne présente aucune unité; au contraire, il se compose de plusieurs résolutions réunies en une seule. C'est la raison pour laquelle la plupart des membres du Conseil estiment qu'il est impossible de procéder qu'à un seul vote à son sujet. Je pense donc que nous ne pouvons adopter d'autre procédure que celle qui a été recommandée par le représentant de la Belgique, c'est-à-dire, de voter définitivement sur chacune des demandes d'admission.

M. van Langenhove (Belgique): Une motion d'ordre. Je crois que cette discussion se prolonge assez inutilement. Il serait aisé d'y mettre un terme en invitant le Conseil à se prononcer sur la proposition que j'ai soumise.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Deux orateurs ont demandé à prendre la parole. Quand nous les aurons entendus, je me propose de mettre aux voix la proposition de la Belgique, conformément à la motion d'ordre qui vient d'être présentée. Je prie les deux orateurs d'être aussi brefs que possible.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Je serai très bref. Avant tout, je désire assurer au Conseil qu'en présentant, il y a quelques instants, ma proposition sur la procédure à suivre, mon intention n'était pas de rendre plus difficiles encore les délibérations du Conseil. Ma délégation comprend très bien que le temps presse et sait que l'ordre du jour de l'Assemblée générale est très chargé, mais nous nous efforçons d'exprimer notre opinion.

Je ne puis accepter que l'on mette aux voix la proposition de la Belgique. Je considère que cette proposition n'est pas du tout recevable et qu'elle est contraire aux dispositions de l'article 32 du règlement intérieur provisoire. D'après cet article, l'auteur d'un projet de résolution a le droit de s'opposer au vote par division.

Toutefois, pour faciliter les choses et nous permettre de procéder au vote, je suis prêt à me conformer à la décision du Président. Je me réserve cependant le droit, après le vote par division, de me prononcer sur la proposition concernant le sort à réserver au projet de résolution de la Pologne. Il est entendu que le vote auquel nous allons procéder sur chaque demande d'admission, n'est pas un vote sur le projet de résolution de la Pologne; il s'agit d'un vote sur les demandes d'admission qui ont été présentées, et c'est la réponse donnée, sous forme de vote, à chacun des Etats requérants.

Le colonel Hodgson (Australie) (traduit de l'anglais): J'avais demandé la parole, mais, en raison de la déclaration que vient de faire le représentant de la Pologne, j'y renonce.

M. Parodi (France): Je demande la parole pour une motion d'ordre. Je pense que les déclarations que le représentant de la Pologne vient de faire engagent seulement ce représentant et n'impliquent pas, de la part du Conseil, une décision quelconque sur ce qu'il vient de dire?

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Je propose de mettre aux voix la proposition présentée par le représentant de la Belgique.
Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): I should like to know whether or not the Belgian proposal would prevent us from taking a vote on the Polish draft resolution later, after voting on the separate applications.

The President: I must say that there will be little point in taking a vote on the Polish draft resolution, as the Belgian proposal states: "The Council resolves to hold a separate and final vote on each application for membership." But I never could see myself that there would have been much point in the Polish draft resolution.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I understand that it was the President's ruling to take the vote on the separate applications first. I adhered to that ruling. I do not see any reason why we should vote on the Belgian proposal which, I believe, is contrary to rule 32. I am prepared to accept a new ruling but I am not prepared to accept a new proposal.

With regard to the reservation made by the French representative, I can only answer that there is no question as to who is bound by my declaration. The fact of the matter is that there is a draft resolution before the Council, and that it will still be before the Council after the vote on the separate applications has been taken.

Mr. van Langenhove (Belgium) (translated from French): I must disagree with the Polish representative's interpretation of rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure. This rule states: "Parts of a motion or of a draft resolution shall be voted separately at the request of any representative, unless the original mover objects." This means that any proposal may be split up, which does not require a decision by the Council unless the original mover objects. But the Council is perfectly free to decide to split up the proposal.

The President: The representative of Poland is, of course, entitled to say that he will not accept the Belgian proposal and that he will vote against it. But I propose to put the Belgian proposal to a vote now. I do so because the Belgian proposal, in my opinion, governs our procedure and should come first.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I wish to raise a point of order. It is immaterial to me whether we accept the Polish proposal first, in view of the fact that I agreed to accept the President's ruling. At the moment, I intend simply to challenge the interpretation expressed by the representative of Belgium, not only in its application to the present draft resolution but also in its application to any similar case which may come before the Council in the future. I believe that rule 32 of our rules of procedure states very clearly that no draft resolution may be voted on in parts unless the original mover agrees, or, as it is worded: "Parts of a motion or of a draft resolution shall be voted on separately at the request of any representative, unless the original mover objects."

M. Gromyko (Union des Républiques soviétiques) (traduit de l'anglais): Je voudrais savoir si, oui ou non, la proposition de la Belgique nous empêchera de mettre en vigueur aux yeux de la décision de résolution de la Pologne, lorsque nous aurons voté séparément sur chaque demande d'admission.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): A mon avis, un vote sur le projet de résolution de la Pologne n'aurait guère de sens puisque la proposition de la Belgique déclare: "Le Conseil de sécurité décide de voter séparément et définitivement sur chaque demande d'admission." Personnellement, je n'ai d'ailleurs jamais pu discerner l'intérêt que présente le projet de résolution de la Pologne.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Le représentant de la Pologne a naturellement le droit de contester l'interprétation que le représentant de la France, je répondrai seulement qu'il n'est pas question de savoir qui ma déclaration engage. Le fait est que le Conseil est saisi d'un projet de résolution qui subsistera, lorsque le Conseil aura voté séparément sur les demandes d'admission.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): J'ai dejà contesté l'interprétation que le représentant de la Pologne donne de l'article 32 du règlement intérieur provisoire. Cet article dit: "La division est de droit si elle est demandée, à moins que l'auteur de la proposition ou du projet de résolution ne s'y oppose." Cela veut dire que la division est accordée, sans décision du Conseil, si l'auteur de la proposition ne s'y oppose pas. Mais le Conseil peut parfaitement décider la division de la proposition.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Le représentant de la Pologne a naturellement le droit de déclarer qu'il n'acceptera pas la proposition de la Belgique et qu'il votera contre cette proposition. Mais je vais maintenant mettre aux voix car, à mon avis, elle déterminera la procédure que nous suivrons et elle doit donc avoir la priorité.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Je désire présenter une motion d'ordre. Il m'est indifférent que nous votions d'abord sur la proposition de la Belgique puisque j'ai accepté de me conformer à la décision du Président. Pour le moment, je veux simplement m'élever contre l'opinion formulée par le représentant de la Belgique, pour autant qu'elle s'applique non seulement à la présente résolution mais aussi à tout autre cas semblable dont le Conseil pourrait être saisi plus tard. Je pense que l'article 32 du règlement intérieur prévoit nettement que la division n'est permise que si l'auteur de la résolution l'accepte ou pour reprendre les termes mêmes de cet article: "La division est de droit si elle est-demandée, à moins que l'auteur de la proposition ou du projet de résolution ne s'y oppose."
I believe the interpretation of the representative of Belgium, namely, that the Council may decide to vote on parts of a motion separately, against the will of the original mover, is contrary to rule 32 and does not find any confirmation in any of the rules contained in our provisional rules of procedure.

Mr. Parodi (France) (translated from French): I should like to make a brief observation, with the reservation that I may return to the point at greater length if the discussion should arise again and if further amplification should be necessary.

We have two working languages; they are complementary and one serves to clarify the other. The French text of rule 32 is perfectly clear and, in my opinion, allows of no other interpretation than that given by the Belgian representative. The French text says: "La division est de droit, si elle est demandée, à moins que l'auteur de la proposition... ne s'y oppose." That means that, if the mover of a proposal objects, division does not follow. It does not mean that the Council cannot decide to effect it.

There is one guarantee for the mover of the proposal; he can always withdraw it if he prefers to do so rather than see it divided. But if he maintains his proposal, the Council can always decide to vote on its parts separately. I reserve the right to come back to this point if necessary later on.

The President: Again I ask the Council to vote on the Belgian proposal. The text of that proposal is:

"The Council resolves to hold a separate and final vote on each application."

The representative of the USSR wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): As I have already pointed out, it is immaterial to me when the Polish proposal is voted on, since the practical result will be the same; it makes no difference and can make no difference. The Belgian proposal, however, would prevent us from voting on the Polish draft resolution at all. I think that is wrong. How can we decide not to adopt a decision on the proposals submitted by a particular member of the Council? I have never been aware of such a practice. I can agree neither to the procedure suggested in the Belgian proposal—although, as I have said before, it makes no difference to me when the Polish draft resolution is put to the vote—nor to the fact that it precludes a vote on the Polish draft resolution.

The President: I rule that we should vote upon the Belgian proposal forthwith. If any member wishes to challenge that ruling, the way is open to him to do so.

Mr. Katz-Szuchy (Poland): Could the President explain to me whether an affirmative vote...
on the Belgian proposal would deprive the Polish delegation of its right to object to a division of its draft resolution? According to rule 32, I have the right to object to any proposal to divide my draft resolution into parts and to vote on those parts separately. The Belgian representative has submitted a proposal which, if passed by the Council, would deprive us of that right. I am not challenging the ruling of the President because, as I stated before, I am prepared to accept the ruling he made before the whole discussion started; that is, I agree to separate votes on the individual applications, with the reservation that the Polish draft resolution shall remain before the Council and that, after the votes have been taken, the Polish delegation shall decide what it intends to do with it. I raise this question in connexion not only with our procedure today, but also with our provisional rules of procedure.

Mr. El-Khoury (Syria): I move an amendment to the Polish draft resolution whereby it would read as follows:

"The Security Council,

Having received and examined the application for membership in the United Nations submitted by Hungary, Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria and Finland,

Recommends to the General Assembly that these countries be admitted collectively and jointly as Members of the United Nations."

The amendment adds the words "collectively and jointly". Thus the rejection of that draft resolution would not mean that the applications could not be submitted and voted upon separately. In this way, we should avoid the results which I mentioned before. As the representative of the United States has pointed out, since he expressed approval of the admission of one or two applicants, he cannot reject the Polish draft resolution while these two are included in it. However, he may reject the draft resolution if it contains the phrase "collectively and jointly"; then we could vote separately on each application. Moreover, if the draft as amended is rejected, it would mean that the applications of all these States could not be decided upon by a single vote.

The President: It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Syrian representative would make the Polish draft resolution much clearer but not, in my view, any better.

With regard to the last remarks made by the representative of Poland, I did not understand that there was a proposal to divide his draft resolution. The situation is that the Council has before it separate applications, in some cases submitted separately, from a number of applicants. A very large part of the Security Council membership seems to be anxious to deal with those applications separately and to reach a decision on each of them separately. The Polish delegation, on the other hand, submitted an omnibus resolution; it proposed that we should deal with all the applicants together and on the same proposal. I explained why I thought it was not in conflict with the amendment proposed by the President.

May we not take a decision?

Mr. Katz-Sussman (United States): I have a little difficulty seeing how we could separate the application of two countries that have developed into a proposal to divide the Polish draft resolution. I believe, first the Council members mix a great deal of substance. If I wish to have a difficult question, I should separate it from the vote and from the Council resolution. The situation it faced was that France in 1950 and Egypt in 1953 have been taken, the Polish delegation shall decide what it wants to do with it. I raise this question in connexion not only with our procedure today, but also with our provisional rules of procedure.

Mr. El-Khoury (Syria) (translated from the English):

I move an amendment to the Polish draft resolution of the following:

"The Council of Security,

Having received and examined the demands of admission to the Organisation of the United Nations presented by the Hory, Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria and Finland,

Recommends to the General Assembly that these countries be admitted collectively and jointly as Members of the United Nations."

The amendment consists of adding the words: "collectively and jointly". If the project of resolution is rejected, we should present the demands of admission and we pronounce on each of them separately. The United States has pointed out, since he expressed approval of the admission of one or two applicants, he cannot reject the Polish draft resolution of these two included in it. However, he may reject the draft resolution if it contains the phrase "collectively and jointly"; then we could vote separately on each application. Moreover, if the draft as amended is rejected, it would mean that the applications of all these States could not be decided upon by a single vote.

Le Président: Il semble que j'ai compris de la proposition du représentant de la Syrie rendrait le projet de résolution beaucoup plus clair, mais, à mon sens, il ne l'améliorerait pas. A propos des dernières observations du représentant de la Pologne, je déclare que je n'avais pas compris que nous étions saisis d'une proposition visant à la division du projet de résolution. La situation est la suivante: le Conseil est saisi par plusieurs États de demandes d'admission dont certaines ont été présentées individuellement. Une très grande partie des membres du Conseil semblent désireux d'examiner ces demandes séparément et de se prononcer séparément sur chacune d'elles.

D'autre part, la délégation de la Pologne a présenté une résolution "omnibus"; elle a demandé que nous examinions toutes les demandes
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"The Council of Security,

Having received and examined the demands of admission to the Organisation of the United Nations presented by the Hory, Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria and Finland,
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and on the same footing. I have already explained why I think that is a bad procedure and in conflict with the Charter. I have been perfectly frank with the Polish representative. I told him that when we come to it, I shall rule his draft resolution out of order.

May we not vote on the Belgian proposal?

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): To be frank, I have a little difficulty in grasping the situation which has developed here.

I believe, first of all, that the Syrian amendment mixes procedure with substance; it tries to settle a question of procedure by changing the substance. If I wished to make the situation more difficult, I should simply accept the Syrian amendment and the Council would be facing the same situation it faced previously.

I do not know where the difficulty is now. In his last remarks, the President stated that there are certain members of the Council who prefer to vote upon each application separately, and I quite agree with that. On the other hand, the President noted that there was a Polish draft resolution, which he was kind enough to describe as an omnibus resolution, which is quite a different thing.

I quite agree with the President’s ruling. I believe I have repeatedly stated that there is a Belgian proposal to vote on the applications separately and that there is a Polish draft resolution to vote on the five applications together.

We are willing that the Belgian proposal, to the effect that each application should be voted upon separately, should be put to the vote first; we shall decide what to do regarding our draft resolution after that voting is completed. Perhaps we shall ask for a vote on our draft resolution, or perhaps we shall withdraw it.

The President: We shall now vote on the Belgian proposal.

A vote was taken by show of hands, and the proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 2.

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

Votes against: Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais) : Nous sommes disposés à accepter que l’on vote d’abord sur la proposition de la Belgique tendant à voter séparément sur chaque demande, après quoi nous déterminerons ce que nous ferons de notre propre projet de résolution. Peut-être demanderons-nous qu’il soit mis aux voix; peut-être le retirerons-nous.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais) : Je mets aux voix la proposition de la Belgique.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Par 9 voix contre 2, la résolution est adoptée.


Votent contre: Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

Le Président (traduit de l’anglais) : Nous voterons maintenant séparément sur chacune des demandes d’admission. La première est celle 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 demande d’admission n’est pas acceptée.

Votent pour: Colombie, France, Pologne, Syrie, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.
Abstentions: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, United Kingdom, United States of America.

The President: The next application is that of Italy.

A vote was taken by show of hands. There were 9 votes in favour and 2 against. The application was not accepted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of seven members.

Votes for: China, Colombia, France, Syria.

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

The President: The next application is that of Roumania.

A vote was taken by show of hands. There were 4 votes in favour and 7 abstentions. The application was not accepted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of seven members.

Votes for: Syria.

Votes against: Belgium, France, United Kingdom.

Abstentions: Australia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America.

The President: We shall vote next on the application of Bulgaria.

A vote was taken by show of hands. There was one vote in favour, 3 against and 7 abstentions. The application was not accepted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of seven members.

Votes for: Bulgaria.

Votes against: Belgium, France, United Kingdom.

Abstentions: Australia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

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

A vote was taken by show of hands. There were 9 votes in favour and 2 against. The application was not accepted, one of the votes 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.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): In the discussions at previous meetings of the Council, as well as at the present meeting, the USSR delegation has stated its position with regard to the admission to the United Nations of these five countries.

The USSR delegation supports the applications of all these States for membership in the United Nations.

S'abstient: Australie, Belgique, Brésil, Chine, Royaume-Uni, États-Unis d'Amérique.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): La demande d'admission suivante est celle de l'Italie.

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

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

Votes contre: Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Nous passons maintenant au vote sur la demande d'admission de la Roumanie.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Il y a 4 voix pour, 3 contre et 7 abstentions. N'ayant pas obtenu le vote affirmatif de sept membres, la demande d'admission n'est pas acceptée.

Votes pour: Chine, Colombie, France, Syrie.

Votes contre: Australie, Belgique, Brésil, Colombie, Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques, Royaume-Uni, États-Unis d'Amérique.

S'abstiennent: Australie, Belgique, Brésil, Colombie, Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques, Royaume-Uni, États-Unis d'Amérique.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Nous passons maintenant au vote sur la demande d'admission de l'Italie.

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

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

Votes contre: Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

Mr. Gromyko (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): Au cours des séances précédentes et aujourd'hui même, la délégation de l'URSS a précisé son attitude au sujet de l'admission de ces cinq États à l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

La délégation de l'URSS appuie les demandes d'admission de tous ces États, conformément aux vœux pour et 7 abstentions. N'ayant pas obtenu le vote affirmatif de sept membres, la demande d'admission n'est pas acceptée.

Votes pour: Chine, Colombie, France, Syrie.

S'abstient: Australie, Belgique, Brésil, Colombie, Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques, Royaume-Uni, États-Unis d'Amérique.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Nous passons maintenant au vote sur la demande d'admission de la Roumanie.

Il est procédé au vote à main levée. Il y a 4 voix pour, 3 contre et 7 abstentions. N'ayant pas obtenu le vote affirmatif de sept membres, la demande d'admission n'est pas acceptée.

Votes pour: la Syrie.

Votes contre: Belgique, France, Royaume-Uni.

S'abstiennent: Australie, Brésil, Chine, Colombie, Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques, États-Unis d'Amérique.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Je mets maintenant aux voix la demande d'admission de la Finlande.

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

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

Votes contre: Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.


La délégation de l'URSS appuie les demandes d'admission de tous ces États, conformément aux vœux pour et 2 contre. L'une des voix contre étant celle d'un membre permanent du Conseil, la demande d'admission n'est pas acceptée.

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

Votes contre: Pologne, Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques.

I must remind you that these countries, as States who have been members of the League of Nations, are already fully recognized by the international community.

However, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express the utmost regret of the United Nations that the application of the Italian Republic have not been accepted.

I must refer to the fact that the United Nations was established with the object of promoting peace and international co-operation.

To the regret of the United Nations, the Governments and people of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the United Nations, the United Nations, and the United Nations, have not been accepted.
United Nations in view of the obligations which the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumed under the Potsdam Agreement and under the Peace Treaties with these States. The Government and the delegation of the USSR have no doubt that the Government and people of Bulgaria, the Government and people of Roumania, the Government and people of Finland, as well as the Government and people of Italy, will appreciate the position taken by the USSR in this matter.

We have no desire to take part in the shabby political game that is being played in considering the applications that have been received from these countries. We consider that the question of admitting these countries should be treated as a single question and that the decision to admit these countries to the United Nations should be taken at one and the same time.

Regardless of when the question of admitting these countries is or may be brought up, the USSR delegation both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly—should this question come up for discussion in the General Assembly following a decision to that effect in the Security Council—will always support a proposal for the simultaneous admission to the United Nations of these countries. The question of admitting any one country belonging to this group cannot be decided in a positive sense. This is a single question and a decision must be taken which will apply simultaneously to all the applications.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): The Polish delegation voted in favour of the application of Hungary. After that application was rejected, however, we abstained from voting or opposed the other applications. The non-admission of Hungary has made a complete change in our original intention, which was to admit five States which are returning to normal conditions and normal diplomatic relations with all other nations.

I must remind the Council that it was the representative of the Government of the Republic of Poland who introduced a proposal to that effect and first expressed interest in the admission of those States as soon as the peace treaties had been ratified and had entered into force. I have given a sufficient explanation of why we had to vote in this case against the applications of Italy and Finland. As I stated before, the peoples of Italy and Finland know our attitude towards them and know how to understand our vote.

During the discussion, the Polish delegation, concerned about the results of the voting, made a proposal that the five permanent members of the Council should meet and decide among themselves how certain difficulties could be overcome.

To our regret and surprise—no doubt the surprise was shared by everyone who heard of it—three of the permanent members refused even to attempt to reach some solution. That is proof that the question which has been discussed here is not a question of admitting one or another country.
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try or of barring one or another country; it is part of an attempt to divide the United Nations, to disrupt its work, to discriminate against certain States and thus to thwart the course which has been laid down by the Charter.

That situation, the seriousness of which has been demonstrated so many times before the Council and before the General Assembly, is of great concern to everyone who looks upon the United Nations as an Organization for future peace. We must remember that the Organization of the United Nations is not an idea which originated in the head of a politician. The United Nations was brought into being by the struggle of the people and was built on their blood. Therefore the peoples whose suffering and toil helped to build the United Nations are greatly concerned that such attempts are being made. I am glad that this attitude of certain delegations within the United Nations and within the Security Council has been observed and noticed in the United States and elsewhere.

Referring to another point, a well-known American publicist discussed a certain article published in the quarterly journal, Foreign Affairs, and an article signed by a certain Mr. X., who apparently plays an important part in the foreign policy of the United States. The publicist to whom I am referring is Mr. Walter Lippman, whose book on the war aims of the United States of America was so carefully studied in Europe during the years of occupation. I wish to quote from his article in the New York Herald Tribune of 30 September 1947.

The President: I regret to interrupt the representative of Poland, but there is nothing on the agenda at this moment except the admission of new Members to the United Nations. The first part of his remarks—although I think some of them were superfluous—related in some way to this subject, but I cannot see that the ground he is now traversing relates to this subject in any way.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I believe it is my right to explain why the Polish delegation adopted the attitude it did in voting on these applications. I must state that what I am saying is closely connected with the subject and needs to be said in order that the Council may understand our attitude, the explanation of which I was about to finish when I was interrupted by the President.

The President: The representative of Poland has not been denied repeated opportunities today and on previous occasions to state his attitude in regard to this question; and he has taken advantage of those opportunities. He has again repeated a great deal of what he had previously said. I do not think he should now proceed to read extracts from authors, however eminent, unless they are directly relevant to the question of the admission of new Members. I rule, therefore, that his remarks are out of order, unless he can show that what he proposes to do is relevant to the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations as an Organization for future peace.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I believe it is my right to explain why the Polish delegation adopted the attitude it did in voting on these applications. I must state that what I am saying is closely connected with the subject and needs to be said in order that the Council may understand our attitude, the explanation of which I was about to finish when I was interrupted by the President.

The President: The representative of Poland has not been denied repeated opportunities today and on previous occasions to state his attitude in regard to this question; and he has taken advantage of those opportunities. He has again repeated a great deal of what he had previously said. I do not think he should now proceed to read extracts from authors, however eminent, unless they are directly relevant to the question of the admission of new Members. I rule, therefore, that his remarks are out of order, unless he can show that what he proposes to do is relevant to the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations as an Organization for future peace.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I believe it is my right to explain why the Polish delegation adopted the attitude it did in voting on these applications. I must state that what I am saying is closely connected with the subject and needs to be said in order that the Council may understand our attitude, the explanation of which I was about to finish when I was interrupted by the President.

The President: The representative of Poland has not been denied repeated opportunities today and on previous occasions to state his attitude in regard to this question; and he has taken advantage of those opportunities. He has again repeated a great deal of what he had previously said. I do not think he should now proceed to read extracts from authors, however eminent, unless they are directly relevant to the question of the admission of new Members. I rule, therefore, that his remarks are out of order, unless he can show that what he proposes to do is relevant to the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations as an Organization for future peace.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I believe it is my right to explain why the Polish delegation adopted the attitude it did in voting on these applications. I must state that what I am saying is closely connected with the subject and needs to be said in order that the Council may understand our attitude, the explanation of which I was about to finish when I was interrupted by the President.

The President: The representative of Poland has not been denied repeated opportunities today and on previous occasions to state his attitude in regard to this question; and he has taken advantage of those opportunities. He has again repeated a great deal of what he had previously said. I do not think he should now proceed to read extracts from authors, however eminent, unless they are directly relevant to the question of the admission of new Members. I rule, therefore, that his remarks are out of order, unless he can show that what he proposes to do is relevant to the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations as an Organization for future peace.
what he proposes to read is in direct relation to the question, the only question, which occupies the Council at this moment.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I wish to state that the passage I wanted to read is much briefer than the words that have been exchanged between the President and myself over my right to speak. This passage is directly connected with the attitude of Poland in voting on the acceptance of new Members.

The President: In that case the quotation will be in order.

Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland): I quote: "Judging by the speeches in the Greek affair of the British and American delegates, Sir Alexander Cadogan and Mr. Herschel Johnson appear to be acting on instructions which treat the United Nations as expendable in our conflict with Russia. It is a great pity. Nothing is being accomplished to win the conflict, to assuage it, or to settle it. But the United Nations, which should be preserved as the last best hope of mankind that the conflict can be settled and a peace achieved, is being chewed up. The seed corn is being devoured."

I thank the President for his patience in listening to the passage.

The President: I regret that the representative of Poland should have taken advantage of the latitude I allowed him to read something which appears to me to be totally irrelevant.

We shall have to close our business in regard to the admission of new Members. We have voted and the results are known. I shall see to it that a report of our proceedings on this matter this afternoon is made to the President of the Assembly.

I feel that, in view of the hour, it will be impossible to go very far with the Indonesian question tonight. We shall have to put off consideration of that matter until our next meeting. The date of that meeting cannot be fixed immediately, owing to the difficulty of fitting it in with the meetings of the Committees of the General Assembly. Members of the Council and others interested will be informed as soon as possible when the next meeting of the Security Council is to take place.

Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Regarding the next meeting of the Council to be devoted to the Indonesian question, I think such a meeting should be convened within the next few days because, according to information received from that area, including official communiqués, the situation there is abnormal and military operations are continuing. Therefore we should not defer this meeting of the Council indefinitely. We must arrange with the Secretariat to fix a suitable date for the next meeting of the Council to be devoted to the Indonesian question, I think such a meeting should be convened within the next few days because, according to information received from that area, including official communiqués, the situation there is abnormal and military operations are continuing. Therefore we should not defer this meeting of the Council indefinitely. We must arrange with the Secretariat to fix a suitable date for the next meeting of the Council to be devoted to the Indonesian question.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Je tiens à faire observer que le passage dont je voulais donner lecture contient moins de mots que nous venons d'en échanger, le Président et moi, pour savoir si j'ai le droit de poursuivre mon intervention, et qu'il a un rapport direct avec l'attitude adoptée par la Pologne en ce qui concerne l'admission de nouveaux Membres.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): En ce cas, ce passage rentre dans le cadre de la discussion.

M. Katz-Suchy (Pologne) (traduit de l'anglais): Le voici: "Si l'on en juge par les discours prononcés au cours de la discussion de l'affaire de Grèce par les représentants du Royaume-Uni et des États-Unis, il semble que Sir Alexander Cadogan et M. Herschel Johnson agissent d'après des instructions qui sacrifient les Nations Unies à notre conflit avec la Russie. Cela est à déplorer. Rien n'est fait pour triompher de ce désaccord, pour l'apaiser ou pour le régler; mais on est en train de mettre en pièces l'Organisation des Nations Unies, que l'on devrait s'efforcer de préserver comme le seul espoir qu'a l'humanité de voir le désaccord réglé et la paix établie. On est en train de manger le blé en herbe."

Je remercie le Président de l'attention qu'il a bien voulu m'accorder.

Le Président (traduit de l'anglais): Je regrette que le représentant de la Pologne ait profité de ce que je l'ai laissé poursuivre son intervention pour donner lecture d'un texte qui, à mon avis, est sans aucun rapport avec la question en discussion.


Il me semble qu'étant donné l'heure tardive, nous ne pourrons avancer beaucoup ce soir dans la discussion de la question indonésienne. Il va nous falloir en remettre l'examen à la prochaine séance. Il n'est pas possible de fixer immédiatement la date de celle-ci, qu'il est difficile de faire cadrer avec les réunions des Commissions de l'Assemblée générale. Les membres du Conseil et les autres personnes intéressées seront avisés aussitôt que possible de la date qui aura été fixée.

M. Gromyko (Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques) (traduit du russe): A ce propos, il me semble que l'on devrait tenir une séance du Conseil consacrée à la question indonésienne dans les jours qui suivent, selon les renseignements qui nous parvienrent d'Indonésie et selon les communications officielles, la situation y est anormale et les opérations militaires continuent. C'est pourquoi nous ne devons pas ajourner la séance du Conseil à une date indéterminée. Il faudrait se mettre d'accord avec le Secrétariat
date and, if possible, hold a meeting on this question within the next couple of days.

The President: The Secretariat advises me that it would be impossible to fit in any meeting tomorrow, because that day is completely filled up. It might be possible to arrange a meeting on Friday or Saturday. If that is possible, I shall see that it is done, and I shall inform the members of the Council as soon as possible.

373. Announcements pertaining to the Indonesian question

Mr. Austin (United States of America): I wish to inform the President and the members of the Security Council of the decision recorded in the following communication dated 1 October 1947 and contained in document S/571:

"The United States representative at the Seat of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to advise that the President of the United States of America has appointed the Honourable Frank Porter Graham as the United States representative on the Committee of the Security Council established to exercise the good offices of the Security Council in the dispute between the Republic of Indonesia and the Netherlands Government. The credentials follow."

The President: I am sure that all the members of the Council were interested in hearing the statement just made by the representative of the United States of America.

In view of the statement just read by the representative of the United States of America, I shall read to the Council a letter on the same subject which I have received from the head of the Australian delegation. This communication, which is dated 26 September 1947 and is contained in document S/569, reads as follows:

"I have the honour to inform you that the Australian Government has appointed Mr. Justice Kirby, a judge of the Australian Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, as Australian representative on the Committee established as a result of the resolution1 on the Indonesian question adopted by the Security Council on 25 August 1947..."

Mr. van Langenhove (Belgium): I should like to add, in connexion with the communications which have just been made to the Council, that the Belgian Government, some twelve days ago, appointed Mr. Paul van Zeeland, Senator and former Prime Minister, as its representative.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

---

1 See Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, No. 83, 194th meeting.

2 The preceding communications, pertaining to the composition of the Committee of Good Offices, were pursuant to the nominations recorded in documents S/537, S/545, S/564, S/558, of which the texts follow:

---

1 Voir les Procès-verbaux officiels du Conseil de sécurité, Deuxième Année, No 83, 194ème séance.

2 Les communications qui précèdent, relatives à la composition de la Commission des bons offices, font suite aux désignations qui figurent aux documents S/537, S/545, S/554 et S/558, dont voici le texte:
Document S/537 3 September 1947

[Original text: English]

LETTER DATED 30 AUGUST 1947 FROM THE NETHERLANDS REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

No. 810

I have the honour to inform you under instructions that the Netherlands Government, while maintaining undiminished its point of view regarding the incompetence of the Security Council in the matter, is nevertheless of the opinion that the tendency of the resolutions passed by the Security Council on 25 and 26 August 1947 concerning the Indonesian question is acceptable.

The Netherlands Indies Government will provide the career consular officials in Batavia of the Powers concerned with all facilities necessary to carry out their task.

The Netherlands Government hopes very shortly to be able to inform the Security Council which member it has found willing to accept its invitation to participate in the Commission referred to in the second paragraph of the Council's resolution, which was originally proposed by the United States representative.

The premise on which the Netherlands Government bases its statement of acceptance of the tendency of the above-mentioned resolutions is that the Indonesian Republic will cease all hostile action in word and in deed.

The Netherlands Government maintains its standpoint that it remains ultimately responsible for order and peace in Indonesia.

(Signed) J. W. M. Snouck Hurgronje

Document S/545 9 September 1947

[Original text: English]

LETTER DATED 4 SEPTEMBER 1947 FROM THE NETHERLANDS REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

No. 822

With reference to my letter dated 30 August 1947, No. 810, concerning the acceptance by the Netherlands Government of the tendency of the resolutions passed by the Security Council on 25 and 26 August 1947, relating to the Indonesian question, I have the honour to inform you under instructions from my Government, that the Netherlands Government has approached the Belgian Government with the invitation to participate in the Commission referred to in the second paragraph of the Council's resolution which was originally proposed by the United States representative, and that the Belgian Government has been good enough to accept the invitation.

(Signed) J. W. M. Snouck Hurgronje

Document S/564 23 September 1947

[Original text: English]

LETTER DATED 23 SEPTEMBER 1947 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to inform you that the Republic of Indonesia has selected the Government of Australia to represent Indonesia on the Security Council Committee which is making available its good offices in an attempt to solve the Indonesian-Netherlands dispute.

(Signed) Soetan Sjahrir

Document S/558 18 September 1947

[Original text: French]

LETTER DATED 18 SEPTEMBER 1947 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRALIA AND BELGIUM ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council's resolution dated 25 August 1947 on the Indonesian question provides for the appointment of a good offices committee consisting of three members of the Council. Australia and Belgium, the two members of this committee selected by each of the parties respectively, were empowered to designate the third.

I have the honour to inform the Security Council that the Government of the United States, in compliance with the joint request of the Australian and Belgian Governments, has agreed to be a member of this committee.

(Signed) H. V. Evatt  P. H. Spaak
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Editorial Sudamericana S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>H. A. Goddard Pty. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Agence et Messageries de la Presse, S. A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Libreria Cientifica y Literaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>The Ryerson Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Edmundo Pizarro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>The Commercial Press Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Libreria Latina Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Trejos Hermandos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>La Casa Belga, René de Smet, O'Reilly 455, La Habana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>F. Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Einar Munksgaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Librería Dominicana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Muñoz Hermanos y Cia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Libreria “La Renaissance d’Egypte”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Agence éthiopienne de publicité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Akaatelainen Kirjakauppa, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Editions A. Pedone, 13, rue Soufflot, Paris, Vé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>“Eleftheroudakia” Librairie Internationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>José González, Gonzalo &amp; Cía. Ltda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Max Bouchereau, Librairie “A la Caravelle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Bekaverzum Sigfusar Eymundssonar Austursteit 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Oxford Book &amp; Stationery Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Bongahde Piderow, 731 Shah Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Mackenzie &amp; Mackenzie, The Bookshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Librairie universelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Librairie J. Schummer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>N. V. Martius Nijhoff, Lange Voorhout 9 ’s-Gravenhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Gordon &amp; Gotch, Ltd., Waring Taylor Street Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Ramiro Ramírez V, Agencia de Publicaciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Johan Grundt Tanum Forlag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Librería Internacional del Peru, S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>D. P. Pérez Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Spotzelsna Wydawnicza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>A. B. C. E. Frères Kungl. Holbockhandel, Fredsgatan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Librairie Payot S. A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Librairie universelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Librairie Hachette, 469 Istiklal Caddesi, Beyoğlu-İstanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Central News Agency, Commissionner &amp; Ristik Sts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>H. M. Stationery Office, London, S.E. 1, and at H.M.S.O. Shops in London, Edinburgh, Manchester, Cardiff, Belfast, Birmingham and Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>International Documents Service Columbia University Press 2960 Broadway New York 27, N. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Oficina de Representación de Editoriales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Escritoria Pérez Machado, Conde a Pintango 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Draznov Preduce, Jugoslovenska Knjiga, Moskovska U. 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>