

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

**ASSEMBLEE
GENERALE**

A/108
15 October 1946

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

(Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda for the
Second Part of the First Session)

Special Report by the Security Council

I. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL.

At its fifty-seventh meeting, the Security Council unanimously decided (the Representative for Australia abstaining) to recommend to the General Assembly, the admission of Afghanistan, the Republic of Iceland and Sweden to membership in the United Nations. The text of the resolution reads as follows:

"The Security Council

"Having received and considered the report submitted by the Committee on the Admission of New Members regarding application for membership in the United Nations presented by the People's Republic of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, Afghanistan, the Hashemite Kingdom of Trans-Jordan, Ireland, Portugal, the Republic of Iceland, Siam, Sweden;

"Having considered in the course of its debates each one of the above-mentioned applications; and

"Having taken due notice of the statements of opinions of the members of the Security Council in regard to those applications;

"Recommends

"To the General Assembly that it admit to membership in the United Nations the following applicants:

"Afghanistan, Republic of Iceland and Sweden."

The resolution was transmitted by Dr. Oscar Lange, President of the Security Council, by a telegram dated 30 August 1946, to Mr. P. H. Spaak, President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. It was also stated in this communication that, as Siam had withdrawn its application, it had not been voted upon.

In Part II a summary of proceedings followed by the Security Council in consideration of the applications is given for the purpose of information.

II. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Relevant Article of Charter, Rules of Procedure and Resolutions

In consideration of the applications for membership, the Security Council

was guided by the following article of the Charter, Rules of Procedure of the Security Council and resolutions of the Security Council.

(a) Article 4 of the Charter

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

"The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

(b) Rules of Procedure of the Security Council

"Rule 58: Any state which desires to become a Member of the United Nations shall submit an application to the Secretary-General. This application shall be accompanied by a declaration of its readiness to accept the obligations contained in the Charter."

"Rule 59: The Secretary-General shall immediately place the application for membership before the Representatives on the Security Council. Unless the Security Council decides otherwise, the application shall be referred by the President to a committee of the Security Council upon which each member of the Security Council shall be represented. The committee shall examine any application referred to it and report its conclusions thereon to the Council not less than thirty-five days in advance of a regular session of the General Assembly or if a special session of the General Assembly is called, not less than fourteen days in advance of such session."

"Rule 60: The Security Council shall decide whether in its judgment the applicant is a peace-loving state and is able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter, and accordingly whether to recommend the applicant State for membership.

"In order to assure the consideration of its recommendation at the next session of the General Assembly following the receipt of the application, the Security Council shall make its recommendations not less than twenty-five days in advance of a regular session of the General Assembly, nor less than four days in advance of a special session.

"In special circumstances, the Security Council may decide to make a recommendation to the General Assembly concerning the application for membership subsequent to the expiration of the time limit set forth in the preceding paragraph."

(c) Resolutions of the Security Council

On 17 May 1946 the Security Council at its forty-second meeting resolved that:

"1. Applications for membership which have been or may be received by the Secretary-General shall be considered by the Security Council at a meeting or meetings to be held in August 1946 for this specific purpose."

"2. Applications for membership which have been or may be received by the Secretary-General before 14 July 1946, shall be referred to a committee composed of a representative of each of the members of the Security Council for examination and report to the Council not later than 1 August 1946."

At the fifty-first meeting on 24 July 1946, the Council resolved to modify the dates mentioned in the above resolutions by as many days later as the interval between the day on which the General Assembly was originally to be convened (3 September 1946) and the day on which it actually will be convened.

(The discussions of the Security Council concerning the subject matter in paragraphs (b) and (c) above are summarized in the report by the Security Council to the General Assembly, covering the period from 17 January 1946 to 15 July 1946.

2. Applications received

The applications for membership received by the Secretary-General are as follows:

- (a) People's Republic of Albania, 25 January 1946.
- (b) Mongolian People's Republic, 24 June 1946.
- (c) Afghanistan, 2 July 1946.
- (d) The Hashemite Kingdom of Trans-Jordan, 8 July 1946.
- (e) Ireland, 2 August 1946.
- (f) Portugal, 2 August 1946.
- (g) Republic of Iceland, 2 August 1946.
- (h) Siam, 5 August 1946.
- (i) Sweden, 9 August 1946.

3. The Committee on the Admission of New Members

The applications were referred by the President of the Security Council to the Committee on the Admission of New Members which consisted of a representative of each member of the Security Council. The Committee was convened on 31 July 1946 and held its fourteenth and last meeting on 20 August 1946. At the fifty-fourth meeting of the Security Council on 28 August 1946 the Chairman of the Committee on the Admission of New Members submitted a report of the Committee to the Council for its consideration. (See Annex I - document S/133.)

4. General Discussion of Applications by the Security Council

The discussion of the report by the Committee on the Admission of New Members was divided into two parts, namely a general discussion concerning the admission to membership and a discussion of each application separately.

Before the general discussion, the President read a letter from the Representative of Siam in which it was requested that consideration of the application of Siam be adjourned until settlement of the present territorial dispute between Siam and France.

The Representative of U.S.A. stated that his Government proposed that the Security Council take a broad and far-sighted action to extend the membership of the United Nations as far as is consistent with the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter. He added that, although his Government had misgivings about some of the applicants, especially Albania and the Mongolian People's Republic, he was making the proposal in the spirit of fair-mindedness toward all applicants and in the basic interest of the Organization in order to accelerate advancement of universality of membership. He therefore proposed that the Council recommend to the General Assembly admission of all the present applicants.

This proposal was supported by the Secretary-General who told the Council that it was confronted by a question which affects the future of the United Nations and therefore the Council's decision would be of serious importance. He pointed out that the founding Members of the United Nations and all the great powers had agreed on numerous occasions that the United Nations must be as universal as possible. In his capacity of Secretary-General of the United Nations he declared his support of admission to membership of all applicant States.

The Representatives of Brazil, Mexico and Egypt supported the United States proposal.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. could not agree with the proposal of the Representative of U.S.A. and stated that the Council should not simply apply a general universal standard to a whole block of countries and admit them to the United Nations by such a procedure. He considered that the Council must study each application separately in the light of the circumstances and the facts relevant to each case. Admission of new Members to the United Nations was a very serious question and a very complex one. The Council could not decide eight cases as though they were one.

The Representative of Australia said that while Australia respected the doctrine of universality, this doctrine did not relieve the Security Council of the responsibility of examining each application. The Membership Committee's report showed that a number of substantial objections to several applicants had been raised by various members. As far as he knew, no additional information had since been placed before the Council to resolve the doubts that certain members had expressed. Therefore, further examination of each application was necessary. Secondly, it might be anticipated that the General Assembly would wish to consider each applicant singly on its merits and not in a group. For these two reasons the Australian Delegation opposed the United States' proposal.

The Representative of Australia also drew the attention of the Council to the reservation which he had previously made concerning the report of the Membership Committee. In this reservation the Representative of Australia stated that the Australian Government took the view that the procedure adopted by the Security Council in regard to admission of new Members was incorrect and that applications should be dealt with in the first instance by the General Assembly (document S/133 - Annex I).

The Representative of China expressed support of the United States' proposal on the understanding that, if the resolution were not adopted and if each application were considered separately, his Government reserved the right to consider each application on its own merits.

The Representative of U.K. declared that, while his Government would be in favour of admitting the greatest possible number of properly qualified states, it had doubts about the qualifications of two of the applicants. For that reason, and from what had been previously said about the proposal, it seemed that the proposal would not obtain the requisite votes.

The Representative of The Netherlands stated that if the proposal were put to a vote he would vote in favour of it because he thought that the advantages of voting affirmatively outweigh the disadvantages.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. remarked that the discussion of the proposal

of the Representative of U.S.A. showed that this proposal could not be accepted by the Security Council. In those circumstances it seemed to him to be senseless for the Council to proceed to vote upon that resolution since it was known in advance that it could not be adopted. From the point of view of logic he wondered whether the Representative of U.S.A. would withdraw his resolution since it could not in any case be approved.

The Representative of U.S.A. observing that it was quite evident that it would be the vote of the Soviet Union which would block the passage of the proposal acceded and reserved the position which he would take on individual countries the detailed consideration of those countries.

He expressed the deep regret and grave concern of his Government over the development in the Council which had resulted in the rejection of the fair and wise way to apply the Charter provisions as to membership. He said that the record of the proceedings of the Membership Committee left no room for doubt that the difficulties connected with the applications of Albania and Outer Mongolia, raised by his Government, pertained directly to the qualifications of the two applicants as measured by the Charter. Since then, little had been brought forward by either of the two applicants or by the permanent member who so strongly sponsored their applications, to remove the grounds for misgivings. He therefore moved that the Council not take action at this time on the applications of Albania and Outer Mongolia.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. said that he had to object to any attempt to make the suggestion that any one government was able to express its opinion as an arbiter in this matter. He added also that there was no reason why the Representative of U.S.A. should not express the opinion of his Government, but the other hand, there was no reason why the Representatives of other states should share the position of the Government of the United States. The Representative of U.S.S.R. expressed his intention of making a statement later upon the attitude of the Soviet Government on the substance of each of the applications.

The Representative of the U.S.S.R. suggested that the applications be discussed one by one in chronological order. After some debates and after a proposal to the contrary was withdrawn, the President approved this proposal and the Council proceeded to discuss the applications in their chronological order.

5. Discussion of Individual Applications

(a) Albania

During the discussion of Albania's application, the Security Council at its fifty-fifth meeting on 28 August 1946 decided to ask the Representatives of Greece and Yugoslavia to be present at the discussion. The Representative of U.S.S.R. stated that the facts in his possession proved that the Albanian people, at a cost of their life blood, huge losses and trials, had carried out a heroic and unequal struggle against the Fascist conquerors of their country. This struggle was carried on in an increasingly decisive and intensive form and continued right up to the liberation of the territory of Albania from the Fascist invaders. He asserted that the activities of the Albanian Army of National Liberation permanently held down from three to five picked German divisions amounting to 100,000 soldiers and officers who, in other circumstances, could have been used on other sectors of the immense front. The efforts of Italian Fascism to turn Albania into an Italian province proved a fiasco. The reason for this was the powerful and decided opposition of these attempts made by the Albanian people who were fighting for their national liberation and who believed, like the peoples of other countries and territories occupied by the Fascists, in the common victory over the enemy.

According to official statements, 80,000 participants and non-combatant civilians were killed. 10,000 participants and about 48,000 non-combatant civilians were shot in prison or sent to concentration camps in Germany. The material damage cost to Albania by Fascist Italy alone amounted to the sum of 684,214,000 American dollars.

The Albanian people and their democratic Government desired to unite their efforts to those of other peace-loving peoples who had created the

United Nations, with a view to preventing a new tragedy for humanity and with a view to the creation of a solid and lasting peace. He expressed the hope that all the members of the Security Council would support the application of Albania for admission to membership in the United Nations.

The Representative of U.S.A. said that, as he stated previously, he moved that the Council defer its action on the application of Albania until a later date because if he must vote he would have to vote negatively.

The Representative of U.K. referred to the difficulties which his Government were experiencing with the Albanian Government, the circumstances of which had been set out in the report of the Membership Committee, and said that at present his Government felt unable to support Albania's application.

The Representative of Greece stated that his country which, even after the elimination of all the Axis forces, was still technically in a state of war with Albania, asked the Security Council that Albania should not be admitted to the United Nations until the frontier questions between Greece and Albania had been settled, until normal relations had been re-established between those two countries and until Albania had given proof that she is a peace-loving country, having the capacity and will to conform to international obligations and to respect human rights.

The Representative of Yugoslavia, in supporting the admission of Albania to the United Nations, emphasized that Albania was the first victim of Italian Fascism in Europe. Since the landing of Italian forces in Albania on 7 April 1939 until the liberation of the country and even after the liberation, Albania's armed forces continued on, shaping themselves into liberation detachments and finally reaching the form of an Albanian Army of Liberation. The sacrifices made by the Albanian people in the struggle for the common cause of the United Nations deserved recognition.

He added that the universality of the United Nations required that all peace-loving nations become Members of this Organization. Now, through the efforts of all freedom-loving peoples of

the world, Fascism had been destroyed. There could be no obstacle to prevent the Albanian people from again being introduced into the international community.

The President, speaking as the Representative of Poland, supported the Albanian application.

On the suggestion of the Representative of Mexico, it was decided not to vote on the applications individually until all had been discussed.

(b) Mongolian People's Republic

The Representative of U.S.S.R. supported the application of the Mongolian People's Republic for admission to the United Nations. He was convinced that the Mongolian People's Republic is a peace-loving State, capable of making a valuable contribution to the common cause in the struggle of peace-loving peoples for firm peace and security and that she is capable of carrying out the obligations of the Charter. The Mongolian People's Republic is still a relatively young State and during the short period of its independent existence it had been able to make a valuable contribution to the common cause in the struggle of peace-loving peoples against aggression. The participation of the Mongolian people in the common efforts of the peoples of the United Nations took the form, not only of political backing of the United Nations, but also of powerful economic and military help, in particular, that given to the Red Army in its struggle against the Fascist aggressors. He pointed out that the Mongolian People's Republic sent an army of 80,000 men which fought together with the valiant forces of the Red Army against Japanese armies in Manchuria. Even before the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor, Mongolian armies were engaged in combat with the Japanese forces in 1939. After June 1941, the Mongolian People's Republic decided to enter the war on the side of the democratic states against the Fascist aggressors.

The Representative of China stated that the reply of the Representative of the Mongolian People's Republic of 28 August 1946 (document S/133/Add.2)

to the questionnaire sent by the Membership Committee on 12 August 1946 (document S/133) was before the Council. The object of sending this questionnaire was to seek information on behalf of the Committee. As far as the Chinese delegation was concerned, they were satisfied for present purposes and were prepared to support the application if the Council ever came to vote. The Representative of China added that when he said he was satisfied that was not tantamount to an endorsement of all answers contained in the reply, especially the historical part.

The Representative of U.K. declared that the conclusions which he reached after a study of the reply from the Representative of the Mongolian People's Republic did not change the attitude of his Government and he therefore declared that he would vote for deferring this application.

The Representative of U.S.A. stated that information received subsequent to the submission of the report of the Membership Committee did not seem to him to produce any additional facts which would cause him to change his view or to remove any of the doubts which he then had regarding the suitability of the Mongolian People's Republic for membership in the United Nations.

(c) Afghanistan

The Representatives of U.S.S.R. and Egypt expressed their support of the application of Afghanistan for membership in the United Nations.

As no other member of the Security Council wished to speak on the application of Afghanistan, the President considered the discussion on Afghanistan as closed.

(d) Hashemite Kingdom of Trans-Jordan

The Representative of U.S.S.R. declared that he was unable to support the proposal for the admission of Trans-Jordan to the United Nations. His Government could not consider that, at the present time after the conclusion of the war, a country which had no diplomatic relations with U.S.S.R., satisfied the requirements imposed by the Charter upon a State applying for

membership in the United Nations. Although he conceded that at the conference at San Francisco where the foundations of the United Nations were laid, some of the participants did not have normal diplomatic relations with U.S.S.R., he contended that at that time circumstances were quite different because it was war time.

The Representative of Australia stated that if he understood the remark of the Representative of U.S.S.R. it seemed that the Representative of U.S.S.R. was claiming that existence of normal diplomatic relations with U.S.S.R. was to become a condition of membership in the United Nations. He could not find anything in the Charter itself or in any of the other documents which suggested that one of the conditions of membership in the United Nations should be that a State must have diplomatic relations with U.S.S.R. In his opinion the situation with which the Council was dealing was governed completely by Article 4 of the Charter.

The Representative of The Netherlands declared that he could not accept the proposition that any element extraneous to the Charter could be admitted as a condition for the acceptance or non-acceptance of countries for membership in the United Nations. If an adverse vote were based on a condition which would not be found in the Charter at all, he would consider that vote to have been wrongly cast.

The Representative of U.S.A. considered it a very novel doctrine that the fact that a Member of the United Nations has no diplomatic relations with an applicant State should in itself, be a reason for not admitting the applicant to membership. It might well be that there were good and sufficient reasons why a country did not maintain relations with a non-member country. But it should not in his view, follow that the mere fact that it does not have relations constitutes a reason. He totally rejected the point of view expressed by the Representative of U.S.S.R. and thought it to be contrary to the fundamental law of the United Nations.

The Representative of Egypt shared the views expressed by the

Representatives of Australia, The Netherlands and U.S.A.

The Representative of France said that he did not quite understand the reasons which the Representative of U.S.S.R. invoked for his position. The information received from the Representative of the Mongolian People's Republic showed that the country had diplomatic relations with only two other states. That seemed to him to constitute a contradiction and to make it difficult to explain the attitude taken by the Representative of U.S.S.R. in this case.

The Representative of U.K. maintained that he could not see that the absence of normal diplomatic relations in itself could possibly be a disqualification, and stated that he was instructed by his Government to support this application.

The Representative of Brazil agreed with the statement made by the Representative of U.S.A. concerning the arguments brought forward by the Representative of U.S.S.R. He thought that the Security Council had no right to add to the requirements which are contained in the Charter.

The President speaking in his capacity as Representative of Poland, asked for postponement of the application of Trans-Jordan for one year. He felt that, in the passage of Trans-Jordan from a country under a mandate of the League of Nations to independence, certain legal procedures had to be taken, namely the legal procedures required by the Covenant of the League of Nations. He asserted that these legal procedures had not been applied in this case. Therefore, he asked for postponement of adoption of his application until the legal doubts had been cleared.

The Representative of U.K. admitted that the United Nations inherited certain rights and responsibilities in the matter of mandates from the League of Nations, but he explained that the League of Nations had recently declared Trans-Jordan free from mandate. He failed to see in what way those legal formalities had not been fulfilled in the case of Trans-Jordan.

(a) Ireland

The Representatives of France, U.K. and China declared their support of the application of Ireland. The President, speaking as the Representative of Poland, stated that he did not want to bar entries into the United Nations of any country which, in his opinion, was peace-loving and satisfied other conditions. He expressed deep sympathy with the long struggle of the Irish people for their national independence, which reminded him of the struggle of Poland for her own independence, and he also expressed his satisfaction that now he could support the entry of a free Ireland into the community of the United Nations.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. stated that for the same reason which made it impossible for the Soviet Government to support the candidature of Trans-Jordan he could not support the proposal for the admission of Ireland into the United Nations.

(b) Portugal

The Representatives of Brazil, China and The Netherlands expressed their support of Portugal for membership in the United Nations.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. stated that for the same reasons which rendered it impossible for the Soviet Government to support the proposal for admission to the United Nations of Trans-Jordan and Ireland, it was impossible for U.S.S.R. to support the proposal for the admission of Portugal.

The Representative of France supported the application and asserted that Portugal rendered valuable help to the United Nations during the war and received people from France who had crossed Spanish territory under serious difficulties and received a good welcome in Portugal.

The Representative of U.K. stated that his Government supported whole-heartedly the application of Portugal, not only on the grounds of Portugal's great contribution to the culture and civilization of Europe, but also on the ground that during the war, in particular, Portugal rendered services to the Allied nations of the utmost importance.

The Representative of U.S.A. in supporting the application of Portugal declared that the United States had particular reason to be grateful to Portugal for the material assistance which her attitude rendered the cause of the Allied nations fighting against Germany. All who were associated together in fighting to destroy and remove the Nazi tyranny from Europe were direct and indirect beneficiaries of Portuguese sympathy and assistance. Furthermore, among the decisions reached at Potsdam by the U.S.S.R., U.K. and U.S.A. was an agreement regarding membership of other countries in the United Nations. These three Governments agreed to support the applications for membership from those states which had remained neutral during the war and which fulfilled the qualifications set forth in Article 4 of the Charter.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. stated that the Representative of U.S. had touched upon the question of the help given by Portugal to the United Nations during the war. But leaving aside the character and scope of this help, he reminded the Representative of U.S.A. that it was difficult to distinguish between the help rendered by Portugal and the help rendered by the Mongolian People's Republic and the Albanian People's Republic to the Soviet Union and to the United Nations. The Representative of U.S.S.R. reminded the delegates of those great contributions which the Mongolian and Albanian People's Republics made in the struggle against Japanese, German and Italian Fascist occupying forces. He added that it was necessary to remind the Representative of U.S.A. of that fact because, in referring to Portugal, he had overlooked mention of essential facts concerning the applications from other countries which the Council had been discussing two hours previously.

As regards the remarks relating to the Potsdam Conference and decision, the interpretation of the decision by the Representative of U.S.A. was considered by the Representative of U.S.S.R. to be faulty. The decision was that the United Nations might admit to membership those neutral states which in accordance with the Charter fulfilled the requirements laid down for states seeking membership in the United Nations.

The Representative of U.S.A. replied to the remarks of the Representative of U.S.S.R. that the U.S.A. was voting for Portugal not because of the indirect assistance given by Portugal to the war effort, but because he thought that Portugal was able to fulfill the criteria set up by the Charter for membership. He agreed that in voting on these matters it was the right of each individual state to formulate its own decisions. He thought, however, that because fifty-one nations had agreed on a Charter and had agreed on criteria for membership, as a matter of courtesy, fifty nations were entitled to know the reasons and the rationalizations for a negative vote on membership.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. maintained that the Potsdam decision was that any neutral state might be admitted to membership if it fulfilled the requirements laid down by the Charter for applicants for membership in the United Nations. He considered that these applications should not be treated wholesale as was suggested by the Representative of U.S.A. It was his opinion that each case should be judged in the light of the special facts and circumstances relevant to it and it was the affair of each Government represented in the Council to reach the decision which it considered to be right in each particular case. No one Government had exclusive right to lay down whether this or that state satisfied the requirements of the Charter or not.

The Representative of Egypt thought that there were three requirements to decide whether or not an applicant be qualified for membership. It seemed to him that there was somehow a fourth requisite which was that the Member would be agreeable to the other Members of the United Nations in a vague way without saying precisely how it could be agreeable or otherwise

The President speaking in his capacity as the Representative of Poland, shared the great admiration for the historic and cultural achievements of the Portuguese people but had doubts whether, under her present political conditions, Portugal qualified as a country which would be able and willing

to carry out the obligations of the Charter. He drew the attention of the Council to the close association between the Government of Portugal and Franco's Fascist dictatorship in Spain, which was barred from membership in the United Nations. For these reasons, he suggested that the admission of Portugal be delayed to some future time when the question had been cleared up.

The Representative of Brazil explained that there was a sharp distinction between the Portuguese regime on the one hand, and the Spanish regime on the other. There could be no question as to the valuable role played by Portugal on the side of the United Nations during the war. He felt that the majority of the Council members would share his opinion that the United Nations would gain by admitting Portugal to membership in the United Nations.

(g) Iceland

The Representatives of France, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. spoke in support of the candidature of Iceland. The President declared that since no other members of the Council wished to speak he considered the discussion on Iceland to be closed.

(h) Sweden

The Representatives of The Netherlands, France, China, U.S.A., U.S.S.R., U.K., Egypt, Brazil and Poland spoke in support of the application of Sweden.

6. Decisions of the Security Council

(a) The Mexican Proposal

After all eight applications had been discussed the Representative of Mexico stated that, during the debates in the Council, no new element had been established which had not been already discussed by the Membership Committee. In consideration of the United States' proposal presented at the outset of the discussion, the only valid reason offered in opposition to vote upon it had been that it was advisable for the Council to examine separately the applications, as the circumstances to each case were different. He added that, among several other members, he had had the satisfaction of supporting the United States' proposal, being happy to note that it was coincident with the Mexican general view on the question of membership and

with the position taken by his Delegation in this matter. As that proposition had been withdrawn, he decided to move the adoption, at this stage, of a resolution embodying the admission of all applicant States.

The representative of Mexico added that no objection for the admission of any one of the applicant States had been raised which could be considered insurmountable, and that it had not been proved beyond doubt that the applicants were not admissible. He stressed that Article 4 of the Charter grants to the Organization as a whole, and not to individual Members, the right to pass judgment on the ability and willingness of applicant States to carry out the obligations of the Charter. No States should be precluded from membership by the exercise of the veto power when the latter was not justified by the firmness and the weight of the objections on which it was based.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. contended that the Mexican proposal was made only thirty minutes previously, while other proposals had been made earlier. He reminded the Council that he had put forward a proposal that each application should be considered separately and that the Council should decide upon them after the separate consideration of each application. He asked that a decision be taken upon his proposal.

The Representative of Mexico, in reply, declared that his proposal was a previous question and that if the Council started to vote on each one of the motions he would never find out whether the Council was in favour of his proposal. He held that his proposal could even be considered as an amendment to the Soviet proposal and then Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure would apply and the amendment should be voted upon first.

The President declared that the Mexican proposal must be voted upon before the Council decided on the particular applicant States.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. objected to the adoption of the motion as proposed by the Representative of Mexico, because although some members of the Council favoured the admission of all eight States, there were other members who favoured some of the States and opposed others. He thought that

it was quite clear that the Council would not be in a position to adopt a proposal for the admission of all eight states. From the point of view of elementary logic this conclusion seemed to him to be absolutely ineluctable.

The Representative of U.K. considered that the resolution proposed by the Representative of U.S.A. and that by the Representative of Mexico were, in substance, exactly the same. He stated that his Government had sincere doubts based on the Charter, in regard to two of the applicants, namely Albania and the Mongolian People's Republic. These doubts were not fictitious reasons put forth for the purpose of bargaining. He declared that he could not vote for the Mexican proposal.

The Representative of Australia stated that his objections to the Mexican resolution were fundamentally a matter of principle. The way he saw the position was that certain representatives had made objections based on the Charter. He believed that these objections were properly and honestly made. It seemed to him to be a wrong procedure to ask any member of the Council to withdraw such an objection in order to gain the slight advantage of either saving time or facilitating the admission of other candidates.

After the appeal of the Representatives of The Netherlands and China, the Representative of Mexico withdrew his proposal. He considered that his efforts in favour of the admission of all the applicants and his proposal to that end had served a useful purpose in giving public opinion a general cognizance of the views of the Council on this question.

(b) United States' Proposal

The Representative of U.S.A. then renewed his proposal that the voting on Albania and the Mongolian People's Republic be postponed until the next occasion - next year. He thought that his motion should have a priority in the voting.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. objected to giving priority to the

proposal of the United States and stated that the proposal for the admission of Albania was made eight months ago. The Council should vote upon the proposal for the admission of Albania, and only after that, should it proceed to consider the United States' proposal. The same consideration applied to the question of the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The President declared that the logical situation required that the question of postponement of a vote must be taken before the vote itself. He wanted to know whether his ruling had been challenged, in which case he would submit it to the Council.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. asked the President whether the question to postpone the voting or to postpone a decision was in itself an action. He thought that it did constitute an action.

As requested by the President the Secretary-General expressed his opinion that when the question of Albania was raised in London, the Representative of U.S.A. proposed to keep this question on the agenda but to defer its disposition pending further study. The American resolution was regarded as a procedural matter in regard to voting.

The President stated that he could not doubt the question was one of procedure. As this had met with opposition, he therefore would like the Council to decide upon the proper order of voting.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. maintained that the United States' proposal was not of a procedural character, and that the Secretary-General's statement was not quite accurate. It was decided at London to postpone the examination of this application, but the Council was now dealing, not with the question of postponement of the consideration, but with the rejection of the application.

The President then asked the Council to vote on whether the American resolution for postponement should be voted upon first. The results of the voting were ten affirmative votes (China, Egypt, France, Mexico, The Netherlands, Poland, U.K., U.S.A., Australia, Brazil); one negative vote (U.S.S.R.).

The President declared that in view of the result of the voting, the Council must make a decision as to whether the United States' resolution was a matter of procedure or substance.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. reminded the Council that the decision whether or not the proposition of the U.S.A. was a matter of procedure or substance could be taken only by an affirmative majority vote of seven members of the Council including all the permanent members.

The Representative of China considered that the United States' resolution was not a matter of procedural character as the Council was asked to take action or delay action. Delaying action should be considered as a negative action, therefore he considered that this was not a procedural vote.

The President's ruling that it was a matter of procedure was then put to a vote. The results of the voting were five affirmative votes (Australia, Brazil, Netherlands, Poland, U.S.A.); four negative (China, France, U.S.S.R., U.K.); two abstentions (Egypt, Mexico.)

The President declared that his ruling was not adopted as its adoption required the concurring votes of all permanent members.

The Representative of The Netherlands objected to the President's statement and stated that the person who moved to overrule the President's ruling required five concurring votes of the permanent members.

The Representative of U.S.S.R. stated that the decision of the Council as to whether a question was of a procedural character or not required a majority of seven votes, including those of five permanent members. As the Council had not obtained the votes of the five permanent members in favour of the point of view that this question was one of procedure, it was, therefore, not a question of procedure.

The President stated that the question which the Council was asked was whether it supported his ruling that this was a question of procedure. There were five votes in favour, four against. The four against were permanent members. On that condition it seemed clear to him that his ruling had not

been supported. He had not asked for the opposite question. Consequently, the Council must treat the resolution asking to postpone the voting on Albania as a matter of substance and not procedure.

The Representative of The Netherlands disagreed with the statement of the President and observed that if this were a question of substance, in order that the President's ruling be overruled, the Council must have five concurrent affirmative votes of the permanent members. These five concurring votes were not cast in favour of overruling the President's ruling. Therefore, in his opinion, the ruling stood.

The Representative of Australia endorsed the view expressed by the Representative of The Netherlands and stated that the question before the Council was governed by Rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure, which said that if the President's ruling was challenged the President should submit his ruling to the Security Council for immediate decision and it should stand unless overruled. The plain meaning of these words would seem to be that, unless there be sufficient majority against the ruling, the ruling would stand.

The Representative of U.S.A. stated that in order to shorten the discussion and get on with the substance of the business, he was prepared to accept the President's ruling that as a result of the vote just taken the Council must treat the resolution asking to postpone the voting on Albania as a matter of substance and not procedure without, however, committing himself or his Government to any stand on this important matter of principle.

The Representatives of Australia and The Netherlands stated that they would like to go on record as emphatically disagreeing with the President's ruling interpreting the results of the vote.

The President stated that he would like to take full notice of the statements made by the Representatives of the U.S.A., Australia and The Netherlands and he made it quite clear that acceptance of his ruling did not constitute any precedent whatsoever. He added that he was acting only in the interest of avoiding confusion and getting unnecessarily into

very complicated problems of procedure.

The resolution of the United States to postpone consideration of the vote on Albania until the next occasion was then put to a vote. The results were as follows: six affirmative votes (China, Egypt, Netherlands, U.K., U.S.A., Brazil); three negative (France, Poland, U.S.S.R.); two abstentions (Australia, Mexico.)

Thus the United States proposal was not adopted.

The Representative of U.S.A. withdrew a similar motion to postpone voting on the Mongolian People's Republic.

(c) Voting on Individual Applications

The Security Council then proceeded to vote on individual applications. It decided by ten affirmative votes with the Representative of Australia abstaining, to recommend three applicant States, namely, Afghanistan, The Republic of Iceland and Sweden, to the General Assembly for membership in the United Nations. The results of the voting on the other five States, whose applications were not carried, were as follows:

People's Republic of Albania

Affirmative: Brazil, U.S.S.R., Poland, Mexico, France

Negative: U.S.A., U.K., Netherlands

Abstaining: Australia, China, Egypt

Mongolian People's Republic

Affirmative: China, France, Mexico, Poland, U.S.S.R., Brazil

Negative: Netherlands, U.K., U.S.A.

Abstaining: Australia, Egypt

Hashemite Kingdom of Trans-Jordan

Affirmative: China, Egypt, France, Mexico, Netherlands, U.K., U.S.A., Brazil

Negative: Poland, U.S.S.R.

Abstaining: Australia

Ireland

Affirmative: China, Egypt, France, Mexico, Netherlands,
Poland, U.K., Brazil, U.S.A.

Negative: U.S.S.R.

Abstaining: Australia

Portugal

Affirmative: China, Egypt, France, Mexico, Netherlands,
U.K., U.S.A., Brazil

Negative: Poland, U.S.S.R.

Abstaining: Australia

d) Statements of the Representatives of Egypt and Australia

After the voting on the application of Albania, the Representative of Egypt stated that the Egyptian delegation had listened with great interest to the statements made in connection with Albania's application for membership in the United Nations and had taken into serious consideration the arguments and the material presented for and against the applications. His Government had a long and continued tradition of close friendship with all the countries concerned in this matter and it was the earnest hope of his Government that the situation mentioned by some delegations to explain the objection to the admission of Albania would be clarified in the near future. In the meantime, he was to abstain from voting.

As to the application of the Mongolian People's Republic, the Egyptian delegation considered that until now they did not have at their disposal sufficient information concerning the Mongolian People's Republic and that, in this case also they would abstain from voting.

The Representative of Australia declared that, because of the view of the Australian Government regarding the correct procedure for the admission of new Members, he was instructed by his Government not to declare their attitude toward any application at this stage, and so he would abstain from voting on the question whether or not any particular

State should be recommended for membership. This abstention was made for reasons relating to procedure and not for reasons relating to the merits of any applications. He also was instructed by his Government that on the information at present available, the Australian Government would be prepared at a proper time to support the applications of Ireland, Sweden, Trans-Jordan, Afghanistan and Iceland, but this statement should not be taken as an indication that at the proper time Australia would not support the application of any or all of the other applicant States.

After the voting, the President declared that, while the Council had recommended the admission of certain States and not of certain others, this did not mean that the Council would not recommend their admission in the future. He voiced the general wish of the members of the Council and of the United Nations that all nations of the world should become members of the Organization as soon as possible.

NOTE

The Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members, originally issued as Document S/133, will be found reproduced in full in Supplement No. 4 to the Official Records of the Security Council, which has been issued to all Members of the General Assembly.