

SUMMARY STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF MATTERS OF
WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED AND OF THE
STAGE REACHED IN THEIR CONSIDERATION

A. Pursuant to rule 11 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, I submit the following summary statement of matters of which the Security Council is seized and of the stage reached in their consideration on 7 January 1949.

1. The Iranian question

The Iranian application, dated 19 January 1946 (page 13, Security Council Journal No. 2), was considered at the 3rd and 5th meetings of the Council in London on 28 and 30 January 1946, and a resolution was unanimously adopted requesting the parties to inform the Council of any results achieved in negotiations between them.

By letter dated 18 March 1946 (document S/15), the Iranian Ambassador made a further application, which was considered at the Security Council's 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th meetings, from 26 March to 4 April 1946. After various procedural decisions, it was resolved by nine votes (the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics being absent and the representative of Australia abstaining) to defer further proceedings until 6 May, at which time the Soviet Government and the Iranian Government were requested to report to the Council (pages 458-9, Security Council Journal No. 24).

By letter dated 6 April 1946 (document S/30), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposed that the Iranian question be removed from the agenda of the Council; and by letter dated 9 April 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General (document S/33), the Iranian Ambassador opposed this proposal. The letters were discussed at the 32nd meeting on 15 April.

By letter dated 15 April 1946 (document S/37), the Iranian Ambassador communicated the text of a telegram from his Government stating that it withdrew its complaint from the Council.

At the 33rd meeting on 16 April, the Secretary-General submitted a memorandum to the President of the Council (document S/39) concerning the legal effect of the above letters from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Iranian Ambassador. The Council referred

/this memorandum

this memorandum to the Committee of Experts and considered its report (document S/42) at the 36th meeting on 23 April. A resolution submitted by the representative of France (page 522, Security Council Journal No. 27) providing that the Secretary-General collect information to complete the Security Council's report to the General Assembly received three votes (France, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and was declared lost. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the decision of the Council to retain the Iranian question on its agenda was contrary to the Charter, and accordingly, the Soviet delegation did not consider it possible to take any further part in the discussion of the Iranian question in the Council.

By letter dated 6 May 1946 (document S/53), the Iranian Ambassador reported on the withdrawal of Soviet troops. At the 40th meeting on 8 May the Council resolved to defer further proceedings and requested the Iranian Ambassador to submit a complete report to the Security Council immediately upon the receipt of the information which would enable it to do so (page 635, Security Council Journal No. 33).

By letters dated 20 May and 21 May 1946 (documents S/66 and S/68), the Iranian Ambassador submitted reports of additional information with respect to the matters brought to the Council's attention by the Iranian Government.

At the 43rd meeting on 22 May 1946, the Council resolved to adjourn the discussion of the Iranian question, the Council to be called together at the request of any of its members (page 711, Security Council Journal No. 36).

By letter dated 5 December 1946 (document S/204) the Iranian Ambassador in Washington, D.C., forwarded a report concerning the state of affairs in the Province of Azerbaijan.

2. Special Agreements under article 43 and the organization of the armed forces made available to the Security Council

At its 23rd meeting on 16 February 1946, the Council directed the Military Staff Committee, as its first task, to examine the provisions of article 43 of the Charter, and to submit the results of the study and any recommendations to the Council in due course.

At its 105th meeting on 13 February 1947, in its resolution concerning the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly regarding the principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments and information on armed forces of the United Nations (document S/268/Rev.1/Corr.) the Council requested the Military Staff Committee to submit, as soon as possible, its recommendations in pursuance of article 43 and, as a first step, to submit not later than 30 April 1947, its recommendations with regard to the basic principles which should govern the organization of armed forces made available to the Security Council.

/By letter

By letter dated 30 April 1947 (document S/336), the Military Staff Committee forwarded its report on "General principles governing the organization of the armed forces made available to the Security Council by Member nations of the United Nations".

A general discussion on the report was commenced at the 138th meeting on 4 June and continued at the 139th, 140th and 141st meetings through 16 June 1946. Discussion on the separate articles of the report was taken up at the 142nd meeting on 18 June and continued at the 143rd, 145th, 146th, 149th and 157th meetings from 20 June to 15 July. The Council adopted various articles of the report including several amendments submitted by the representatives of Australia and Belgium.

Several questions raised during the discussion on the articles of the report were referred to the Military Staff Committee, and replies were received (documents S/380 and S/395). At the 146th meeting the Council requested the Military Staff Committee to submit an estimate of the over-all strength of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council, indicating the strength and composition of the separate components and the proportions that should be provided by the five permanent members. At the 149th meeting the Council considered the Military Staff Committee's estimate (document S/394) and also decided to request the interpretation of the Military Staff Committee of the initial contribution of armed forces referred to in articles 10 and 11. The answer from the Military Staff Committee was circulated as document S/408.

At its last meeting on this matter, the Council was discussing article 11 of the report and proposals submitted by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia.

3. Rules of procedure of the Security Council

As instructed by the Council at its 1st, 6th, and 23rd meetings, the Committee of Experts drafted provisional rules of procedure and recommendations concerning communications from private individuals and non-governmental bodies. After minor amendments the Council adopted these provisional rules of procedure and recommendations at the 31st meeting, and agreed that the Committee of Experts should formulate additional provisional rules for submission to the Council.

Additional provisional rules of procedure drafted by the Committee of Experts were adopted by the Council at its 41st, 42nd, 44th and 48th meetings. At the 138th meeting, the Council adopted a rule on the election of Members of the International Court of Justice. The provisional rules of procedure adopted by the Council to date are given in document S/96 and Addendum 1.

/By letter

By letter dated 5 September 1947 (document S/540/Corr.1) the representative of the United Kingdom suggested several additional rules of procedure concerning meetings of the Security Council. This letter has not yet been considered by the Council.

4. Statute and rules of procedure of the Military Staff Committee

At the 23rd meeting on 16 February 1946, it was agreed to postpone consideration of the report of the Military Staff Committee concerning its statute and rules of procedure (document S/10 as revised in S/115). The Committee of Experts was instructed to examine the report. It was agreed that pending the approval of the report the Military Staff Committee was authorized to carry out its business along the lines suggested in its report. At the 25th meeting on 26 March 1946, consideration of the report was further postponed pending examination by the Committee of Experts.

On 17 July 1947, the report of the Committee of Experts was circulated as document S/421 but has not yet been placed on the agenda of the Security Council.

5. The general regulation and reduction of armaments and information on armed forces of the United Nations

By letter dated 27 December 1946 (document S/229), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a proposal regarding the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly on the "Principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments" (document S/231). At its 88th meeting on 31 December 1946, the Council placed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' proposal on its agenda, and at the 90th meeting on 9 January 1947, it was agreed to formally accept the resolution of the General Assembly and proceed to the question of its implementation.

Further discussion took place at the 92nd and 93rd meetings on 15 January, and at the 95th meeting on 20 January. Draft resolutions were submitted by the representatives of the United States (S/233), France (S/243), Australia (S/249) and Colombia (S/251).

At the 95th meeting on 20 January, the Council adopted by nine votes to two a resolution submitted by the representative of the United States to defer consideration of these items and the first report of the Atomic Energy Commission until 4 February 1947.

Discussion was resumed at the 98th and 99th meetings on 4 February 1947. A new draft resolution was submitted by the representative of the United States (document S/264). The Council agreed that the authors of the various draft resolutions would meet unofficially with the President to try to work out a common text upon which unanimous agreement of the Council could be obtained.

The draft resolution resulting from the consultation of the President with the authors of previous draft resolutions (document S/268), was discussed at the 102nd, 103rd, 104th and 105th meetings on 11, 12 and 13 February 1947. The Security Council resolved (document S/268/Rev.1/Corr.1) inter alia, to set up a Commission for Conventional Armaments to be composed of representatives of the members of the Security Council to submit to the Security Council, within the space of not more than three months, proposals

- (a) For the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces; and
- (b) For practical and effective safeguards in connexion with the general regulation and reduction of armaments.

By letter dated 25 June 1947, (document S/387), the Chairman of the Commission transmitted a report to the Council, attaching a plan of work and a proposal for the organization of the work of the Commission. At its 159th meeting, the Council adopted by nine votes to none (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland abstaining) the plan of work adopted by the Commission for Conventional Armaments (Annex A to document S/387). The Council took note of the Commission's plan of organization of its future work (Annex B to document S/387).

6. Appointment of a Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste

By letter dated 13 June 1947, the representative of the United Kingdom requested that an early date be fixed for the discussion by the Security Council of the question of the appointment of a Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste. The question was placed on the agenda at the 143rd meeting of the Security Council, and discussed in private at the 144th and 155th meetings on 20 June 1947 and 10 July 1947. The Council set up a sub-committee composed of the representatives of Australia, Colombia and Poland to collect additional information about the candidate.

At its 203rd meeting held in private on 24 September 1947, the Council examined the report of its sub-committee and also examined a new candidate proposed by the representative of China. The Council decided to ask the permanent members to hold an informal consultation.

The Council took up this matter again at its 223rd meeting, held in private on 13 December, and decided in pursuance of article 11 (paragraph 1) of the Permanent Statute for the Free Territory of Trieste to request the Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia to consult with each other in an effort to reach agreement on a candidate and to report on their progress to the Council not later than 5 January 1948.

At its 233rd meeting held in private, the Council discussed the replies from the Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia to the

/Security Council's

Security Council's request of 19 December. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics suggested that the members of the Council should express their opinion regarding the new candidates mentioned in the above replies. Some permanent members of the Council, however, declared that they were not yet in position to discuss those candidates. The Council decided to ask the permanent members to have a further consideration on the matter next week and also decided to have another meeting of the Council on this question as soon as possible.

At its 265th meeting held in private, the Security Council agreed, after some discussion, to postpone further consideration of this question until such time as it was requested by any member of the Council.

7. The Egyptian question

By letter dated 8 July 1947 (document S/410), the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt stated that British troops were maintained in Egyptian territory against the unanimous will of the people and contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter and to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1946. He also complained of British policy in relation to the Sudan and stated that the facts set out had given rise to a dispute between the Egyptian Government and the Government of the United Kingdom, the continuance of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. He stated that negotiations had been attempted pursuant to article 33, but had failed to achieve their end. Consequently, the Egyptian Government brought its dispute with the Government of the United Kingdom to the Security Council under articles 35 and 37, requesting the Security Council to direct:

- (a) The total and immediate evacuation of British troops from Egypt, including the Sudan;
- (b) The termination of the present administrative regime in the Sudan.

At its 159th meeting, the Security Council placed this question on its agenda. It was agreed that the application would not be discussed before 5 August, to afford sufficient time for preparation.

The Council commenced its discussion of the question at the 175th meeting on 5 August, and it was continued at the 176th, 189th, 193rd, 196th, 198th, 199th and 200th meetings. The Brazilian representative introduced a draft resolution (S/507) and accepted several amendments thereto, submitted by the representatives of China (S/507/Add.1), Belgium (S/507/Add.1) and Australia (S/516). The amended draft resolution was put to a vote and received 6 votes in favour, 1 against (Poland) with three abstentions (Colombia, Syria and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the

/United Kingdom

United Kingdom representative not participating in accordance with article 27 of the Charter; the resolution was not adopted. The representative of Colombia then submitted a new draft resolution (S/530). It was voted on in parts and was not adopted.

The Council further considered the question at its 201st meeting on 10 September 1947. A draft resolution submitted by the representative of China (document S/547) and amendments thereto submitted by the representative of Australia (document S/549) failed to receive a majority of votes and were not adopted. The President then stated that the Egyptian question would remain on the agenda, and that the Council would continue its consideration of the question at the request of any member of the Council or of either of the two parties concerned.

8. The Indonesian question

By letter dated 30 July 1947 (document S/447) the Government of India drew the attention of the Security Council, under article 35, paragraph 1 of the Charter, to the situation in Indonesia, stated that in its opinion the situation endangered the maintenance of international peace and security. The Government of India requested the Council to take the necessary measures provided by the Charter to put an end to the present situation.

By letter dated 30 July 1947 (document S/449) the Australian Government also brought the hostilities in progress in Java and Sumatra to the attention of the Council, stating that it considered these hostilities constituted a breach of peace under article 39. It urged the Council to take immediate action to restore international peace and security.

The Council placed the Indonesian question on its agenda at the 171st meeting on 31 July 1947. The Council invited the representatives of India and the Netherlands to participate in the discussion. After discussing the question at the 172nd and 173rd meetings on 1 August, the Council adopted a resolution (document S/459) calling upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith, and to settle their disputes by arbitration or by other peaceful means, keeping the Security Council informed about the progress of the settlement.

By letters dated 3 and 4 August, the Netherlands representative informed the Council that orders had been issued to the Netherlands forces in the areas concerned to cease hostilities (document S/466). By cablegram dated 5 August (document S/469), the Vice-Premier of the Republic of Indonesia informed the Council that his Government had decided to order cessation of hostilities. He requested that a committee be appointed by the Council to secure effective implementation of cessation of hostilities.

/Further

Further discussion of the Indonesian question commenced at the 178th meeting of 7 August and continued at the 181st, 184th, 185th, 187th, 192nd, 193rd, 194th and 195th meetings through 26 August.

By telegram dated 1 August 1947 (document S/458), the permanent representative of the Philippines to the United Nations expressed the desire of his Government to participate in the discussion of the Indonesian question. This request was rejected at the 178th meeting but, at the request of the representative of the Philippines (document S/485), was reconsidered and an invitation approved at the 184th meeting. At the 181st meeting, it was decided to invite a representative of the Republic of Indonesia to participate in the discussion. At the 184th meeting, a Belgian proposal to invite the representative of East Indonesia and Borneo to participate in the discussion was rejected. At the 193rd meeting, a Belgian proposal to invite representatives of East Indonesia and Borneo to participate in the work of the Council on the same basis as the representatives of Indonesia was rejected.

At the 181st meeting, the representative of Australia introduced a draft resolution (document S/488); and amendments to this resolution were submitted by the representative of Poland (document S/488/Add.1) and China (document S/488/Add.2) at the 185th and 187th meetings. At the 192nd meeting, the representatives of Australia and China introduced a joint draft resolution (document S/513) and the representative of Australia introduced a new separate draft resolution (document S/512). The representative of the United States also submitted a draft resolution (document S/514). At the 193rd meeting, the representative of Belgium introduced a draft resolution (document S/517).

At the 195th meeting, the draft resolutions were put to a vote. An amendment submitted by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the joint Australian-Chinese resolution (S/513), providing for the establishment of a commission of the Security Council to supervise the "cease fire" order, received 7 votes in favour, 2 against (Belgium and France) with 2 abstentions (China and the United Kingdom) and was not adopted since one of the permanent members voted against it. The joint Australian-Chinese resolution was then adopted by 7 votes in favour with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Poland, United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

The Polish amendment (S/488/Add.1) to the original Australian draft resolution was re-submitted as an amendment to the second Australian resolution (S/512). The Polish amendment received 3 votes in favour, 4 against (Belgium, France, United Kingdom and the United States) with 4

/abstentions

abstentions (Australia, Brazil, China and Colombia), and was not adopted. The Australian resolution received 3 votes in favour (Australia, Colombia and Syria), none against with 8 abstentions, and was not adopted.

The United States draft resolution (S/514) received 8 votes in favour none against with 3 abstentions (Poland, Syria and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and was adopted.

The Belgian draft resolution (S/517) received 4 votes in favour (Belgium, France, United Kingdom and the United States), 1 against (Poland) with 6 abstentions and was not adopted.

A new draft resolution submitted by the representative of Poland (S/521) received 10 votes in favour, 1 against (United Kingdom) and was adopted.

The President announced that he considered the discussion on the Indonesian question closed for the present stage, but that the question would remain on the list of matters of which the Council is seized.

The resolutions on the Indonesian question adopted at the 194th and 195th meetings are given in document S/525.

By letters dated 4 and 18 September 1947 (documents S/545 and S/564), the representatives of the Netherlands and Indonesia informed the Council that the Governments of Belgium and Australia had accepted their invitation to serve on the Council's Committee of Good Offices on the Indonesian Question. By letter dated 18 September 1947 (document S/558), the representatives of Australia and Belgium informed the Council that the Government of the United States had agreed to be the third member of this Committee. By letters dated 26 September, 1 and 2 October 1947 (documents S/469, S/571 and S/570), the representatives of Australia, United States and Belgium informed the Council of the representatives appointed to this Committee by their Governments.

The Council adopted a resolution submitted by the representative of Australia (document S/574) requesting the Secretary-General to act as convener of the Committee of Three on the Indonesian Question and requesting the Committee to proceed to exercise its functions with the utmost dispatch.

The Security Council, at its 207th through 219th meetings discussed the interim report (document S/573) and the full report (document S/586) from the Consular Commission at Batavia. Draft resolutions were submitted by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (document S/575), Australia (document S/579/Rev.1), the United Kingdom (with amendments by the representative of Belgium accepted by the representative of the United Kingdom (document S/578), the United States (document S/585, later revised document S/588) and Poland (document S/589). The representatives of Belgium and China submitted amendments to the revised United States draft resolution

(documents S/592 and S/591). The representative of the United Kingdom later withdrew his resolution.

Two messages from the Government of the Republic of Indonesia to the Security Council were circulated as documents S/583 and S/590.

At the 217th meeting, the draft resolutions submitted by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (document S/575) and Australia (document S/579/Rev.1) were put to a vote and were not adopted since they did not obtain the necessary affirmative votes.

The representative of Australia then submitted an amendment to the United States revised draft resolution (document S/593).

A sub-committee consisting of the representatives of Australia, Belgium, China and the United States was created with the task of trying to merge the revised United States draft resolution and the various amendments thereto into one text. A proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom to use both the revised United States draft resolution (document S/588) and the Polish resolution (document S/589) as a basis was rejected by the Council.

The above-mentioned sub-committee met on 1 November and submitted a combined draft resolution to the Security Council (document S/594). The combined draft resolution was considered by the Security Council at its 218th and 219th meetings on 1 November 1947.

The representative of the United States, in support of the draft resolution submitted by the sub-committee, withdrew his own revised draft resolution. He further stated that he was authorized by the representatives of Australia, Belgium and China to announce that they, for the same reason, also withdrew their amendments to the United States revised draft resolution.

An amendment introduced by the representative of Colombia (document S/595) to the draft resolution submitted by the sub-committee was not carried.

The revised United States draft resolution as submitted by the sub-committee (document S/594) was put to a vote and adopted.

The Polish draft resolution (document S/587) was then put to a vote and rejected since it did not obtain the required number of affirmative votes.

At its 222nd meeting on 9 December 1947, the Council took note of a report from the Committee of Good Offices regarding the place for holding meetings with the two parties concerned (document S/611).

At its 224th meeting on 19 December 1947, the Security Council agreed that the Committee of Good Offices should continue with its present composition after 31 December 1947.

At the same meeting of the Council, the President informed the Council that the Committee of Good Offices was preparing an interim report to the Security Council on the progress of its work, and that it hoped to cable the report on or about 22 December 1947.

/At its 225th meeting

At its 225th meeting on 30 December 1947, the Security Council took note of a cablegram from the Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices stating that the Committee was now preparing a more comprehensive report than originally anticipated, and that the report would be forwarded upon its early completion.

At its 229th meeting of the Security Council on 17 January 1948, the President read a cablegram from the Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices (document S/650) stating that delegations of the Republic of Indonesia and the Netherlands would sign a truce agreement on 17 January 1948 on board the USS "Renville" and that immediately thereupon, both parties would sign an agreement on twelve political principles which were to form the agreed basis for discussions concerning the settlement of the dispute.

The first interim report of the Security Council's Committee of Good Offices on the Indonesian Question (documents S/649 and S/649/Corr.1) was considered by the Security Council at its 247th, 248th, 249th, 251st, 252nd, 256th and 259th meetings, with representatives of Australia, India, the Netherlands, the Philippines, the Republic of Indonesia and the Committee of Good Offices participating without a vote. A draft resolution regarding the interim report was introduced by the representative of Canada (document S/678), and amendments thereto were submitted by the representatives of Australia (document S/681) and of Colombia (document S/682).

The representative of China introduced a new draft resolution (document S/689) which was adopted at the 259th meeting with 8 votes in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (Argentina, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The Colombian amendments (document S/682) to the Canadian draft resolution (document S/678) were then put to a vote paragraph by paragraph, but did not obtain the required number of affirmative votes. The Canadian draft resolution (document S/678) was adopted with 7 votes in favour, none against, and 4 abstentions (Colombia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Discussion was continued at the 316th, 322nd and 323rd meetings. At the 323rd meeting, it was agreed that the President should send a cablegram to the Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices requesting information pertaining to the suspension of negotiations by the parties.

At the 326th meeting the President drew to the attention of the Council the replies (documents S/850 and S/850/Add.1) to his cablegram to the Committee of Good Offices concerning the temporary suspension of negotiations. As a result of the discussion it was agreed that the President should communicate with the Committee of Good Offices requesting them to continue their efforts toward the attainment of peaceful adjustment between the parties and to keep the Security Council informed of further developments. /At the

At the 328th meeting the representative of China introduced a proposal requesting the Committee of Good Offices to make available to the Security Council the text of the Australian-United States Working Paper which had previously been submitted to the parties.

The proposal was rejected. There were 6 votes in favour, none against and 5 abstentions (Argentina, Belgium, France, the United Kingdom and the United States).

At the 329th meeting, the representative of China introduced a draft resolution authorizing the President of the Security Council to send a cable to the Committee of Good Offices requesting an early reply on the existing restrictions on the domestic and international trade of Indonesia, and the reasons for the delay in the implementation of article 6 of the Truce Agreement.

The draft resolution was voted on and adopted by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

At the 341st meeting the representative of China introduced a draft resolution (document S/931) calling upon the Government of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia, with the assistance of the Committee of Good Offices, to maintain strict observance of both the military and economic articles of the Renville Truce Agreement, and to implement early and fully the Twelve Renville Political Principles and the Six Additional Principles.

At the 342nd meeting the Council adopted the Chinese draft resolution by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (document S/933).

The question raised by the request of the Committee of Good Offices for the supply of eighteen jeeps for the use of military assistants of the Committee (document S/929) was discussed and referred to the Secretariat for action.

A cablegram dated 20 October was received from the Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices stating that the Committee was proceeding with the drafting of its Fourth Interim Report. (S/1046). This report was distributed as document S/1085.

On 12 and 19 December 1948, the Committee of Good Offices submitted special reports concerning the direct talks between representatives of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia (S/1117 and S/1129).

By letter dated 19 December 1948, the Deputy Representative of the United States requested an emergency meeting of the Council in the light of the recent resumption of military operations and of the reports of the Committee of Good Offices (S/1128).

Pursuant to this request, the Council considered the Indonesian question at its 387th, 388th, 389th, 390th and 391st meetings. During this period, the Committee of Good Offices submitted further reports (S/1138, S/1144 and S/1146).

At its 392nd meeting on 24 December 1948, the Council voted on a joint draft resolution of Colombia, Syria and United States of America (S/1142) and on Australian amendments (S/1145) thereto, paragraph by paragraph. The joint draft resolution, as amended (S/1150) was adopted, with 7 votes in favour, none against and 4 abstentions (Belgium, France, Ukrainian S.S.R. and U.S.S.R.). This resolution called upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith; and immediately to release the President and other political prisoners arrested since 18 December. It also instructed the Committee of Good Offices to report on events since 12 December and on the parties' compliance with the above directions.

At the 392nd meeting, the Council rejected U.S.S.R. and Canadian draft resolutions (S/1148 and S/1149) and Australian and Syrian amendments to the Canadian draft resolution.

By cable dated 25 December 1948 (S/1154), the Committee of Good Offices communicated to the Security Council the texts of its letters to the parties, pursuant to the resolution of 24 December.

On 26 December 1948, the Committee of Good Offices submitted a report (S/1156) pursuant to the resolution of 24 December.

After further discussion at its 393rd meeting, the Security Council rejected Ukrainian S.S.R. and U.S.S.R. draft resolutions (S/1158 and S/1159).

At its 395th meeting on 28 December 1948, the Council adopted a Colombian draft resolution (S/1165) requesting the Consular Representatives in Batavia referred to in the resolution of 25 August 1947 to transmit a complete report on the situation in the Republic of Indonesia, covering observance of the cease-fire orders and conditions in areas under military occupation or from which armed forces might be withdrawn (9 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions (U.S.S.R. and Ukrainian S.S.R.)). Also at the 395th meeting, the Council adopted a Chinese draft resolution (S/1164) with 8 votes in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (Belgium, France and United Kingdom). This resolution called upon the Netherlands Government forthwith to set free the President of the Republic of Indonesia and other political prisoners; and to report to the Council within 24 hours.

After discussion at the 396th meeting on 29 December 1948, further consideration was deferred until the Council reconvened in Lake Success.

On 7 January 1949, the Committee of Good Offices submitted a further report (S/1189) concerning implementation of the resolution of 24 December.

The Council continued its discussion at the 397th meeting.

9. Voting procedure in the Security Council

At the 197th meeting on 27 August, the Council discussed the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its sixty-first plenary meeting, held on 13 December 1946, concerning voting procedure in the Security Council (document S/237). It was decided to refer the resolution to the Committee of Experts with instructions to consider the matter and to make recommendations as to action the Council might take to comply with the recommendations.

/By letter dated

By letter dated 2 December 1947 (document S/620), addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General drew the attention of the Council to the resolution concerning the voting procedure in the Security Council adopted by the General Assembly on 21 November 1947.

The Security Council considered this communication at its 224th meeting on 19 December 1947. The President of the Council confirmed the receipt of the above-mentioned letter.

10. Procedure in application of articles 87 and 88 of the Charter with regard to the Pacific Islands under strategic trusteeship of the United States of America

By letter dated 7 November 1947 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General drew attention to certain questions in connexion with the procedure to follow in application of articles 87 and 88 of the Charter in relation to the Pacific Islands under strategic trusteeship of the United States of America (document S/599).

The Security Council, at its 220th meeting on 15 November, discussed the above-mentioned letter and decided to refer all questions arising from that letter to the Committee of Experts for study and report.

By letter dated 2 December 1947 (document S/613) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United States informed the Security Council that Eniwetok Atoll, part of the Pacific Islands under strategic trusteeship by the United States, had been closed for security reasons in order that the United States Government might conduct experiments relating to nuclear fission there.

The Security Council at its 222nd meeting on 9 December 1947 took note of the above-mentioned communication and unanimously decided to defer further consideration of the matter until the report from the Committee of Experts now examining the functions of the Security Council in relation to strategic areas had been received.

By letter dated 12 December 1947 (document S/621), the Chairman of the Committee of Experts announced that due to unexpected complications the Committee of Experts had not been able to report to the Council within the time specified, and that it would do so at the earliest possible moment.

The Security Council considered this letter at its 224th meeting on 19 December 1947. A resolution submitted by the representative of Poland (document S/625) giving further instructions to the Committee of Experts and setting new time limits was ruled out of order by the President of the Council. The ruling was challenged, but confirmed by a vote with nine affirmative votes.

/The representative of

The representative of Poland reserved his right to reintroduce his draft resolution under a separate agenda item later.

The President stated that the Council took note of the above-mentioned letter.

Discussion was resumed at the 320th meeting. The rapporteur presented the preliminary report by the Committee of Experts to the Security Council on the respective functions of the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council with regard to the trusteeship system as applied to strategic areas (document S/642).

At the 324th meeting it was decided by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) to authorize the President, together with two other Member States of the Security Council, (Belgium and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) to meet with a similar committee of the Trusteeship Council for the purpose of discussing the extent to which the Security Council might avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council with regard to strategic areas under the trusteeship system.

At the 327th meeting, it was agreed to postpone further discussion of this question until such time as the views of the Trusteeship Council were made known concerning the extent to which the Security Council might avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council with regard to strategic areas under the Trusteeship System.

11. Applications for membership

At its 118th plenary meeting held on 17 November 1947, the General Assembly adopted resolutions requesting the Security Council to reconsider, before the end of the Assembly's session, the applications by Transjordan and Italy for admission as Members.

By letter dated 18 November 1947, (document S/606) the Secretary-General transmitted these resolutions to the President of the Security Council.

At its 221st meeting on 22 November 1947, the Council considered these Assembly resolutions. The President stated that none of the members of the Security Council had changed its position on either application. The Security Council would report to the General Assembly accordingly, and would postpone further reconsideration of these two applications in order to allow consultation among the permanent members.

By letter dated 22 November 1947 (document A/515) the President of the Security Council informed the President of the General Assembly of these proceedings.

/At the 261st meeting

At the 261st meeting, the application of Burma for membership in the United Nations (document S/687) was referred without discussion to the Security Council Committee on the Admission of New Members.

The Security Council considered this question again at the 279th and 280th meetings. At the 279th meeting the resolution recommending the application of the Union of Burma for membership in the United Nations (document S/717) was adopted by 10 votes to none with 1 abstention (Argentina).

The Council then reconsidered the applications of Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Eire, Finland, Hungary, Italy, the Mongolian People's Republic, Portugal, Roumania and Transjordan. The result of the vote on the application of Italy was 9 in favour and 2 against (the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Inasmuch as one of the negative votes was cast by a permanent member, the application of Italy failed to obtain the recommendation of the Security Council.

At the 280th meeting, since none of the representatives had changed his attitude with regard to the other applications, the Council decided to report accordingly to the General Assembly, and to adjourn the discussion on this matter indefinitely.

By letter dated 26 May 1948 from the Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs, the Government of Ceylon applied for membership in the United Nations (document S/820).

At the 318th meeting it was agreed, in accordance with rule 59 of the provisional rules of procedure, to refer the matter to the Committee on the Admission of New Members.

At the 351st meeting the Council considered the application of Ceylon for admission to the United Nations. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft resolution (document S/974) providing for the postponement of consideration of the question of Ceylon's admission to the United Nations until such a time as full information on the status of the Government of Ceylon and on its constitution as well as sufficient proof that Ceylon is a sovereign and independent state has been received from the Government of Ceylon. The Council voted on this proposal and rejected it by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), none against and 9 abstentions. The representative of China then proposed that the Security Council recommend to the General Assembly the admission of Ceylon to membership in the United Nations. The result of the vote on this proposal was 9 in favour and 2 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) but inasmuch as a permanent member
/of the Council

of the Council had voted in the negative it was not adopted.

By telegram dated 22 September (S/1012), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria renewed the Bulgarian Government's request for admission to membership in the United Nations and requested reconsideration of Bulgaria's application. This telegram was placed on the provisional agenda of the 360th meeting of the Security Council on 28 September but consideration was postponed for a few days at the request of the Bulgarian Government.

By letter dated 27 September (S/1017), the Hungarian Minister, on instructions from his Government, requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly of the United Nations, with his support, the Hungarian Government's formal application for admission to the United Nations.

By telegrams dated 12 and 13 October respectively (A/1035 and 1033), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Albania and of the Mongolian People's Republic renewed the application of their Governments for admission to the United Nations.

By letter dated 12 October 1948 (S/1051) from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Government of the People's Republic of Roumania renewed its application for membership in the United Nations.

By letter dated 29 November 1948 (S/1093), addressed to the Secretary-General, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Government of Israel, requested Israel's admission to membership in the United Nations. This communication was discussed by the Council at its 383rd, 384th, 385th and 386th meetings. At the 386th meeting on 18 December 1948, the Israeli application received 5 votes in favour, 1 against, and 5 abstentions, and consequently no recommendation was made by the Council.

By letter dated 9 December 1948 (S/1113) the President of the General Assembly drew attention to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its 177th meeting on 8 December 1948 requesting the Council to reconsider the application of Ceylon for membership in the United Nations. The Security Council reconsidered the application of Ceylon at its 384th meeting on 15 December 1948. The application received 9 votes in favour, 2 against with no abstentions and was not recommended as one of the votes against it was passed by a permanent member.

By letter dated 11 December 1948 (S/1170) the Secretary-General transmitted the text of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its 177th meeting on 8 December 1948 requesting reconsideration by the Security Council of the applications of Portugal, Transjordan, Italy, Finland, Ireland and Austria.

12. The Palestinian question

By letter dated 2 December 1947 (document S/614), the Secretary-General requested that the President of the Security Council draw the attention of the Council to the General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 (document A/516) particularly paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the operative part of that resolution.

By two telegrams dated 7 December, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt (document S/617) and the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon (document S/618) requested that their countries, under article 31, be given the right to participate without a vote in the discussions in the Security Council whenever the question of Palestine was to be under consideration.

At its 222nd meeting on 9 December, the Security Council took note of the above-mentioned letter of the Secretary-General (document S/614) and the resolution of the General Assembly on the Palestinian question and decided to postpone discussion of the matter.

At its 243rd meeting, the Security Council considered the first monthly progress report from the United Nations Palestine Commission (document S/663).

The President of the Council stated that this report was purely factual and for the information of the Council. However, the Commission was preparing a special report which would be available shortly and which would involve questions requiring determination by the Council. He suggested that the Council at this stage only take note of the first monthly progress report and postpone consideration of it until the Council would also have the special report before it.

No objection was raised to the procedure suggested by the President, and it was so decided.

The Security Council at its 253rd, 254th, 255th and 258th meetings considered the first monthly progress report of the United Nations Palestine Commission to the Security Council (document S/663) and the first special report to the Security Council, covering the problem of security in Palestine, submitted by the United Nations Palestine Commission (document S/676). The representatives of Egypt and Lebanon were, in accordance with a previous decision of the Council, invited to participate in the discussion without a vote. The Jewish Agency for Palestine, was, at its request, invited to the Council table for the purpose of supplying such information and rendering such assistance as the Council might require. At the suggestion of the President of the Council, it was agreed to grant the same privilege to the Arab Higher Committee if it so requested.

Draft resolutions were introduced by the representatives of Colombia (document S/684) and the United States of America (document S/685). The representative of Belgium submitted an amendment to the United States draft resolution (document S/688). The representative of Colombia later withdrew his draft resolution. Further consideration of this question was postponed until Tuesday, 2 March 1948.

The Security Council at its 260th, 261st, 262nd and 263rd meetings continued consideration of the first monthly progress report of the United Nations Palestine Commission to the Security Council (document S/663) and the first special report on the problem of security in Palestine submitted by the United Nations Palestine Commission to the Security Council (document S/676).

At the 262nd meeting, the President requested that the representatives of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics consult together in an effort to formulate a mutually acceptable version of the United States draft resolution (document S/685). At the 263rd meeting, the representatives of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reported on the results of their consultation, and the representative of the United States amended his draft resolution accordingly. The representative of Belgium announced that he accepted certain of the changes made in the United States amended resolution and wanted them to be incorporated in the Belgian amendment (document S/688). Thereupon, the Belgian amendment as revised was put to a vote paragraph by paragraph but failed to obtain the required number of affirmative votes and consequently was not carried. The amended resolution of the United States was also voted upon paragraph by paragraph. The preamble, the first part of paragraph 2 and the final paragraph were adopted. The accepted paragraphs of the amended United States resolution were then put to the vote as a whole and adopted by 8 affirmative votes, none against and 3 abstentions (Argentina, Syria and the United Kingdom. For the text of the resolution as finally adopted see document S/691).

At its 267th meeting, the Security Council heard statements by the representatives of Lebanon and Syria. At the 270th meeting, members of the Council who had participated in the consultations of the permanent members reported to the Council on the results of their discussion. At the 271st meeting, the representative of the United States outlined the contents of a proposed resolution which would be submitted at a later date.

Discussion was continued at the 274th, 275th and 277th meetings. At the 277th meeting the draft resolution (document S/704) introduced by the

/representative of

representative of the United States as amended by the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, calling for a truce in Palestine was adopted unanimously. The draft resolution (document S/705) also introduced by the representative of the United States, requesting the Secretary-General to convoke a special session of the General Assembly regarding Palestine, was adopted by 9 votes in favour with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The Secretary-General announced that the special session of the General Assembly called for by the terms of the United States resolution (S/705) would be convoked on 16 April 1948.

Discussion was continued at the 282nd and 283rd meetings. The representative of Colombia introduced a draft resolution containing the terms of a truce in Palestine. The resolution as amended (document S/723) was adopted by a vote of 9 in favour, none against, and 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

At the 287th meeting, the representative of the United States introduced a draft resolution calling for the establishment of a truce commission to supervise the implementation of the resolution adopted by the Council on 17 April (document S/723). The resolution (document S/727) was adopted by a vote of 8 in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (Colombia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

At the 289th meeting, the President informed the Council that a cable had been received from the Jewish Agency (document S/730) concerning the invasion of Palestine by foreign forces, and that information had been requested from the Palestine Truce Commission on this matter. The reply from the Commission and a statement from the Mandatory Powers are contained in document S/733.

At the 291st meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to two cablegrams (documents S/741 and S/742) which had been received from the Truce Commission in Palestine. It was agreed that the President would reply to the cablegram (document S/741) concerning the control of traffic between Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, to the effect that the Truce Commission should use its own discretion as to the employment of the various means of assistance it required, and that whatever resources were available on the spot should be used to implement any agreement between the parties, including such facilities of the International Red Cross as it deemed appropriate.

/At the 292nd meeting,

At the 292nd meeting, the President brought to the attention of the Council a letter and enclosed cablegram which had been received from the Jewish Agency for Palestine (document S/744) and also a cablegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (document S/743) concerning the armed intervention in Palestine of the Government of Egypt.

At the 293rd meeting, the representative of the United States introduced a draft resolution, (document S/749) describing the situation existing in Palestine as a threat to the peace and a breach of the peace, within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter, and ordering a cease-fire within thirty-six hours after the adoption of the resolution. The representative of the United States also submitted a list of questions, which he proposed should be addressed to all of the parties concerned, to obtain additional information.

At the 294th and 295th meetings, the Council considered various additions and amendments to the questionnaire and adopted a final text (document S/753), which was addressed to the parties concerned, with the request for a reply.

At the 296th meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom introduced an amendment (document S/755), to the United States proposal (document S/749).

At the 297th meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to two cablegrams which had been received from the Chairman of the Security Council Truce Commission (documents S/758 and S/759).

At the 299th meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to two additional cablegrams which had been received from the Chairman of the Security Council Truce Commission (documents S/761 and S/762), and announced that Count Folke Bernadotte had been chosen as United Nations Mediator in Palestine.

At the 301st meeting, the representative of the United States announced that Mr. Thomas Wasson, the representative of the United States on the Security Council Truce Commission, had been gravely wounded while returning to his Consulate from a meeting of the Truce Commission (document S/771). The representatives of Egypt, the Jewish Agency, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon submitted their replies to the questionnaire which had been addressed to them by the Council (documents S/766, S/767, S/768, S/769 and S/770). The Foreign Minister of Transjordan replied by cable (document S/770) that his Government did not find it possible to reply to the questions addressed to it.

/At the 302nd meeting

At the 302nd meeting the Council voted on the United States draft resolution (S/749) and the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (document S/755). The vote on the second paragraph of the United States resolution, which described the situation in Palestine as constituting a threat to the peace and a breach of the peace, within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter, was 5 in favour (Colombia, France, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America), none against, and 6 abstentions. The draft resolution as amended was voted upon and adopted by a vote of 8 in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

At the 303rd meeting, the reply of the provisional government of Israel accepting the terms of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 May was received (document S/779). It was agreed, at the request of the Arab States, to extend by forty-eight hours the time-limit imposed by the resolution of 22 May due to communication difficulties which had been encountered by the Governments of these States.

At the 305th meeting, the representative of Iraq, acting on behalf of all the Arab States, submitted the reply (document S/792) to the resolution adopted by the Council on 22 May.

At the 306th meeting, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft proposal, subsequently revised, which, considering that the Security Council resolution of 22 May had not been carried out, in view of the refusal of the Arab States to comply with it, and that military operations in Palestine were increasing, and that as a result of this the situation in Palestine constituted a threat to peace and security within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter, ordered the States involved in the present conflict in Palestine to secure the cessation of military operations within thirty-six hours after the adoption of the resolution (document S/794/Rev.2). The representative of the United Kingdom also submitted a draft resolution (document S/795/Rev.2) calling for a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of four weeks, during which time the United Nations Mediator would make contact with the parties, with a view to making recommendations to the Security Council for an eventual settlement in Palestine.

At the 308th meeting, the representative of France introduced a draft resolution calling for the cessation of hostilities in the City of Jerusalem (document S/798/Rev.2).

/At the 310th meeting

At the 310th meeting, the Council voted on two proposals before it. The first part of the first paragraph of the revised proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (document S/794/Rev.2) was rejected by a vote of 5 in favour (Belgium, France, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America), none against, and 6 abstentions. The second part of the first paragraph was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), none against, and 9 abstentions. The remaining four paragraphs were rejected by a vote of 5 in favour (Colombia, France, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America), none against, and 6 abstentions. The draft resolution of the United Kingdom (document S/795/Rev.2) as amended by the United States, France and Canada, was voted upon paragraph by paragraph and adopted (document S/801). The representative of France then announced that he would not insist on a vote being taken on the French proposal (document S/798/Rev.2).

At the 311th meeting, the President drew to the attention of the Council the replies of the parties to the resolution adopted by the Council on 29 May. The President declared that the acceptance of the parties was to be considered as being unconditional; and it was agreed that the time-limit for the actual cessation of hostilities should be fixed by the United Nations Mediator, that this time-limit should be as short as possible, and that all parties concerned should comply with the instructions of the Mediator in these respects.

At the 313th meeting, it was agreed that the Mediator should be given full authority to interpret the text of the resolution of 29 May in such a manner as he deemed appropriate, that if the interpretation was challenged the matter would then be submitted to the Security Council for further consideration, that he should act in accordance with previous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and that no further instructions should be given him unless the Council decided otherwise.

At the 314th meeting, the President informed the Council of his consultation with the Mediator regarding the interpretation of the Council's resolution of 29 May 1948 (document S/801).

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requested that the Security Council clarify the method by which military observers were to be sent and assigned to the Mediator and the Truce Commission for the supervision of the cease fire and truce agreement.

/At the 317th meeting

At the 317th meeting, the President drew to the attention of the Council two communications (documents S/830 and S/831) from the Mediator concerning the acceptance by the parties of a truce in Palestine. Discussion was then resumed with regard to the implementation of that part of the Council's resolution of 29 May where it was decided that military observers would be sent to Palestine to assist the Mediator and the Truce Commission.

Discussion was continued at the 320th meeting. It was agreed that all communications from interested parties should be submitted to the Mediator and that he should exercise the discretion of reporting to the Security Council such complaints and their disposition as he deemed appropriate. It was understood that this procedure would not preclude the parties from addressing any communications directly to the Council should they consider it necessary. It was also agreed to request Member States to report on steps taken in the implementation of the resolution of 29 May and to call to their attention as well as to that of non-member States from which substantial immigration to Palestine or to the Arab States might emanate, paragraph six of the Truce Proposals, and to request them to extend co-operation and assistance to the Mediator in the implementation of the provisions of the Truce Agreement.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft resolution (document S/841) providing for the appointment of military observers by Member States of the Security Council wishing to participate in the designation of such observers, excluding Syria, and limiting their number to an amount not exceeding fifty persons. This resolution was voted upon and rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and 9 abstentions.

Discussion was continued at the 330th, 331st and 332nd meetings. At the 331st meeting the Council voted on the draft resolution, (document S/867) submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom, appealing to the parties to accept a prolongation of the truce. The resolution was adopted (document S/875) by a vote of 8 in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

At the 332nd meeting the President drew the following documents to the attention of the Council:

1. The reply (document S/871) of the Provisional Government of Israel to the resolution concerning the prolongation of the truce (document S/875) adopted at the 331st meeting of the Council.
2. Cablegram dated 8 July from the United Nations Mediator to the

/Secretary-General

Secretary-General concerning the reply of the Provisional Government of Israel accepting the proposal of the Mediator for the prolongation of the truce (document S/872).

3. Cablegram dated 8 July from the United Nations Mediator containing his statement on Arab and Jewish replies to his proposal for the prolongation of the truce (document S/873).

It was agreed that the President should send a cablegram to the Arab States requesting immediate information regarding the actual situation in Palestine and in particular their attitude towards the observance and prolongation of the truce.

At the 333rd meeting the United Nations Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, presented an oral report to the Council supplementing his previously submitted written report (document S/888) on the situation in Palestine.

At the 334th meeting the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution (document S/890) describing the situation in Palestine as a threat to the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter, and ordering the governments and authorities concerned, pursuant to article 40 of the Charter, to desist from further military action, and to issue cease-fire order to their forces to this effect. The representative of the United Kingdom then submitted two amendments to the United States draft resolution which are contained in document S/895. The representative of Syria also introduced a draft resolution (document S/894) requesting the International Court of Justice to give an advisory legal opinion as to the international status of Palestine after the termination of the mandate.

At the 336th meeting the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted an amendment (document S/896) to paragraph 7 of the United States draft resolution, proposing that both parties immediately withdraw their armed forces from Jerusalem. The representative of China also submitted an amendment (document S/897) augmenting the United States draft resolution, by calling upon both parties to seek, in co-operation with the Mediator, a solution through mutual concessions, both in regard to the political organization of Palestine, and in regard to immigration.

At the 337th meeting the representative of Argentina requested that in voting on the United States draft resolution the phrase, "pursuant to Article 40 of the Charter", in paragraphs 3 and 5 of the draft resolution be voted upon separately.

At the 338th meeting the representative of Syria introduced an amendment (document S/901) to the United States draft resolution which

/deleted the

deleted the entire first paragraph and substituted the following: "taking into consideration the report of the United Nations Mediator dated 12 July 1948, (document S/888)". The representative of Canada submitted an amendment to paragraph 3 of the United States draft resolution replacing the last three lines by the following: "to take effect at such early date as the Mediator, taking into account his responsibilities for supervising the observation of the truce, may determine and notify to the respective parties". The Secretary-General submitted two additional paragraphs to the United States draft resolution requesting the Secretary-General to provide the Mediator with the necessary staff and facilities to assist in carrying out the functions assigned the Mediator and to make appropriate arrangements for the provisions of the necessary funds to meet the obligations arising from the resolution. The representative of the United States submitted an alternative text for the Chinese amendment (document S/897) which was accepted by the representative of China. The Council then voted upon the various draft resolutions and amendments under consideration. The Syrian amendment (document S/901) was rejected by a vote of 4 in favour (Argentina, Belgium, China and Syria), none against and 7 abstentions. The first United Kingdom amendment (document S/895) was rejected by a vote of 3 in favour (Belgium, Colombia and the United Kingdom), one against (Syria) and 7 abstentions. The Canadian amendment was rejected by a vote of 5 in favour (Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China and Colombia), none against and 6 abstentions. The United States alternative text for the Chinese amendment was adopted by a vote of 9 in favour and 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). In compliance with the Argentine request the phrase "pursuant to Article 40 of the Charter" was voted upon separately and maintained in the text of paragraph 3 and deleted from the text of paragraph 5. The amendment submitted by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (document S/896) was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), one against (Syria) and 8 abstentions. The two additional paragraphs submitted by the Secretary-General were adopted by a vote of 8 in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The United States draft resolution as amended was adopted by a vote of 7 in favour, one against (Syria) and 3 abstentions (Argentina, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). It was decided

/to postpone

to postpone consideration of the Syrian draft resolution (document S/894) until a future meeting of the Council.

At the 339th meeting discussion was continued on the Syrian draft resolution (document S/894) requesting the International Court of Justice to give an advisory legal opinion as to the international status of Palestine arising from the termination of the mandate. The representative of Colombia submitted an amendment (document S/921) which specified that the request should not delay or impair the normal course of mediation.

At the 340th meeting the draft resolution, as amended, was voted upon, and failing to obtain the necessary 7 affirmative votes, was rejected by a vote of 6 in favour, 1 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and 4 abstentions (Canada, France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States). At the same meeting the representative of the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (document S/923) designed to support the demand of the Palestine Truce Commission for the release of five employees of the Jerusalem Electric Corporation who had been abducted by the Irgun Zvai Leumi, and called for their surrender to the Truce Commission in Jerusalem.

Discussion was continued at the 343rd meeting. It was decided to request the Mediator and the governments and the authorities concerned to supply the Council with information regarding the following questions:

1. The question of Jewish displaced persons in Europe;
2. The question of Arab refugees in Palestine and neighbouring countries;
3. The question of relief and assistance to both Arab refugees and Jewish displaced persons;
4. The question of Jewish refugees detained on Cyprus.

By cablegram dated 12 August 1948 (document S/963) the United Nations Mediator informed the Security Council that the pumping station at Latrun had been completely destroyed by demolition charges during the night of 11-12 August.

At the 349th meeting the Council decided to send a cablegram to the United Nations Mediator requesting him to make all efforts and to take steps to ensure the water supply for the population of Jerusalem.

By cablegram dated 18 August 1948 (document S/977) the Mediator informed the Security Council that a further deterioration of the situation in Jerusalem might lead to a general resumption of hostilities and he, therefore, requested that the Council take prompt action with a view to giving effect to its resolution of 15 July. At the 354th meeting,

/in response

in response to this request, the representatives of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States jointly submitted a draft resolution concerning violations of the truce which was voted upon paragraph by paragraph and adopted. (S/983)

In connexion with the report of the Mediator regarding the demilitarization of Jerusalem (document S/979), it was decided to send him a cablegram stating that the Council relied on him to make all efforts to achieve speedy results on the matter to which the Security Council attached serious importance.

The Council also decided to transmit the record of its discussion on the question of Palestinian-Arab refugees and Jewish displaced persons to the Economic and Social Council and the International Refugee Organization.

By cablegram dated 17 September (S/1002), Mr. Ralph Bunche, Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, informed the Security Council of the assassination in Jerusalem of Count Folke Bernadotte, United Nations Mediator, and Colonel Serot of the French Air Forces, a United Nations Observer.

At its 358th meeting on 18 September, the Council paid tribute to Count Bernadotte and Colonel Serot and adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary-General to keep the flag of the United Nations at half mast for a period of three days, authorizing the Secretary-General to meet all expenses connected with the death and burial of the United Nations Mediator and resolving to be represented at the interment by its President or the person whom he might appoint for the occasion (S/1006). The Council also approved two cablegrams sent by the Acting Secretary-General on 17 September empowering Mr. Bunche to assume full authority for the Palestine Mission until further notice and requesting General Lundstrom, Chief of Staff of the Mediator, to make the fullest investigation of the circumstances of the shooting (S/1003). It was agreed to send copies of these cablegrams to the Chairman of the Truce Commission together with a request that he and his colleagues give fullest co-operation to Mr. Bunche and to General Lundstrom.

A message dated 17 September addressed by the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General to the Foreign Minister of the Provisional Government of Israel, extracts from the reply dated 19 September and a cablegram dated 17 September from the Foreign Minister of the Provisional Government of Israel to the Secretary-General, all concerning the assassination, were distributed to the members of the Council as documents S/1004, S/1007 and S/1005.

Communications concerning alleged violations of the truce were distributed to the Council as documents S/1013, S/1014, S/1015 and S/1019.

A cablegram from the Acting Mediator in Palestine transmitting a further report on the death of Count Bernadotte and Colonel Serot was distributed to the Council as document S/1018.

Communications from the Acting Mediator in Palestine and from the Truce Commission concerning the truce were distributed to the Council as documents S/1022, S/1023 and S/1024.

A report dated 16 September by the United Nations Mediator on the observance of the truce in Palestine during the period from 11 June to 9 July 1948 was distributed as document S/1025.

At its 365th meeting, on 14 October, the Council considered documents S/1018, S/1022, and S/1023, concerning the assassination of the Mediator and the situation in Palestine in regard to the supervision of the Truce. These documents were amplified in an oral statement by the Acting United Nations Mediator.

A draft resolution was submitted by the representatives of China and the United Kingdom requesting the Provisional Government of Israel to submit, at an early date, on account of the progress made in the investigation of the assassinations and determining certain duties which the Governments and authorities of the parties should carry out pursuant to the Council's resolutions of 15 July and 19 August 1948, (S/1032).

Letters from the League of Arab States and from the French Delegation on the subject of refugees were distributed to the Council as documents S/997/Add.1 and S/1028.

A letter dated 8 October from the representative of the Provisional Government of Israel concerning alleged violations of the Truce by Arab forces was distributed as document S/1030.

A cablegram dated 14 October 1948 from the Chairman of the Truce Commission concerning the violation of the Truce by Arab Forces in Jerusalem was distributed as document S/1034.

At its 367th meeting on 19 October, the Security Council considered the following communications concerning violations of the truce in the Negev area:

- (a) Telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt dated 15 October (S/1038);
- (b) Telegram from the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt dated 16 October (S/1041);

/(c) Report

(c) Report of the Acting Mediator for Palestine, dated 18 October (S/1042).

(d) Letter from the representative of the Provisional Government of Israel, dated 18 October (S/1043).

The Council adopted a resolution (S/1044) endorsing the conclusions of the Acting Mediator's report stating that the indispensable condition to the restoration of the situation was an immediate and effective cease-fire and setting forth conditions which might be considered as the basis for further negotiations, looking toward ensurance that similar outbreaks would not occur again and that the truce would be fully observed in this area.

The Council also adopted the resolution submitted by the representatives of China and the United Kingdom at the previous meeting on this question, as amended by the representative of the USSR, requesting the Provisional Government of Israel to submit, at an early date, an account of the progress made in the investigation of the assassination of the United Nations Mediator, Count Bernadotte, and the United Nations Observer, Colonel Serot, and determining certain duties which the Governments and authorities of the parties should carry out pursuant to the Council's resolution of 15 July and 19 August 1948 (S/1045).

The following communications from the Chairman of the Truce Commission were distributed to the Council:

(a) Telegram dated 16 October concerning violation of the truce by Arab forces in Jerusalem (S/1039).

(b) Telegram dated 16 October concerning violation of the Holy Places by Jewish and Arab forces in Jerusalem (S/1040).

(c) Letter dated 9 October transmitting copies of communications exchanged between the Truce Commission and the Military Government of the Jewish-controlled area of Jerusalem.

By letter dated 23 October (S/1049), the Acting Mediator informed the Council of the replies of the Egyptian Government and of the Provisional Government of Israel to the Security Council resolution of 19 October 1948 and to his subsequent communication fixing the time for a simultaneous cease-fire in the Negeb at 12 noon, 22 October 1948.

At its 373rd meeting on 26 October the Council began consideration of the following documents:

(a) Letter dated 23 October 1948 from the permanent representative of Egypt to the United Nations concerning alleged violations of the truce by Jewish forces and requesting an emergency meeting of the Security Council (S/1052).

/(b) Letter

(b) Letter dated 25 October 1948 from the Acting Mediator transmitting communications from the Government of Egypt and the Provisional Government of Israel concerning convoys to the Negeb settlements (S/1053).

(c) Preliminary report dated 25 October 1948 from the Acting Mediator on observance of the truce in the Negeb and in the Lebanon sector (S/1055).

At the following meeting on 28 October 1948, the delegations of China and the United Kingdom introduced a draft resolution (S/1059) which would endorse the order of the Acting Mediator of 25 October 1948 calling for a withdrawal of military forces to the positions occupied on 14 October, and would appoint a Committee of the Council to examine, urgently and report on the measures which it would be appropriate to take under article 41 of the Charter, if either party or both should refuse to comply with the order of the Acting Mediator. During this and the following meeting on 29 October, a number of amendments were submitted to this draft resolution (see documents S/1059/Rev.1 and Rev.2, and S/1061); and a Sub-Committee was established to prepare a revised draft resolution in consultation with the Acting Mediator (S/1062).

The following documents concerning the Palestine question were also distributed:

(a) Letter dated 27 October 1948 from the representative of the Provisional Government of Israel transmitting a communication addressed to the Acting Mediator concerning a cease-fire in the Negeb (S/1056);

(b) Letter dated 27 October 1948 from the representative of the Provisional Government of Israel transmitting a letter dated 26 October 1948 from the Foreign Minister of Israel concerning a cease-fire in the Negeb (S/1057);

(c) Note dated 26 October 1948 addressed by the Truce Supervision Headquarters on behalf of the Acting Mediator to the Government of Egypt and the Provisional Government of Israel concerning the cease-fire in the Negeb (S/1058);

(d) Letter dated 28 October 1948 from the representative of the Provisional Government of Israel concerning the willingness of the Provisional Government of Israel to meet the Egyptian Government at any time for the purpose of negotiating all outstanding differences between the two Governments (S/1060).

Sub-Committee 16, established at the 375th meeting on 29 October to prepare a revised draft resolution on the Negeb situation submitted its report on 2 November (S/1064). During the Council's discussion of the report at its 376th and 377th meetings on 4 November, amendments to the draft resolution contained therein were submitted by the representative of the United States of America (S/1067); and the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic submitted a new draft resolution (S/1068).

The United States amendments were adopted and the draft resolution as a whole (S/1070) was then adopted by 9 votes in favour, 1 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) with 1 abstention (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The resolution calls upon the interested Governments, without prejudice to their rights, claims or position with regard to a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine or to the position which the Members of the United Nations may wish to take in the General Assembly on such peaceful adjustment:

"1. To withdraw those of their forces which have advanced beyond the positions held on 14 October, the Acting Mediator being authorized to establish provisional lines beyond which no movement of troops shall take place;

"2. To establish, through negotiations conducted directly between the parties, or failing that, through the intermediaries in the service of the United Nations, permanent truce lines and such neutral or demilitarized zones as may appear advantageous, in order to ensure henceforth the full observance of the truce in that area. Failing an agreement, the permanent lines and neutral zones shall be established by decision of the Acting Mediator; and

"Appoints a Committee of the Council, consisting of the five permanent members together with Belgium and Colombia, to give such advice as the Acting Mediator may require with regard to his responsibilities under this resolution, and in the event that either party or both should fail to comply with sub-paragraphs 1 and 2 of the preceding paragraph of this resolution within whatever time-limits the Acting Mediator may think it desirable to fix, to study as a matter of urgency and to report to the Council on further measures it would be appropriate to take under Chapter VII of the Charter."

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic draft resolution was rejected by 2 votes in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) to 1 against (Syria), with 8 abstentions.

Following upon the discussion of a question from the representative of Lebanon, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution providing for the extension of the scope of the above resolution to the situation in northern Palestine (S/1069). The Council adjourned without taking a decision on the United Kingdom draft resolution.

A cablegram dated 3 November 1948 from the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States concerning alleged truce violations by Jewish forces in Galilee was distributed to the members of the Council as document S/1068.

At the request of the Acting Mediator, the Security Council held its 378th and 379th meetings in private on 9 and 10 November to hear his views on the truce situation in Palestine and to consider the best possibilities for a more permanent arrangement. The Acting Mediator submitted certain suggestions which were put in the form of a draft resolution for purposes of convenience (S/1076). After an exchange of views among the representatives on the Council, during which the USSR representative submitted amendments to the Acting Mediator's draft resolution, the Council decided to resume public meetings for further consideration of this matter.

Committee 17, established by the Council's resolution of 4 November, held three meetings during this period to give advice to the Acting Mediator on his plans for provisional lines of demarcation in the Negev area.

The following communications were distributed to the Council:

- (a) A letter dated 8 November from the representative of the Provisional Government of Israel concerning a previous letter from the Secretary-General of the Arab League (S/1073);
- (b) A letter dated 7 November from the representative of Egypt concerning alleged truce violations by Jewish forces on 5 November (S/1074);
- (c) A letter dated 9 November from the representative of Egypt further to his letter of 8 November (S/1075).

The Council resumed its public discussion on the Palestine question at its 380th and 381st meetings on 15 and 16 November to consider the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom representative at the 377th meeting (S/1069) and the suggestions of the Acting Mediator submitted in the form of a draft resolution at the 378th meeting (S/1076), together with amendments to the latter submitted by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/1077). A new draft resolution was introduced by the Canadian representative supported by the representatives of France and Belgium, calling upon the parties to seek agreement forthwith by negotiations conducted either directly or through the Acting Mediator with a view to the immediate establishment of an armistice (S/1079).

During the discussion, the representative of the United Kingdom withdrew his draft resolution. The suggestions of the Acting Mediator (S/1076), as amended and endorsed by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/1079) were rejected; there were 2 votes in favour (Ukrainian SSR and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), none against, and 9 abstentions. An amendment submitted to the joint draft resolution by the representative of Syria, which would have applied the Council's resolution of 4 November to the Galilee area, was rejected; there were 3 votes in favour, none against and 8 abstentions. The joint draft resolution was adopted by paragraphs with 8 votes in favour and with the representatives of the Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Syria abstaining, except on the fourth and fifth paragraphs, which the representative of Syria voted against. The resolution, as adopted, is contained in document S/1080.

The following communications were distributed to the Council:

- (a) A letter dated 19 November from the representative of the Provisional Government of Israel transmitting observations on the resolutions of the Security Council of 4 and 16 November (S/1081).
- (b) A letter dated 9 November from the Truce Commission transmitting correspondence exchanged between the President of the Commission and the Jewish Military Governor of Jerusalem (S/1082).

At the request of the Acting Mediator, Committee 17, established by the Council's resolution of 4 November, met on 26 November to consult further with the Acting Mediator on the implementation of the Council's resolution of 4 November.

The following communications were distributed to the Council:

- (a) A letter dated 20 November 1948 from the Acting Mediator, transmitting a cablegram from Cairo concerning arrangements for provisional demarcation lines in the Negeb (S/1086).
- (b) A letter dated 22 November from the representative of Egypt concerning an alleged violation of the truce by Jewish forces (see S/1088).

In letters dated 1 December 1948 (S/1095 and S/1096) the Permanent Representative of Egypt and the Chairman of the Lebanon Delegation requested that the question of the implementation of the Council's resolution of 4 November 1948 be placed on the agenda of the Council's 383rd meeting to be held on 2 December. These letters were discussed at that meeting, and the proposal for the inclusion of this item was not adopted.

The following documents concerning this question were distributed to the Security Council:

/(a) Cablegram

- (a) Cablegram dated 26 November 1948 from the Acting Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia concerning the resolution of the Security Council of 16 November (S/1092);
- (b) Letter dated 1 December 1948 from the Acting Mediator transmitting a communication from the Syrian Government concerning the Security Council resolution of 16 November (S/1097);
- (c) Letter dated 29 November 1948 from the Acting Mediator transmitting report on a truce violation by Jewish forces on 23 September 1948 (S/1098);
- (d) Letter dated 30 November 1948 from the Acting Mediator transmitting report concerning the deaths of United Nations observers (S/1099);
- (e) Letter dated 29 November 1948 from the Acting Mediator transmitting a final report on the truce violation by Arab forces on 22 September 1948 (S/1101);
- (f) Letter dated 3 December 1948 from the representative of Egypt requesting a convocation of the Security Council (S/1103).

On 8 December the Acting Mediator met with Committee 17, established by the Council's resolution of 4 November, and sought further advice on the implementation of the Council's resolution of 4 November.

The following documents relating to this question were distributed to the Council:

- (a) A telegram dated 7 December from the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, concerning the Council's resolutions of 4 and 16 November (S/1111);
- (b) A letter dated 7 December from the Acting Mediator transmitting a communication from the Government of Transjordan concerning the Council's resolution of 16 November (S/1112).

By letter dated 11 December 1948 (S/1123) the Acting Mediator transmitted a communication from the representative of Lebanon, concerning the Council's resolution of 16 November 1948.

By letters dated 17, 23 and 24 December 1948 (S/1126, S/1147 and S/1151) the representative of Egypt reported a series of truce violations by the Jewish forces and requested that the Security Council examine the situation.

On 25 and 27 December 1948, the Acting Mediator transmitted reports (S/1152 and S/1153) concerning the situation in the Negeb.

The Council considered these questions at its 394th, 395th and 396th meetings. The representative of the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (S/1163 and S/1167) and the representative of France submitted amendments thereto (S/1168).

At its 396th meeting on 29 December 1948, the Council voted on the United Kingdom draft resolution and the amendments thereto, paragraph by paragraph. The resolution, as amended (S/1169) was adopted with 8 votes in favour and 3 abstentions (Ukrainian SSR, USSR and USA). The resolution called upon the parties in the Southern Palestine hostilities to order an immediate cease-fire and to implement without further delay the resolution of 4 November and the instructions issued by the Acting Mediator in accordance with paragraph 5 (I) of that resolution. The resolution also instructed the Committee appointed on 4 November to meet on 7 January, to consider the situation in Southern Palestine and to report on compliance with the present resolution and with the resolutions of 4 and 16 November.

By letter dated 6 January 1949 (S/1187) the Acting Mediator informed the President of the Security Council that the Government of Egypt and the Provisional Government of Israel had unconditionally accepted a proposal providing for a cease-fire to be immediately followed by direct negotiations under United Nations Chairmanship on the implementation of the resolutions of 4 and 16 November.

13. The India-Pakistan Question

By letter dated 1 January 1948 (document S/628), the representative of India, under article 35 of the Charter, drew the attention of the Council to the present situation in Jammu and Kashmir and requested the Security Council to ask the Government of Pakistan:

1. To prevent Pakistan Government personnel, military and civil from participating or assisting in the invasion of the Jammu and Kashmir State;
2. To call upon other Pakistan nationals to desist from taking any part in the fighting in the Jammu and Kashmir State;
3. To deny to the invaders:
 - (a) Access to and use of its territory for operations against Kashmir;
 - (b) Military and other supplies;
 - (c) All other kinds of aid that might tend to prolong the present struggle.

The Security Council admitted this question to its agenda at its 226th meeting on 6 January. Representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan were, in pursuance of article 31 of the Charter, invited to participate in the discussion without a vote.

At the request of the representative of Pakistan, the Council postponed further consideration of the question until a meeting to be held not later than 15 January 1948.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General (document S/646), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Pakistan answered to the application to the Security Council made by the representative of India (document S/628).

The Security Council at its 227th, 228th and 229th meetings on 14, 16 and 17 January 1948 heard statements by the representatives of the two parties concerned.

At the 229th meeting, a draft resolution submitted by the representative of Belgium (document S/651) was adopted with 9 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The representative of the United Kingdom then proposed that the President of the Council should meet with the representatives of the two Governments concerned and that, under his guidance, they should try to find some common ground on which the structure of a settlement might be built. This proposal was met with the approval of the parties concerned, and the President expressed his readiness to assist. No objection was voiced to the proposal by any representative on the Security Council. The President then announced that the Council would adjourn until 20 January 1948, at 10.30 a.m. and that, at this meeting, the Council would hear the reports of the representatives of India and Pakistan on the conversations held.

Consideration of this question was continued at the 230th, 231st, 232nd, 234th and 235th meetings. At the 230th meeting, the President reported to the Council on the result of the conversation he had had with the two parties and introduced a draft resolution (document S/654) which had the support of the parties. This resolution was adopted at the same meeting by the Council with 9 affirmative votes and 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

By letter dated 20 January (document S/655) the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested that the Security Council, at as early a date as possible, consider the situations (other than the Kashmir and

/Jammu

Jammu situation) mentioned in his previous letter (document S/646 and Corr.1). This letter was included in the provisional agenda of the 231st meeting of the Security Council. The Council, at this meeting, decided to describe the question under consideration. "The India-Pakistan question". The Security Council heard additional statements by the representatives of India and Pakistan at the 232nd, 234th and 235th meetings.

The Council decided to adjourn further consideration of this question until 27 January, the President's conversations with the parties to continue in the meantime.

The question was further considered at the 236th, 237th, 238th, 239th, 240th, 241st and 242nd meetings, and the President reported on his continuing conversations with the parties. At the 237th meeting, the representative of Belgium introduced two draft resolutions (documents S/661 and S/662). At the 239th meeting, the representative of India introduced two proposals.

Further consideration of the question was postponed until 10 February 1948, the conversations between the President and the two parties to be continued in the meantime.

Discussion continued at the 243rd, 244th, 245th and 246th meetings. At the 246th meeting, the Council concurred with a request of the representative of India to postpone indefinitely the consideration of the situation in Jammu and Kashmir (document S/628) in order to give the representative of India an opportunity to return to India for consultation with his Government. The representative of India was urged to be at the disposal of the Council for continuation of the consideration of this question at as early a date as possible; and the Council reserved its right to take up the Jammu and Kashmir question again at its discretion before the return of the Indian representative. Consideration of aspects of the India-Pakistan question other than those relating to the situation in Jammu and Kashmir would be resumed on Wednesday, 18 February 1948.

At its 250th and 257th meetings, the Security Council considered aspects of the India-Pakistan question other than those relating to the situation in Jammu and Kashmir.

Discussion was continued at the 264th, 265th and 269th meetings. The representative of China introduced a draft resolution (document S/699) which resulted from his consultations with the delegations of India and Pakistan. At the 284th, 285th and 286th meetings, the Council considered

a revised draft resolution submitted jointly by the representatives of Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, (document S/726) outlining the terms of a general settlement of the dispute. At the 286th meeting, this resolution was voted on paragraph by paragraph, and adopted. At the 287th meeting, the nomination of Belgium and Colombia, to the Commission provided for in the terms of the resolution (document S/725) was approved by a vote of 7 in favour, none against and 4 abstentions (Belgium, Colombia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). It was agreed that the President of the Security Council should continue to meet with both parties in an effort to find a solution to the question of Junagadh.

Discussion was continued at the 289th and 290th meetings. The President announced that Pakistan had selected Argentina as a member of the Commission established by the resolution of 20 January 1948. Since discussions between the representatives of Argentina and Czechoslovakia had not led to the designation of the remaining member within the specified time limit, the President designated the United States of America to complete the membership of the Commission. The representative of the United States then announced that his Government accepted the responsibility which had been conferred upon it.

At the 312th meeting, the representative of Syria introduced a draft resolution (document S/818) which was adopted, as amended, (document S/819) by a vote of 8 in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (China, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The resolution directed the Commission of Mediation to proceed without delay to the areas of dispute, and to study and report to the Council, when it considered appropriate, on the matters raised in the letter of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan dated 15 January 1948, in the order outlined in paragraph D of the resolution dated 20 January 1948.

At the 315th meeting it was agreed that the President would prepare a reply to the letter (document S/825) from the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government of India.

A resolution for a cease-fire order and truce agreement adopted by the Commission for India and Pakistan on 13 August and the Commission's correspondence with the Indian and Pakistani Governments in relation to this resolution were distributed at the request of the Commission as document S/995.

A cablegram dated 20 September, addressed to the Secretary-General from his Personal Representative with the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan and forwarding the Commission's resolution of 19 September concerning its departure for Europe to prepare an interim report, was distributed as document S/1009.

/At its

At its 382nd meeting on 25 November, the Council discussed an Interim Report from its Commission for India and Pakistan (S/1100) and a letter dated 22 November from the Chairman of the Commission concerning the situation in Kashmir (S/1087).

At the close of the discussion the President stated that it was the sense of the Council that the task of the Commission in bringing about a peaceful settlement of the dispute should receive the confirmed support of the Council; furthermore, the Council should endorse the recent appeal made by the Commission to the Governments of India and Pakistan to refrain from any action which might aggravate the military and political situation and thus endanger the negotiations which were at present being directed towards preparation of a peaceful settlement.

The following documents concerning this question were distributed to the Council:

(a) Letter dated 30 November 1948 from the Chairman of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan enclosing a letter dated 28 November 1948 from the representative of India to the Chairman of the Commission (S/1094),

(b) Letter dated 2 December 1948 from the Secretary-General, Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth relations, Government of India, concerning the India Pakistan question (S/1102),

(c) Letter dated 2 December 1948 from the Chairman of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan enclosing a letter of the same date from the Indian representative to the Chairman of the Committee (S/1104).

By letter dated 2 December 1948, (S/1107) the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations of the Government of Pakistan replied to the letter of the President of the Security Council dated 27 November which had endorsed the recent appeal made by the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan to the Governments of India and Pakistan to refrain from any action which might aggravate the military and political situation and thus endanger the negotiations which were at present being directed towards the achievement of a peaceful settlement.

14. The Czechoslovakian situation

By letter dated 12 March 1948 (document S/694), the permanent representative of Chile to the United Nations requested that, in accordance with article 34 of the Charter, the Security Council "investigate the events reported by the permanent representative of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Jan Papanek, which constitute a threat to international peace and security". At the 268th meeting, this item was admitted to the agenda

/and the

and the representative of Chile invited to participate in the discussion in accordance with article 31 of the Charter. The representative of Chile requested that, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, the Security Council should invite Dr. Jan Papanek to supply it with information.

At the 272nd meeting, at the request of the representative of Argentina, and in accordance with rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, the proposal of the representative of Chile to invite Dr. Jan Papanek to supply the Security Council with information, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, was adopted by a vote of 9 to 2.

Discussion was continued at the 273rd, 276th and 278th meetings. The resolution (document S/711) introduced by the representative of the United States, inviting the Government of Czechoslovakia to participate in the discussion of the Czechoslovakian question, was adopted by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions (the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). In response to this invitation, the Government of Czechoslovakia stated that it did not find it possible to take part in the discussion (document S/713).

At the 281st meeting, the representative of Chile submitted a draft resolution proposing that a sub-committee of the Council be appointed to hear statements and testimony relative to this question, and to submit a report thereon to the Security Council as soon as possible.

Discussion was continued at the 288th meeting, and further consideration postponed until Thursday, 6 May 1948.

At the 300th meeting the proposal to invite Dr. Jan Papanek to supply the Council with additional information was adopted by a vote of 8 in favour, 2 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and 1 abstention (Argentina).

At the 303rd meeting, the Council voted on the question of whether the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Chile was to be regarded as a matter of procedure. The result of the vote was 8 in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention. The President interpreted this decision as a vote to regard the resolution as a matter of substance, since a permanent member (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had voted against the proposal. Several representatives opposed this ruling and the President then submitted it to a vote. Six votes were cast to nullify

/the ruling,

the ruling, two votes were cast to uphold the ruling, and three members abstained. The President announced that his ruling stood. The Chilean resolution, as completed by the representative of Argentina, was then put to the vote and received 9 votes in favour and 2 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Since a permanent member had voted in the negative, it was rejected.

At the 305th meeting, the representative of Argentina submitted a draft resolution (document S/782) proposing that the Committee of Experts be entrusted with the task of obtaining further evidence regarding the situation and report back to the Security Council at the earliest opportunity.

15. Third report of the Atomic Energy Commission

By letter dated 26 May 1948 (documents S/812 and AEC/31), the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted the third report of the Commission to the Security Council which was considered at the 318th meeting.

The representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution accepting the first, second and third reports of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, approving the general findings and recommendations of the first report, the specific proposals of Part II of the second report, the "Report and recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission" of the third report, and directing the Secretary-General to transmit to the General Assembly, and to the Member nations of the United Nations, the first, second, and third reports of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the record of the Security Council's approval thereof.

Discussion was continued at the 321st meeting.

At the 325th meeting the Council voted on the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the United States (document S/836). The result of the vote was 9 in favour and 2 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), but since a permanent member of the Council voted in the negative it was not adopted.

The representative of Canada then introduced a draft resolution (document S/831) directing the Secretary-General to transmit to the General Assembly the first, second, and third reports of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the record of the Security Council deliberations on the subject.

The President declared that he considered the draft resolution to be a procedural matter, with the understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission remained seized of the question of the control of atomic energy.

The resolution was put to the vote and adopted (document S/852) by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

16. The question of the Free Territory of Trieste

By letter dated 29 July 1948, (document S/927), the representative of Yugoslavia requested the Security Council to consider the question of the independence and integrity of the Free Territory of Trieste, and in particular to examine the legality of certain agreements concluded by the administration of the British-United States Zone of the Free Territory of Trieste with the Government of Italy. He further requested the Council to declare the above-mentioned agreements, violations of those provisions of the Treaty of Peace with Italy which pertain to the Free Territory of Trieste, to undertake the measures it considered necessary and sufficient to nullify these agreements, and to assure the respect of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom of their international obligations, thus guaranteeing the independence of the Free Territory of Trieste.

At the 344th meeting the Council, after having admitted this question to the agenda, invited the representative of Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion, and began its consideration of the matter.

Discussion was continued at the 345th, 346th and 348th meetings.

At the 348th meeting the representative of Yugoslavia submitted a draft resolution (document S/968) by which the Council would determine that a series of agreements concluded between the Allied Military Command and the Government of Italy were in contradiction to certain obligations undertaken by the Allied and Associated Powers and Italy under the Treaty of Peace with Italy, declared these agreements incompatible with the status of the Free Territory of Trieste and therefore rendered them null and void, and called upon the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States to avoid any action in the future which was contrary to the Treaty of Peace with Italy.

Discussion was continued at the 350th, 353rd and the 354th meetings.

At the 353rd meeting the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic submitted a draft resolution to the effect that the Security Council considered it urgently necessary to settle the question of the appointment of the Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste (document S/980).

/At the

At the 354th meeting the Council voted on the proposals before it. The Yugoslav draft resolution (document S/968) was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), none against and 9 abstentions. The Ukrainian draft resolution (document S/980) was also rejected by a vote of 4 in favour (China, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), none against and 6 abstentions, with the United Kingdom delegation not participating in the vote.

By memorandum dated 24 October 1948, the Government of the Peoples Federal Republic of Yugoslavia drew the Security Council's attention to fresh violations of the provisions of the Peace Treaty with Italy committed by the Allied Military Administration of the Anglo-American zone of the free territory of Trieste (S/1054).

A letter dated 1 November 1948 from the permanent representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations transmitting the annual report of the Yugoslav Army Military Government on the administration of the Yugoslav Zone of the Free Territory of Trieste was distributed to the members of the Council as document S/1066.

17. The Hyderabad question

On 21 August the Secretary of the Government of the Nizam of Hyderabad and Berar in the Department of External Affairs addressed a letter and cablegram to the President of the Security Council stating that the Government of Hyderabad, in reliance on Article 35(2) of the Charter of the United Nations, requested the President to bring to the attention of the Security Council the grave dispute which had arisen between Hyderabad and India (S/986).

By cablegram dated 12 September addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Secretary to the Government of the Nizam of Hyderabad the Government of Hyderabad requested that its complaint against India be put on the agenda of the Security Council at the earliest possible date in view of the officially proclaimed intention of India, as announced by its Prime Minister, to invade Hyderabad and in view of the active preparations for imminent invasion (S/998). A further cablegram of 13 September stated that the invasion was taking place and that hostilities had broken out in various parts of Hyderabad (S/1000).

These communications were placed on the provisional agenda of the 357th meeting of the Council on 16 September and, the Council admitted them to its agenda with the reservation that this action did not decide or affect in any way the question of the Security Council's competence in this matter. After hearing the views of the representative of India the Security Council

/adjourned

adjourned discussion of this question until 20 September.

At the 359th meeting on 20 September, the representative of Hyderabad said that he had no instructions directly emanating from the Nizam although reports from the press indicated that the Nizam had ordered the cessation of hostilities and the news had been circulated that he had given instructions to the Hyderabad delegation to press its complaint. He was of the opinion that the situation was confused and that the Council might find it convenient to postpone the discussion for a few days. After discussing this new situation briefly the Council adjourned consideration of this question until a date to be later determined.

By communications dated 22 September (S/1011), the Nizam of Hyderabad requested the Secretary-General to note that the complaint made by his Government to the Security Council had been withdrawn by him and that the delegation to the Security Council had ceased to have any authority to represent him or his State.

By note dated 24 September (S/1015), the Hyderabad delegation gave its views on the situation in Hyderabad and stated that it was imperative that a meeting of the Security Council be called to review the situation.

These communications were considered at the 360th meeting of the Council on 28 September. After some discussion, the Council agreed to allow the representative of Hyderabad to participate, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, in the discussion in the Security Council on the question of the validity of his credentials. The representative of India was also invited to participate in this discussion. After hearing the views of the parties, the Council adjourned.

By letter dated 6 October 1948 (S/1027) the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested that Pakistan be permitted to participate in the discussion of the Hyderabad question when it was resumed.

By letter dated 11 October the Head of the Hyderabad delegation informed the President of the Security Council that he did not propose to ask for the delegation to be represented at the next meeting of the Council which might be convened for the purpose of considering the question of Hyderabad (S/1031).

By letter dated 20 November (S/1084) the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested the Security Council to deal with the Hyderabad-India case at a very early date.

This question was placed on the provisional agenda for the 382nd meeting on 25 November. Subsequently, the leader of the Indian delegation informed the President of the Security Council that the Indian delegation dealing with the Hyderabad question had been withdrawn (S/1089). At the 382nd meeting the Council postponed discussion of this question to its next meeting.

/At the 383rd meeting

At the 383rd meeting on 2 December 1948, the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Security Council Affairs informed the Council, in reply to questions from the representative of Syria, that the Secretariat still had no information from the Indian delegation that it had a duly qualified representative to participate in the discussion of this question.

By letter dated 6 December 1948 (S/1109) the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations of Pakistan requested that a meeting of the Security Council might be called at as early a date as might be convenient to enable it to deal with this question before it adjourned for Christmas.

By letter dated 10 December 1948 (S/1115), the Government of India informed the Security Council that conditions in Hyderabad were peaceful and normal. In the circumstances, it did not propose to send a representative to the Security Council to discuss the Hyderabad question.

In a letter dated 12 December 1948 (S/1118), the head of the Hyderabad delegation stated that it was clear that the Nizam was virtually a prisoner of the Indian military authorities. Under the circumstances, his delegation considered it their duty to reassert their authority as originally appointed.

By letter dated 13 December 1948 (S/1124), the representative of India transmitted a report on the situation in Hyderabad.

The Hyderabad Question was placed on the agenda of the Council at its 384th meeting on 15 December 1948 at which the representative of Pakistan was invited to participate in the discussion. Further consideration of this question was postponed until the Council met at Lake Success.

18. Conditions under which a State which is a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice but is not a Member of the United Nations may participate in electing the members of the Court

By letter dated 2 August to the President of the Security Council, the Acting Secretary-General informed the Council that Switzerland had become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice (S/347). He further drew attention, in this connexion, to article 4, paragraph 3, of the Statute of the International Court relating to the conditions on which parties to the Statute which are not Members of the United Nations might participate in electing the members of the Court, and to article 69 of the Statute concerning the participation of such States in the procedure for making amendments to the Statute.

By letter dated 12 August 1948 (S/969), the representative of Belgium requested that the question of participation in electing the members of the Court be included in the provisional agenda of one of the next meetings of the Security Council in order that the Council might take its decision in time to make it possible for Switzerland usefully to exercise its right to
/participate

participate in the elections which would be held during the third session of the Assembly. In his letter, the representative of Belgium submitted a draft resolution.

At the 360th meeting on 28 September, the Council approved this draft resolution and is, therefore, no longer seized of this question.

19. Identic notifications of the Governments of the French Republic, the United States of America and the United Kingdom to the Secretary-General dated 29 September 1948

On 29 September 1948 the Secretary-General received identic notifications from the Governments of the French Republic, the United States and the United Kingdom drawing attention to the serious situation which had arisen as a result of the unilateral imposition by the Government of the USSR of restrictions on transport and communications between the Western Zones of Occupation in Germany and Berlin. The notifications stated that this action by the Soviet Government was contrary to its obligations under Article 2 of the Charter and created a threat to the peace within the meaning of Chapter 7 of the Charter. The three Governments requested that the Security Council consider this question at the earliest opportunity.

The identic notifications were placed on the provisional agenda of the 361st meeting of the Council on 4 October but the adoption of the agenda was opposed by the representatives of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR. After further discussion at the 362nd meeting on 5 October the agenda was adopted by nine votes to two, whereupon the representatives of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR stated that the adoption by the majority of this item for consideration constituted a violation of Article 107 of the Charter and accordingly their delegations would not participate in the consideration of this question in the Security Council.

The Council commenced discussion of this item at the 363rd meeting on 6 October and continued at the 364th meeting on the same date.

The Council further considered these notifications at its 366th meeting on 15 October. The President requested certain additional information and the Council adjourned until 19 October to allow an opportunity for the representatives concerned to prepare this information.

At its 368th meeting on 19 October, the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America furnished the information which had been requested by the President at the previous meeting on this question.

At the 370th meeting a draft resolution was submitted by the representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia and Syria (S/1048), and the Council adjourned until 25 October.

/At the Council's

At the Council's 372nd meeting on 25 October, the draft resolution submitted by the representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, and Syria (S/1048) was put to the vote, receiving 9 votes in favour and 2 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Since one of the negative votes was cast by a permanent member of the Security Council, the draft resolution was rejected.
