

security". The letter of Dr. Papanek, to which the Chilean note referred, stated that the political independence of Czechoslovakia had been violated by the threat of the use of force by the Soviet Union. Dr. Papanek's letter went on to say that a minority in his country, encouraged and given promise of help by the Soviet Union, had usurped power by eliminating the constitutional system of government in Czechoslovakia, and had trampled under the civil liberties established by the Constitution. Dr. Papanek's letter stated that the coup in Czechoslovakia, by which this minority had seized power, had been successful only through the official participation of representatives of the Soviet Union and by the threat of the use of military force by the U.S.S.R. on the northwest boundaries of Czechoslovakia.

39. By a vote of 9 in favour and 2 against, the Security Council agreed to place the Czechoslovak situation on its agenda and then subsequently agreed, by the same vote, to hear Dr. Papanek state his case. After discussion had taken place in the Council, during the course of several meetings, the Chilean representative introduced a draft resolution proposing that a sub-committee of the Council be appointed to hear statements and testimony relevant to this question and to submit a report thereon to the Security Council as soon as possible. While the majority of the Council favoured this Chilean proposal for a sub-committee, it was not adopted in view of the veto exercised by the Soviet representative.

40. The position of the Canadian Government on this very serious question was stated in the Security Council on March 31, 1948. The Canadian representative then said that the events in Czechoslovakia paralleled early developments in other European states too closely to be dismissed as pure coincidence. He added that in view of the seriousness of the allegations it was essential that the facts in the situation be ascertained. If it was true that a minority group, linked with an outside power, was able to overthrow its political opponents and deprive the majority of the people of their political liberties, this was not only dangerous to democracy but also created a threat to international peace. In the Canadian view it was essential that the Council should press forward its enquiries into the Czechoslovak situation and that to this end it should receive testimony from first-hand witnesses to these events.

41. At a later stage, when the Chilean proposal for a sub-committee came up for discussion in the Council, the Canadian delegation supported this proposal on the ground that it was essential for the Council to have access to all relevant facts; and that the establishment of such a sub-committee did not prejudice the Council's decision in this matter but merely gave the Council an opportunity to obtain the facts necessary for taking such a decision. The majority of members of the Council expressed a similar point of view and the Chilean proposal received 9 votes in favour and 2 against. The proposal was not adopted due to the veto of the Soviet representative, although the majority of members of the Council, including Canada, had held that this was a purely procedural question and hence not subject to the veto. The President of the Council upheld the right of the Soviet representative to exercise his double veto in this matter (i.e. to veto the preliminary question as to whether the Chilean proposal was procedural or substantive). Accordingly the Security Council has been placed in the strange position of being unable to establish a sub-committee to hear evidence concerning very serious allegations made against the Soviet Union, due to the fact that the representative of the very state against which these allegations were