

After the rejection of all sections of the *Soviet* resolution advocating direct United Nations trusteeship for all territories, a proposal submitted by *Pakistan* to the effect that a special committee of seven should be appointed to ascertain all the relevant facts relating to the colonies, including written or oral testimony from the administering authorities, from representatives of the populations and their Governments, and other organizations and individuals for the purpose of reporting by 1 September, 1949, was rejected by 21 votes in favour (N.Z.), 28 against, and 9 abstentions. A later resolution submitted jointly by *Cuba*, *Uruguay*, and *Costa Rica* proposing that the problem be submitted to the Interim Committee for consideration before the Fourth Assembly was opposed by the *United Kingdom* representative on the grounds that such a procedure would create disturbances within the territories which the present administering authorities would find it difficult to control, and was finally rejected by 27 votes (N.Z.) to 21 with 11 abstentions. The General Assembly then accepted a *Polish* resolution proposing postponement of further consideration of the problem until the fourth session.

Implementation of Assembly Resolution on Franco Spain

The differences of opinion which had been expressed at the 1947 General Assembly concerning the justification for and the effectiveness of the resolution on Franco Spain of December, 1946, were once again revealed in the discussion of two proposals—one submitted jointly by *Colombia*, *Peru*, *Bolivia*, and *Brazil*, which aimed at allowing members of the United Nations freedom of action in the conduct of their diplomatic relations with Spain, the other, submitted by *Poland*, which called for an intensification of United Nations pressure on Spain.

The case of the four South American States had its most insistent and eloquent advocate in Dr. Belaunde of *Peru*. In the first place Dr. Belaunde maintained that the United Nations resolution of 1946 was a "mistake" since it represented an interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State and conflicted with the principle of self-determination which the South American States held so dear. Moreover the members of the United Nations had not only failed from the outset to apply the 1946 resolution unanimously but had in the 1947 Assembly failed to reaffirm the resolution by the necessary two-thirds majority. Thus in fact, Dr. Belaunde claimed, the resolution had been nullified and member States had been left free to restore Ambassadors to Spain if they so desired. Since many States had in fact done this it was necessary that the United Nations should now take steps to regularize the position. At present confusion concerning the validity of the 1946 resolution was preventing certain States who desired to restore Ambassadors from actually doing so and was having the unfortunate practical result of prejudicing their economic relations with Spain.