

decision of the Assembly recommending the Security Council to reconsider the particular cases in question. In the absence of such an assurance, the Canadian Delegation considers that it would be futile to go through the process once again of expressing opinions on the eligibility of various applicants and unless the discussion brings out more points which we have missed in our consideration of the matter, we would be disposed to abstain from voting.

With regard to the proposal of the Belgian Delegation for reference of certain points of law to the court, we should be disposed to support that resolution.

**AGREEMENT ON PALESTINE:** Due largely to Canadian efforts, the United States and U.S.S.R. reached agreement on a proposed plan for the partition of Palestine. The plan was worked out on the basis of a Soviet compromise which came, after the Canadian delegation, in a series of talks had advanced concrete suggestions.

The plan would provide:

1. Termination of the British mandate for Palestine and withdrawal of all British armed forces by May 1, 1948.
2. Independence of Arab and Jewish countries to come into existence July 1, or at an earlier date subsequent to May 1 as a U.N. Assembly commission for Palestine recommends and as the 11-power Security Council approves as desirable and practicable.
3. Creation of a commission by the Assembly to be composed of from three to five representatives of small countries. (Russia suggested they be countries which vote for partition.)
4. Functions of the commission will be to implement measures recommended by the General Assembly.
5. The Commission shall assist Britain as the mandatory power until the termination of the mandate.
6. The commission will be responsible for the administration of Palestine during the period, if any, between the end of the mandate and the independence of the Arab and Jewish countries.
7. The commission shall act under the authority and guidance of the Security Council. The commission shall be guided in its activities by recommendations of the General Assembly, and by such special instructions and within the purview of Assembly recommendations as the Security Council may consider necessary to issue.

**SANCTIONS AGAINST FRANCO:** In the Political Committee, Nov. 11, the Canadian Delegation opposed a Polish resolution that members of the United Nations take all possible economic steps -- short of actual war -- to force the fall of the Franco regime in Spain.

Speaking on the resolution, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Ilsley said: I should like to say a few words in explanation of the vote

that the delegation of Canada proposes to pass on these resolutions that are before the Committee.

We feel that we will have to vote in opposition to the resolution of Poland. If we were to select speeches that come closest to representing our point of view, they would be the speeches by the representatives of Pakistan and the Netherlands made this morning.

Briefly stated, the reasons why we feel that we must oppose the Polish resolution are:

First, because nothing in the way of effective sanctions can flow from it. The Security Council cannot apply Article 41 without first determining that there is a threat to the peace under Article 39, and there is no serious allegation of a threat to the peace. It would be very doubtful if any such allegation could be proved if it were made.

Therefore we feel that the resolution, if passed, would be entirely ineffective and could not properly be acted upon. It would be a futile gesture by the United Nations, much as if we were making a face at Franco, making a face across the Atlantic at him. We do not think it is likely that a step of that kind would add to the dignity or the prestige of the United Nations, and we think that it would go some distance in discrediting the United Nations. That is our first reason.

Our second reason for voting against that resolution is because the passing of such a resolution would, we think, be helpful rather than harmful to the Franco regime. We do not want to help Franco in any way. Last year we expressed our abhorrence of the Franco regime. The words which our representative used were these:

"We abhor the records and the present policies of the Franco dictatorship.

"We earnestly hope that the Spanish people may be able to rid themselves of Franco by peaceful means and establish a democratic, responsible and enlightened administration.

"We are not prepared to support at this time outside intervention in Spain which might impede European recovery, or revive in Spain the horrors and sufferings of civil war."

Our delegation sees no reason to change its position as stated last year.

The Canadian people and government do not favour authoritarian or totalitarian government, whatever may be its political complexion. If we are to spend our time in passing ineffective resolutions, we are afraid that they would simply cause the Spanish people to rally to the support of Franco, instead of bringing the Franco regime into disrepute. That is the reason why we think passing a resolution of this kind would help him rather than hurt him.

Our third reason is that last year we voted against this provision of last year's resolutions with respect to specialized agencies. We did not think it was wise to pass that part of the resolution, and we still are of that opinion. We would not like to vote for a reaffirma-

tion of last year's resolution for that reason. While we abstained in the vote last year, we feel that the reasons, under the present circumstances, for opposing the resolution are so strong that we should vote against it this year.

#### HOW THE VOTING STOOD

An eleven-nation sub-committee of the Political Committee met in the morning of Nov. 12 to draft three resolutions and two amendments on Spain into a common text. The sub-committee had before it a joint resolution submitted by Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama and Uruguay, as revised; a joint resolution from Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands; an amendment to this resolution by India; the Polish resolution and an amendment by Yugoslavia. Poland, however, did not insist on its resolution.

Without a vote, the sub-committee agreed on the following:

Whereas the Secretary-General in his annual report has informed the General Assembly of the steps taken by the states members of the organization in pursuance of its recommendations of Dec. 12, 1946;

The General Assembly

Reaffirms its resolution adopted on Dec. 12, 1946 concerning relations of members of the United Nations with Spain, and expresses its confidence that the Security Council will exercise its responsibilities under the Charter as soon as it considers that the situation in Spain so requires.

In the afternoon, the Political Committee met and adopted the sub-committee's resolution. The vote was taken by paragraphs and by roll call.

Paragraph 1, containing the preamble, (which takes note of the Secretary General's report on the implementation of last year's resolution) was adopted by 36 votes to 6 with 11 abstentions. Canada voted in favor.

Paragraph 2 (which reaffirms the resolution adopted by the Assembly on Dec. 12, 1946) was adopted by 30 votes to 14 with 11 abstentions. Canada voted against.

Paragraph 3 (which expresses confidence that the Security Council will exercise its responsibilities under the Charter as soon as it considers that the situation in Spain so requires) was adopted by 37 votes to 6 with 12 abstentions. Canada voted in favor.

Finally, the resolution as a whole was approved by 29 votes to 6, with 20 abstentions. On this vote, Canada abstained.

The voting was:

**For:** Belgium, Byelorussia, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, India, Iran, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, USSR, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia -- 29.

**Against:** Argentina, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Paraguay and Peru -- 6.

**Abstentions:** Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iraq, Lebanon, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, South Africa, United States, Yemen -- 20.

**Absent on all four votes:** Afghanistan and Siam.

**TEACHING U.N. IN SCHOOLS:** The Assembly Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural), Nov. 10, approved by 32 votes in favor, none against and five abstentions an amended Norwegian resolution on the teaching of the purposes and principles of the United Nations in the schools of member states.

Following is the text of the resolution with amendments suggested by China, USSR, Ecuador and Lebanon:

The General Assembly,

Considering that the knowledge and understanding of the aims and activities of the United Nations are essential in promoting and assuring general interest and popular support of its work.

Recommends to all member governments that they take measures at the earliest possible date to encourage the teaching of the United Nations Charter, purposes and principles, structure, background and activities of the United Nations in the schools and institutes of higher learning of their countries, with particular emphasis on such instruction in elementary and secondary schools.

Invites UNESCO to assist members of the United Nations at their request in the implementation of this programme, with the cooperation as required of the Secretary-General, and to report thereon to the Economic and Social Council.

L.R. Beaudoin M.P. for the Canadian Delegation, announced that he would abstain from voting. Mr. Beaudoin said: I would like to state the position of my Delegation in connection with this proposal. It recommends the teaching of the purposes and principles, the structure and activities of the United Nations in the schools of member states, with particular emphasis on such instruction in elementary and secondary schools.

In Canada, under our system of confederation, there is a federal government and nine provincial legislative assemblies. By our constitution, the government of each province has complete and exclusive jurisdiction and control over educational matters.

Therefore, everyone will understand that my government could not, if this proposal is adopted, take measures to encourage the teaching of the United Nations Charter, etc. in the schools of Canada.

We will refrain from expressing our opinion on the merits of the proposal. If it is adopted, my government will gladly transmit the recommendation to the proper authorities in each of our nine provincial governments. As it is for them, and for them only, to decide what