

Although adopted by a substantial majority, the December 1946 resolution has not, throughout its subsequent reviews by the General Assembly, had the continuing support of all those states which originally voted in its favour.<sup>1</sup> By 1950 it was evident that a sufficient number of member states had begun to entertain serious misgivings as to the wisdom and legality of the United Nations boycott of Spain to warrant reconsideration of the December 1946 resolution by the General Assembly at its Fifth Session.

The item entitled "relations of states members and Specialized Agencies with Spain" was placed on the agenda of the Fifth Session on the initiative of the Dominican Republic and Peru. A number of draft resolutions proposing revision of the December 1946 resolution were then submitted by other Latin-American states, and these were subsequently revised and consolidated into a single draft resolution, jointly sponsored by Bolivia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru and the Philippines,

In its preamble, the eight-power draft resolution emphasized that the accreditation of heads of diplomatic missions did not imply any judgment upon the domestic policy of the receiving government. It further expressed the view that inasmuch as the Specialized Agencies were technical, largely non-political in character and designed to benefit the peoples of all nations, they should be free to decide for themselves whether the participation of Spain would broaden the scope and increase the efficiency of their activities. The joint resolution thereupon recommended the revocation of the two operative provisions of the resolution of December 12, 1946, which called for the withdrawal of heads of missions from Madrid and the exclusion of Spain from membership in the Specialized Agencies.

The fundamental point of controversy which crystallized in the course of the debate related to the validity of the premises upon which the 1946 resolution was based. Certain delegations, in particular the Soviet bloc, which opposed the rescission of the two operative parts of the resolution, argued that if these premises were valid in 1946, they must still be valid in 1950 since the situation in Spain, if it had changed at all, had changed for the worse and that if the United Nations did not now uphold the provisions of the original resolution, the first step towards a complete surrender to Franco would have been taken. On the other hand, delegates supporting rescission contended that the December 1946 resolution not only represented an unjustifiable attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state but also had the effect of limiting the freedom of action of states members of the United Nations in the conduct of their diplomatic relations. They held that adoption of the joint draft resolution would in no way involve an expression of approval of the policy followed by Franco but would merely rescind certain measures which, in the light of Spain's peaceful conduct in the post-war years, were discriminatory, unjustifiable and in contravention of the Charter.

In his statement on October 28, in support of the eight-power draft resolution, the Canadian Representative reaffirmed Canada's disapproval of the totalitarian form of government but emphasized

<sup>1</sup>See *Canada and the United Nations, 1949* pp. 54-55.