

each party should announce its willingness to cease fire and withdraw its armed forces; that each party should, at midnight on the day of such an announcement, put the cease-fire order and withdrawal into effect; and that any state failing to abide by these provisions should be considered the aggressor.

The submission of this resolution confronted the Committee with a difficult problem. While delegations were reluctant to oppose a resolution designed to strengthen the security machinery of the United Nations, serious misgivings were expressed with regard to the provisions of the Yugoslav draft. In the first place, it was generally considered that in its original form the resolution might work to the disadvantage of a victim of armed attack. Moreover, the consensus of the majority was that no definition of an aggressor should be attempted without the fullest possible examination of all its implications.

The agreement of the Yugoslav Delegation was in due course obtained to a modified version of its own resolution. The final text avoids the issue of defining aggression and contains provisions so phrased as not to work to the disadvantage of a state which complies with them. A clear reference is made to the rights of self-defence recognized by the Charter; states engaged in hostilities are to announce, within twenty-four hours after the outbreak of armed conflict, their readiness for a simultaneous cease fire on terms agreed by the parties or under conditions laid down by the United Nations; and procedures are established to enable the Assembly's Peace Observation Commission to make an immediate investigation.

A Soviet proposal for defining aggression, which was based on a somewhat similar suggestion advanced by Mr. Litvinov seventeen years ago, was referred to the International Law Commission.

The second Yugoslav item—that a permanent commission of good offices should be set up as a means of mediating in international disputes—was referred to the Interim Committee as part of that body's study of United Nations conciliation machinery.

Spain

The question of the relations of member states and the Specialized Agencies with Spain was placed on the agenda of the current session of the Assembly on the initiative of the Dominican Republic. A number of draft resolutions were also submitted by other Latin-American states. When the question was referred to the Ad Hoc Political Committee for consideration on October 27, the previous draft resolutions were revised and consolidated into a single draft resolution which was jointly sponsored by eight Latin American states.

The eight-power joint resolution emphasized in its preamble that the accreditation of heads of diplomatic missions does not imply any judgment upon the internal policy of the receiving government, and that Specialized Agencies of the United Nations should be free to decide whether the participation of Spain in their activities is desirable inasmuch as the Agencies themselves are technical and largely non-political in character. The joint resolution thereupon proposed to revoke two recommendations contained in the Assembly's resolution of December 12, 1946 — one recommending the withdrawal of ambassadors and ministers from Madrid and the other debarring Spain from membership in the Specialized Agencies connected with the United Nations.

Debate on the eight-power resolution concluded on October 31; after a majority of countries, including Canada, had made statements in support of it. The vote in the Ad Hoc Political Committee on the draft resolution, which included a minor amendment introduced by the Netherlands delegation, was 37 in favour, 10 against and 12 abstentions.