

Committee had been all the more cautious in view of the refusal of the Slav countries to take part in its work. He added, with reference to Yugoslavia's relations with the Cominform, that Dr Bebler might regret his justification of interference in the internal affairs of Greece if in the future dissident elements in his own country were to receive aid from a foreign Power. The principle of non-intervention was of supreme importance to all small countries, Yugoslavia included.

For *New Zealand*, Mr Thorn also stressed the importance of the non-intervention principle, and went on to say that if it was a fact, as his delegation believed, that the activity of United Nations observers on the Greek frontier had limited the extent of acts of interference, then it was the duty of the Assembly to maintain the apparatus of observation in being.

The Special Committee had had some success in the task of observing incidents upon the Greek frontier. It had had little or no success in carrying out the diplomatic and political tasks entrusted to it. This was not a criticism of the Special Committee, which had reported the considerable efforts it had put forth with a view to establishing normal relations between Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The Committee, having been organized and instructed under the terms of the Assembly's resolution of October, 1947, there were no doubt strong arguments in favour of confirming it, as was proposed in the four-Power resolution, in its dual function. Otherwise it might have been preferable to provide for the two functions separately, a technical observing and investigating body on the one hand, and a small political committee of good offices on the other.

Mr Thorn said he would like to hear the views of the Great Powers upon the recommendation of the Special Committee that the "General Assembly shall consider ways and means of obtaining the co-operation of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia with the Special Committee." Had they considered how this appeal by the Special Committee was to be met? Was some special effort at understanding under reference to the Mexican resolution possibly under contemplation? Or was it hoped that the Security Council would take up in a new and better spirit a problem which, had it been able to do its duty, it would certainly have resolved?

The representative of *Australia* (Colonel Hodgson) said that UNSCOB was essentially a different organ from the fact-finding body which the Security Council had established in 1946. Its first concern was mediation, its second observation. It was not until six months after its establishment that UNSCOB had decided to assume powers of investigation as distinct from observation. The Australian representative on the Special Committee had abstained on the relevant chapter of its report because it put disproportionate emphasis on investigation. He had also abstained