

diction and the United Nations is thus debarred from intervening under Article 2 (7) of the Charter. On these grounds, South Africa has refused to recognize the Good Offices Commission set up at the seventh session, and the Commission has consequently been unable to carry out its task of assisting in negotiations.¹

At the eighth session, the South African Representative again opposed inclusion of the subject in the agenda, but his proposal was rejected by 45 votes to 1 with 11 abstentions. Canada, as before, voted with the majority on the grounds that the United Nations may discuss even where it may not, under the Charter, intervene.

India and 16 Asian and Latin American countries on October 16 introduced a resolution which recalled earlier resolutions; regretted the failure of the Government of South Africa to comply with them or to co-operate with the Good Offices Commission; again called upon it to refrain from implementing the Group Areas Act; continued the Good Offices Commission; and urged the South African Government to co-operate with it. Under enlarged terms of reference, the Commission will report to the ninth session the progress achieved, together with its own views of the problem and any proposals which, in its opinion, might lead to a peaceful settlement. This resolution was adopted by 42 in favour, 1 against (South Africa) and 17 abstentions (including Canada). The Canadian Representative, in explaining Canada's abstention, expressed doubts as to the competence of the United Nations to intervene, and also as to the value of passing a resolution which showed little chance of being implemented. The long history of the dispute suggested that direct discussions, upon which it was to be hoped South Africa, India and Pakistan might agree, offered the only chance of a solution. A number of countries condemned racial discrimination in general terms, but expressed doubt of the Assembly's competence to intervene, and urged that it was not a function of the United Nations to issue directives to South Africa, to pass judgment, or to recommend particular solutions, but rather to facilitate negotiations. Others, though habitually opposed to intervention in matters of domestic jurisdiction, nevertheless considered that the Charter was being violated by one of its signatories and upheld the Assembly's right to discuss the issue. The South African Representative said that his country was prepared to accept a conference with India and Pakistan on the understanding that it would be outside the United Nations, and in no way related to past United Nations resolutions. India and Pakistan declined to meet South Africa on this basis.

The Question of Race Conflict in South Africa

The General Assembly in 1952 established a three-member Commission to study and report on the racial situation in South Africa in the light of the Charter and previous resolutions on racial persecution and discrimination.²

On July 8, 1953, South Africa informed the Secretary-General that it considered the resolution and the Commission established thereunder unconstitutional. The Commission nevertheless held

¹See *Canada and the United Nations 1952-53*, pp. 12-13.

²See *Canada and the United Nations 1952-53*, pp. 11-12.