

show that this kind of legislation, this kind of policy in South Africa is itself a threat to international peace by what it is stirring up in the minds of the coloured people on that continent.

As far as the decisions of the Canadian delegation were concerned - I gather that these decisions have caused some comment in this country - we joined the majority of the Assembly in voting against South Africa's contention that under the Charter the United Nations was not competent even to consider these matters. In voting in that way we drew a distinction between consideration in the form of discussion and consideration in the form of intervention.

We felt, and I think it is becoming the established jurisprudence and established doctrine of the United Nations, that the Assembly is now competent to discuss anything as the town meeting of the world, but that that does not mean that the Assembly is competent to interfere in the domestic affairs of member states by certain types of resolutions or by setting up committees and commissions to visit those countries and report and possibly take action at succeeding Assemblies. It was in the light of those considerations that we made our decision in respect to this particular resolution.

We voted for a resolution inspired by the Scandinavian states and supported by, I think, 18 delegations which, while not singling out South Africa in terms, while not setting up any machinery to go to South Africa, and while not calling on South Africa to rescind any item of domestic legislation, called upon South Africa and all other member states to bring their policies into conformity with their obligation under the Charter to co-operate for the achievement of and universal respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

It has been said that in voting for this and abstaining from voting on other resolutions we were avoiding our responsibilities. As the head of our delegation the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Martin, said:

"The Scandinavian resolution is not just a means of dodging the issue, but rather of dodging a reaction which will be harmful to the people who would like to help."

As far as the Asian resolution was concerned, we abstained on that because we thought it was of doubtful legality. For the same reason we also abstained on the South African resolution which said that this particular Asian resolution was ultra vires. In the committee considering this matter 21 other delegations joined us in abstention on this issue. In the plenary session, which was held last Friday, most of these delegations switched their vote from abstention to voting against the Asian contention and in favour of the South African contention that a particular clause of this resolution was ultra vires. We did not switch; we remained and abstained on that issue.

However, abstention on this particular issue, which was caused by doubt in our minds as to the legality of this action and as to the practical effect the action