

(including Canada); the Scandinavian resolution by 24 in favour (including Canada) 1 against and 34 abstentions. Under the terms of the 18-power resolution the President of the Assembly appointed Ralph Bunche, Hernan Santa Cruz and Jaime Torres Bodet as members of the Commission. Dr. Bunche and Dr. Torres Bodet being unable to serve, they have been replaced by Henri Laugier of France and Dantes Bellegarde of Haiti.

### Indians in the Union of South Africa

Since 1946 the General Assembly has every year had before it the question of the treatment of persons of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. India has contended that South Africa's racial policies are a violation of the human rights provisions of the Charter and of the so-called Capetown Agreements between India and South Africa. South Africa, though maintaining that the matter is of domestic jurisdiction and that the United Nations is thus debarred from intervening under Article 2(7) of the Charter, has expressed willingness to participate in a round-table conference on the question. This India has been unwilling to do until the Group Areas Act of 1950, by which the South African Government restricted various racial groups to specific areas of residence and economic activity, has first been suspended.<sup>1</sup>

At the seventh session of the Assembly, India and 14 other co-sponsors introduced a resolution which proposed the establishment of a Good Offices Commission to arrange and assist in negotiations between the Government of the Union of South Africa and those of India and Pakistan. It also called on the South African Government to suspend implementation of the Group Areas Act until negotiations were concluded and provided that the question should come before the eighth session of the Assembly.

Of the 36 speakers who took part in the debate, a considerable number of Arab, Asian and Latin American Delegates supported the Indian position, while others, notably those of Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium and the Netherlands doubted the competence of the United Nations to set up the Commission for the purpose proposed. The stand taken by the South African Government was the same as before. Although the Canadian Representative did not speak in this debate, the Canadian position on the question continues to be that, in the absence of an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice, there is a legitimate doubt whether the United Nations may properly intervene in the issue. Thus, though Canada has in the past supported proposals enjoining the parties to the dispute to enter into negotiations, the Canadian Delegations to the United Nations have not been able to accept proposals which stated or implied United Nations intervention.

The 15-power resolution referred to above was adopted by a vote of 42 in favour, 1 against, and 15 abstentions (including Canada). In its final form it did not specify the number of members

<sup>1</sup>See *Canada and the United Nations 1951-52*, pp. 37-40.