

Thus the United Nations is faced with a situation totally unlike that which prevailed under the League of Nations. What would the League of Nations have done in such a case? We do not know. There can be two sides to the question and two differing views of the legal position. However, under the League it was contended in some quarters that the fact that it was the duty of the League of Nations to supervise the mandatory administration implied a right of enquiry, of investigations on the spot. It is at least arguable that where the United Nations body charged with supervision of a mandate is denied access to direct sources of information concerning the mandated territory, the General Assembly (as the United Nations body responsible for supervision) can properly authorize resort to other sources to gain information on the mandate.

In saying this, I want to make it clear that the Canadian Government still hopes for the co-operation of the Union of South Africa; we would welcome this very much and we do not agree that in adopting this and previous resolutions the United Nations intends to close the door on negotiations with the Union.

Mr. Chairman, you will now permit me to make some comments on the text of the resolution itself. First of all, we are grateful to the co-sponsors for the co-operative attitude they displayed in accepting a number of changes in the text to meet the point of view advanced by the distinguished representative of the United States. These changes, to my mind, greatly improve the text.

As regards preambular paragraph 4 of the resolution, we agree with the comments made by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom in addressing the Committee yesterday. In our opinion, it is beyond question that the Mandate was conferred, in accordance with Article I of the operative part, "upon His