

that "France proposes to guide the peoples for whom she has assumed responsibility towards freedom to govern themselves and democratically to manage their own affairs; putting aside any system of colonization based on arbitrary power".

The distinguished Foreign Minister of France has re-affirmed that his country remains dedicated to the principles I have just quoted in the French constitution and that "France would make it a point of honour to fulfil the obligations entered into under the Charter everywhere and at all times".

Why, therefore, is the question of Tunisia before us now? I think that the clearest and most succinct answer to this question was given by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan when the question of Morocco was being discussed in the General Assembly almost a year ago, on the 13th of December 1951, when Sir Zafrulla Khan then stated: "The objective being unquestionable, the controversy, we conceive, centres around the methods by which the objective is sought to be achieved and the pace of progress towards its complete achievement".

This is a good description of the problem before us, and one which allows us to see in a better perspective the role which the United Nations may play in considering it. The sponsors of the 13-power resolution bring in a new element, however, when they maintain that the situation in Tunisia is "endangering international peace and security". There are places where peace and security are imperilled. We are not convinced that Tunisia is one of them; we cannot help feeling that the terms "endangering international peace and security" should be reserved for situations of the utmost gravity.

If the situation does not endanger international peace and security, if any normally accepted construction is placed on these words, two further questions must be asked. First, has the United Nations any authority or jurisdiction whatsoever in this question, and, secondly, if it has, how can it best fulfil its purpose to develop "friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of the equal right and self-determination of peoples"?

In 1949, when discussing another matter, the Canadian representative to the United Nations stated that a fine balance should be drawn between Articles 10 and 14 of the Charter, which give the United Nations very broad powers of discussion, and Article 2(7), precluding the United Nations from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. In the absence of an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice, it is difficult, if not impossible, to define the limits of the authority of the United Nations in instances where the provisions of Articles 10 and 14, on the one hand, and Article 2(7), on the other, appear to be contradictory. Furthermore, it must, I suppose, be recognized that, even if some of these marginal questions were put to the International Court for an advisory opinion, there would necessarily be a certain political or perhaps philosophical element in the Court's judgment going beyond the mere words of articles which might appear contradictory - a philosophical judgment reflecting the views of the Court as to how the United Nations might grow and develop to meet the needs of all of us in our search for peace amongst mankind. It may be that such contradictions