

has invariably been rejected by the Union. In 1959 the Union discontinued the submission of annual reports on the administration of the territory, in protest against what it considered undue interference in its domestic affairs.

In 1950 the General Assembly referred the question of the status of the territory to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. The Court's opinion, which the Union has not accepted, was that South Africa continued to have international obligations for South West Africa under Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Mandate, that its supervisory functions should in future be examined by the United Nations, and annual reports and petitions should be submitted to the United Nations, that Chapter XII of the Charter of the United Nations provided a means whereby the territory could be brought under a trusteeship agreement but that the Union was not legally obliged to place the territory under trusteeship, and finally, that the Union acting alone did not have the competence to modify the international status of the territory.

In 1957 the General Assembly decided on a "new approach" and appointed a Good Offices Committee of three members, Brazil, the United Kingdom and the United States, to negotiate with the Union on the future international status of the territory of South West Africa. In 1958 the General Assembly received the Good Offices Committee's report and, although it could not agree to the proposals contained therein, re-appointed the Committee in order that negotiations might be continued with the Government of the Union.

At the fourteenth session, despite the somewhat more conciliatory position taken by the Union of South Africa, no progress was made towards resolving the problem. The Union indicated a willingness to continue negotiations regarding the territory's future international status, despite the failure of the second round of discussions held between it and the Good Offices Committee. Also for the first time the Delegation of the Union included a resident of the territory—also a member of its Legislative Council—who was prepared to answer questions on its economic and social development. The Foreign Minister of the Union also indicated that his Government might be prepared to supply information on the territory to the United Nations under certain conditions.

The debate became embittered, however, over the question of granting hearings to petitioners against which the Union maintained its usual adamant attitude. The African, Asian and like-minded powers felt it necessary to table a draft resolution, which, although it called for renewed negotiations with the Union, was so condemnatory in its terms that in the opinion of the Canadian Delegation it would have been impossible for the Union to accept it. Canada, therefore, voted for a series of Swedish amendments, which were designed to make the terms of the draft resolution more acceptable to the Union. They were all defeated. A draft resolution was also tabled requesting further study by the United Nations of legal action to ensure fulfilment of South Africa's obligations in respect of South West Africa, paying particular attention to possible action by the United Nations as well as proceedings which might be instituted before the International Court of Justice.

Both draft resolutions, which in the Canadian point of view would have done nothing to further an acceptable solution of the problem, were adopted by large majorities by both the committee and by the plenary session. Canada abstained in the vote. A series of resolutions on the granting of hearings and the complaints of petitioners, on conditions in the territory and on the desirability of placing it under the United Nations trusteeship system were all adopted by large majorities. Canada abstained on all these resolutions, but voted to express appreciation of the Good Offices Committee's efforts.