

After the Trusteeship Committee had decided to hear the South West African representative, the South African Delegation asked the President of the General Assembly for a review by the Assembly of the legality of the Committee's resolution. The Delegation informed the President of its withdrawal from the Committee pending this review. The President, after studying the circumstances, stated that he could find no valid reason for arranging a review by the General Assembly of the resolution already adopted by the Trusteeship Committee. The South African Delegation therefore absented itself from that Committee for the remainder of the session, and temporarily from plenary sessions of the Assembly.

Later, the Trusteeship Committee passed, by a vote of 41 in favour, none against, with 11 abstentions (including Canada), a proposal to hear the Reverend Michael Scott, an Anglican missionary who had special knowledge of conditions in South West Africa and who had appeared before the General Assembly in 1949 on behalf of the Hereros. Mr. Scott told the Committee that the South African Government had prevented the chiefs from coming to Paris to state their case. At the same time, Mr. Scott made a strong attack on South Africa's racial policy. He suggested that, since South Africa had not allowed the chiefs to come to Paris, and since he himself had been declared a prohibited immigrant and could not return to South West Africa, the United Nations might send a representative to inform the chiefs at first hand of what had taken place at the Assembly.

Two substantive resolutions on South West Africa were approved by the Trusteeship Committee during the sixth session of the Assembly. The first, introduced by Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, the Philippines, Thailand and the United States and carried by a vote of 39 in favour (including Canada), 5 against, with 8 abstentions, solemnly appealed to South Africa to reconsider its position and to resume negotiations with the *Ad Hoc* Committee. It also urged South Africa to report on its administration of the territory and to transmit petitions from the South West African people to the United Nations. The resolution expressed regret that the Union of South Africa, while it was prepared to negotiate on the basis of certain articles of the mandate, had indicated its unwillingness to carry out its international obligations with regard to the supervisory role of the United Nations. Although a number of delegations hinted that they would have preferred a stronger resolution, the debate was moderate and restrained. The Canadian Delegation supported this resolution. It is the Canadian view that advisory opinions of the International Court, while not legally binding, are authoritative expressions of internationalism, and should be accepted in the interests of promoting the rule of law and enhancing the prestige of the Court.

The second resolution passed by the Trusteeship Committee reasserted that the normal way of bringing the international status of South West Africa into line with developments which had occurred since the League of Nations ceased to exist, would be to place it under the international trusteeship system. The vote on this resolution was 33 in favour, none against, with 17 abstentions (including Canada).