

stain, nevertheless, any acts of discrimination that take place are not the consequence of policy or design. We do not elevate these lapses to the status of government policy or regulate our societies along these lines. It is this technique which is to us so profoundly abhorrent. We remember and deplore the tragic situation which last year gave rise to violence and loss of life at Sharpeville and Langa. What has happened is that the Government of the Union of South Africa, for a variety of motives, has been trying for the last twelve years to apply an unworkable philosophy embodied in a policy - with results that are positively unjust and harmful to large segments of the South African population and which, in our estimation, can only lead to catastrophe.

In considering the resolution co-sponsored by 25 African nations which is before us, the General Assembly cannot ignore Article 2(7) of the Charter which says: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state." The Canadian view has always been that this Article does not prevent discussion of domestic subjects or prevent the Assembly from expressing opinions, but that it does not permit the Assembly to call for specific action (other, in this case, than appeals to the South African Government for action).

A resolution calling for sanctions would be harmful because it might force South Africa out of the United Nations and thus cut the only channel of communication now left between South Africa and the international community. It is difficult to see how anything can be accomplished by driving the Union into complete isolation: the Union is already too isolated from the changing ideas and conditions in the modern world. Moreover, if every country in the world refused to trade with every other nation whose domestic policies were repugnant to it, the