United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE 32nd

MEETING

Saturday, 5 January 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARPER (Turkey).

Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa (A/1787, A/1794, A/1795, A/AC.53/L.20/Rev.1, A/AC.53/L.21) (*concluded*)

[Item 25]*

1. Mr. NEHRU (India) explained that India, together with Burma, Indonesia, Iran and Iraq, was submitting a revised version (A/AC.53/L.20/Rev.1) of the original draft resolution, for the following reasons.

2. Resolution 395 (V), adopted by the General Assembly in 1950, had been the third in a series of resolutions on the matter. Without passing judgment on, and still less condemning, the Union of South Africa, that resolution recalled the General Assembly's previous resolutions, expressed an opinion on racial segregation and included two recommendations: first, that the Governments of India, Pakistan and the Union of South Africa should proceed with the convening of a round table conference bearing in mind the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and secondly, that, in the event of failure of the Governments concerned to hold a round table conference before 1 April 1951, a commission of three members should be set up for the purpose of assisting the parties in carrying through appropriate negotiations.

3. The resolution also called upon the Governments concerned to refrain from taking any steps which would prejudice the success of their negotiations and requested, in particular, that the provisions of the Group Areas Act should not be implemented or enforced pending the conclusions of such negotiations.

4. For reasons which the Indian representative reserved the right to explain later, it had been impossible to hold the proposed round table conference. Hence the original draft resolution submitted by Burma, India, Indonesia, Iran and Iraq (A/AC.53/L.20) recommended, in accordance with the spirit and the letter of General Assembly resolution 395 (V), the establishment of the proposed commission and had not included any further new provision. But, since some delegations felt that the parties would come to an understanding more easily if the draft resolution provided for another possible method of negotiation, in the event that the three-member commission could not for some reason be established, the Indian delegation and the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution had agreed to add a new clause, which appeared as paragraph 3 of the operative part of the revised draft resolution. That clause provided that, in the event that the members of the commission were not nominated within sixty days, the Secretary-General of the United Nations should lend his assistance to the Governments concerned, provided such assistance was deemed necessary with a view to facilitating appropriate negotiations between those Governments, and that he should appoint, after consulting the Governments concerned, an individual who might render such additional assistance as might be necessary to facilitate the conduct of those negotiations.

5. Needless to say, the Indian delegation appreciated the difficulty of appointing a competent person of the standing needed for the purpose, but it accepted the suggestion in order to meet the wishes of other delegations and to muster the largest majority possible in the vote on the amended draft resolution.

6. The Pakistani representative had recently made (28th meeting) a moving appeal to the representative of the Union of South Africa, and it might have been hoped that that appeal would not go unanswered. The persistent silence of the South African delegation was a reason for believing that it had said its last word on the matter and that it maintained the two points it had raised: the question of competence, already discussed at five consecutive sessions of the General Assembly, and the question of determining the responsibility for the obstacles that had prevented the convening of the round table conference.

7. It seemed that everything had already been said on the question of competence. But the Indian representative felt compelled to observe that the General Assembly, after studying the matter, had declared itself competent, firstly, because it had not admitted

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

the argument of the Union of South Africa that the agreements concluded since 1885 between India and South Africa, under the auspices of the United Kingdom —agreements which, incidentally, the Union of South Africa had continuously violated since 1943—did not involve any international obligations ; secondly, because the relations between two States, Members of the United Nations, had been impaired as a result of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa ; finally, because the General Assembly, fully conscious of its responsibilities, had felt that the measures adopted by the South African Government were contrary to the principles of the Charter and constituted a violation of human rights. Furthermore, the General Assembly had recognized that such measures were liable to cause tension and hatred between two human races and to threaten international peace. For all those reasons, the General Assembly had held that it was in fact competent in the matter.

8. With respect to the second point raised by the South African delegation, he recalled that, in February 1950, the Governments concerned had held a preliminary meeting at which an agenda had been established for the round table conference. But, before the proposed conference could be held, the South African Government had introduced the Group Areas Act in the South African Parliament and had rejected the Indian and Pakistani Governments' request that the implementation of that Act should be suspended until the negotiations had been concluded. It was quite obvious that, in those circumstances, the Indian and Pakistani Governments could not agree to initiate negotiations since the action of the South African Government had prejudged the question of the abolition of the discriminatory practices which were due to be discussed at the conference. The General Assembly had, moreover, adopted the view of the Indian and Pakistani Governments, since, in resolution 395 (V), it had requested that certain conditions should be observed to ensure the success of the conference.

9. In implementation of that resolution renewed efforts had been made to convene the conference in March 1951, but those efforts had failed because the South African Government had refused to negotiate on the basis of the General Assembly's resolution and had also brought into force the Group Areas Act in direct contravention of paragraph 3 of that resolution.

10. The South African representative had asserted that it had been impossible to convene the conference because of a difference of opinion between India and Pakistan, but the Pakistani representative had made an apposite reply to that assertion. In any case, India had submitted that the conference could be held only on the basis recommended by the General Assembly. It could not therefore be suggested that the Indian Government was responsible for the failure of the negotiations to convene the conference.

11. Mr. Nehru did not wish to go into the details of the measures provided for in the Group Areas Act, which aimed at reducing all non-whites in South Africa to the status of inferior communities. Such a policy was a challenge to the principles of the Charter, to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the self-respect and dignity of man.

12. The Liberian representative had expressed (30th meeting) in moderate terms the resentment of the peoples of Africa at the implementation of that policy which was bound to result in dangerous tension between two human races. That danger had been recognized by the General Assembly since, in its resolution 377 (V) entitled " Uniting for peace ", it had stated that the maintenance of a real and lasting peace depended, among other things, on the respect of human rights and of fundamental freedom for all.

13. In conclusion, the Indian representative appealed to all Member States sharing those views to support the joint draft resolution, which should make it possible to reach a settlement of the problem by negotiations carried on in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

14. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the new text of the joint draft resolution (A/AC.53/L.20/Rev.1) incorporated the amendment submitted by Israel (A/AC.53/L.21) to the original draft resolution. He would welcome the views of the Israeli representative in that connexion.

15. Mr. FISCHER (Israel) agreed that his amendment duplicated paragraph 3 of the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution and he consequently withdrew his amendment.

16. Mr. DARMASETTIAWAN (Indonesia) noted that the Committee's main concern was to bring about a resumption of negotiations between the parties concerned as soon as possible. That was the reason for which the sponsors of the original draft resolution had incorporated in it new provisions based on suggestions made by several representatives during the discussion. The draft resolution thus amended was moderate and conciliatory in tone. The Indonesian delegation therefore hoped that it would be supported by a substantial majority of the Committee.

17. U MYINT THEIN (Burma) pointed out that the revised text of the joint draft resolution was extremely moderate and testified to the conciliatory spirit of its sponsors. He hoped that the Union of South Africa would show a similar spirit and would agree to a compromise solution.

18. Miss STRAUSS (United States of America) supported the new paragraph 3 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution, which contained the essence of the Israeli amendment, which the United States delegation strongly supported.

19. Mr. KYROU (Greece) gladly admitted that the pessimism which he had felt at the beginning of the discussion had been replaced by the firm hope that a satisfactory solution would be reached. The Committee should be grateful to the Indian representative for having once more given proof of his wisdom and moderation by agreeing to include in his original draft resolution the Israeli representative's felicitous amendment which definitely improved the earlier text. Positive

results could only be attained by friendly and direct contacts between the Governments concerned, and such contacts would be facilitated by the Israeli proposal, which had been included in the revised text.

20. He feared, however, that the new paragraph as drafted might prove to be barren of results. Inserted between clauses reiterating methods which had been found to be of no avail, it might share the same fate. He would therefore suggest the deletion of the second, third and fifth paragraphs of the preamble and of paragraph 4 of the operative part. The draft resolution, thus disencumbered of clauses that might embarrass one of the parties, could be more readily accepted by that party, which might consequently adopt a more realistic attitude.

21. Mr. NEHRU (India) regretted that he was unable to accept the Greek representative's suggestion. He thought that the paragraphs in question should be retained for two reasons : first, they reproduced the terms of a General Assembly resolution adopted in 1950 ; secondly, they were certainly not of a nature to justify the Greek representative's fears. The fifth paragraph of the preamble, for example, was neither a condemnation nor a judgment. It set forth an opinion which the General Assembly should announce to the entire world. Acceptance of the Greek representative's proposal would not only considerably weaken the draft resolution but would be contrary to the spirit of previous resolutions on the subject.

22. Mr. TANGE (Australia) said that, adhering to the position taken by his delegation at the previous session on the question of competence, he would vote against the draft resolution before the Committee. Were it to be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, he would not vote against the whole of it, since his main objection was to the general tendency it reflected of making the United Nations intervene in matters that were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States ; in the case in point, that tendency was expressed by a recommendation calling upon a State to suspend enforcement of its national legislation. In his view the Assembly was not competent to adopt the draft resolution as at present worded. The Australian delegation had already defined its attitude at the Assembly's previous session and thought it unnecessary to explain it again, most of the Members of the Assembly having different views concerning the Assembly's competence in the matter. Mr. Tange pointed out, however, that his statement should not be taken to mean that the Australian Government contested the right of the Indian and Pakistani Governments to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa on a problem which caused them the deepest concern.

23. In the opinion of the Australian Government, however, existing international instruments did not authorize the United Nations to impose upon the parties the conditions in which negotiations should be held. Moreover, there were other avenues of negotiations. The Australian Government had always held to the hope of direct negotiations between the three Governments concerned ; it had therefore noted with satisfaction the statements of the representatives of the Union of South Africa, that their Government was ready to meet the representatives of the other two Governments and to examine with them all appropriate means of settling the question. The Australian delegation was convinced that negotiations might be more fruitful if undertaken directly by the parties concerned, instead of under conditions imposed beforehand by the United Nations. He believed that in that respect his point of view was similar to that of the Philippine representative (29th meeting). In addition, it was precisely because his Government was anxious for negotiations to be resumed that it would prefer the adoption of a resolution encouraging the parties to negotiate rather than of a text condemning one of them.

24. The Australian representative had listened with very great interest to the Greek representative's suggestion. However, as the Indian representative had pointed out that the General Assembly had already taken its stand in the matter, he had little hope of agreement if the Assembly decided to follow the procedure proposed by the present draft resolution. In spite of the new provisions in paragraph 3 of the operative part for a procedure for voluntary assistance to the two parties, the draft resolution still contained a recommendation calling upon a Government to annul existing legislation and submit to a compulsory process of mediation.

25. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) recalled that at previous sessions his delegation had already explained its attitude on the substance of the question under consideration. The Belgian delegation shared the concern expressed by several other members of the Committee and firmly adhered to the principles of the Charter which prohibited any racial distinction in the respect of human rights. Nevertheless, it still believed that, in existing circumstances, the resumption of direct negotiations between the States concerned remained the method most likely to yield fruitful results. As it stood, the draft resolution would inevitably be an obstacle to discussions which might lead to a solution of the problem and the Belgian delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

26. Lord TWEEDSMUIR (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as it felt that the question of the General Assembly's competence in the matter should be referred to the International Court of Justice. There was no government that hoped more earnestly than that of the United Kingdom that it might prove possible for the Governments of the Union of South Africa, India and Pakistan to confer together and, by negotiation, achieve a settlement of that difficult and long-standing problem.

27. Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) did not think that the question of competence had been exhaustively discussed and he deplored the dangerous tendency apparent in the General Assembly of not giving sufficiently serious consideration to questions of competence and international law.

28. Dealing first with the question of competence, he pointed out that it was an accepted rule of law that

a question ceased to be within the domestic jurisdiction of a State if its substance was controlled by provisions of international law. It was an open question whether the issue of racial discrimination was a matter the substance of which was controlled by provisions of international law. From a strictly legal point of view, the present issue was perhaps not such a case. It could, however, be maintained that the principles of the Charter prohibited racial segregation as embodied in the Group Areas Act. It seemed therefore that racial segregation did not occupy any clearly defined place in international law. Consequently, there was no certainty that the General Assembly had the right to request the Union of South Africa to suspend the implementation of a particular law. That question of competence had never been referred to the International Court of Justice for its consideration. Mr. Patijn reserved his Government's position on that specific point and would therefore vote against paragraph 4 of the operative part.

29. Turning to the political aspect of the joint draft resolution, the Netherlands representative recalled that at the previous session his delegation had opposed a similar draft resolution, being anxious to avoid compromising the possibility of direct negotiation between the parties. The Netherlands delegation noted, however, that no progress had been made, that the proposed discussions had not taken place and that the situation in the Union of South Africa had not changed. It felt deep sympathy with the Union of South Africa and fully understood the many and very special difficulties facing that country. It also felt that quite a large number of the countries which were now ready to condemn the Union of South Africa could not with a clear conscience declare that conditions in their territories were fully in accordance with all the principles of the Charter. Nevertheless, his delegation regretted that no effort had been made to attempt to bridge the gap between legislation in the Union of South Africa and one of the basic principles of the Charter. It would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole instead of voting against it, as it had previously done on a similar text.

30. Mr. Liu CHIEH (China) considered that the constant recurrence of the item on the Assembly's agenda was proof both of the importance ascribed to the problem and of the difficulties encountered in finding a solution. The Chinese delegation had always upheld the principle of the equality of races ; it believed that the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights enjoined upon all Member States the obligation to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction of race. Any practice based on racial discrimination was not only contrary to the Purposes and Principles of the Charter but also constituted a source of social unrest and international friction and consequently became a matter of concern to the United Nations. The Chinese delegation was, however, aware that social conditions and practices might proceed from deep and varied causes and that their revision or reform required bold statesmanship as well as patience and tolerance. It also considered that, although the United Nations had been properly seized of the problem, the implementation of any recommendation of the General Assembly would, ultimately, depend upon the co-operation of the States directly concerned.

31. The Chinese delegation had therefore been particularly glad of the assurance given by the representative of the Union of South Africa that his Government was willing to confer with the Governments of India and Pakistan on all methods likely to lead to a settlement of the problem, while nevertheless continuing to believe that the question was strictly within its domestic jurisdiction. The Chinese delegation was convinced that if all the States concerned approached the problem in a spirit of conciliation, the way was still open for direct negotiations calculated to remove all difficulties.

32. The joint draft resolution reiterated the provisions of General Assembly resolution 395 (V) but it contained a new paragraph providing that the Secretary-General, or someone appointed by him, should use his good offices to facilitate negotiations between the parties. That provision pointed to a new approach which might be helpful in removing the obstacles which had so far prevented direct and peaceful negotiations. Consequently, the Chinese delegation would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution. If the draft resolution were put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, it would abstain on paragraph 4 of the operative part, not because that paragraph raised the question of competence—which had already been settled by the Assembly—but because its omission would facilitate negotiations between the parties.

33. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) said that his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution. Although the General Assembly had several times declared its competence in the matter, and despite the suggestion that those delegations which felt legal scruples were suffering from a lack of human sympathy, the New Zealand delegation continued to believe that the question involved extremely important legal points which in the interest of the United Nations and of its Members should be elucidated before the Assembly adopted any recommendations or passed any judgments. Although it was true that the advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice would not settle the question of competence, it was nevertheless undeniable that it would contribute the requisite clarification and would enable certain delegations to vote with greater confidence.

34. Miss STRAUSS (United States of America) would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. She would abstain on the third paragraph of the preamble and on paragraph 4 of the operative part since she thought it unwise, in a resolution of that kind, to ask that the implementation of a national law should be suspended. That should not be taken to mean that the United States delegation approved legislation such as that contained in the Group Areas Act. Furthermore, her delegation would vote against the last paragraph of the operative part, not because it believed that the General Assembly should abandon its efforts in the matter, but rather because it considered it

inopportune to take a decision at the present time to examine the question at the next session. Should it appear that the problem called for consideration at a future session, any Member State could request its inclusion in the provisional agenda of the Assembly. Moreover, under the Israeli amendment, which had been incorporated in the final text, the Secretary-General, or someone appointed by him, was to attempt to bring the parties together. If a decision were taken now to include the question in the next session's agenda, such action might prejudice the efforts to be made by the Secretary-General. Furthermore, the latter might consider it useful to submit reports between the regular sessions of the Assembly. For all those reasons, it would be preferable to give the Secretary-General discretion as to the timing of any report he might wish to make, rather than to take now a decision which would complicate his highly delicate task still further.

35. Mr. BELLEGARDE (Haiti) regretted that having had to attend the First Committee he had been unable to take part in the general debate. In the first place, he would have preferred a different wording for the item under discussion. It was not merely a question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa, but of the unfair treatment of all persons not belonging to the white race. At the time of the exercise by the South African Government of the mandate over the former German possessions, he had had occasion, in the League of Nations, to protest against the inhuman treatment of coloured people in South Africa. The delegates who had then represented South Africa on the League of Nations and who were two Englishmen, namely, Lord Cecil and Professor Gilbert Murray, had acknowledged that that treatment was to be condemned and that reparation should be made to the victims. Although at that time the Union of South Africa had been only the mandatory Power administering the possessions in question, it was now appearing before the United Nations as an independent, free and sovereign Government.

36. It was therefore the duty of the United Nations to condemn the inhuman treatment of part of the population for racial reasons. A Member State should not be allowed to violate the explicit obligations it had contracted when it ratified the Charter. It had been claimed that it was not appropriate to ask a State to rectify legislation it had passed in accordance with the provisions of its constitution. But the supremacy of international law over domestic law was none the less true. That principle had been recognized, for instance, by the French Government, for the French Constitution of 1946 stated that treaties and conventions ratified by France became French law but that, when French constitutional and legislative provisions were incompatible with principles laid down in international instruments signed by France, the international legislation prevailed over the national. For all Member States, the Charter was binding law and a State could not be allowed to violate so brutally and flagrantly one of its basic principles, the equality of men before the law.

37. The policy of racial segregation applied in certain parts of the world was the most serious threat to universal peace. The declarations of the responsible South African authorities were a threat to world peace, because they were not limited to South Africa, but were a general condemnation of all non-white races, thus reaffirming Hitler's theories. The massacre of the Jews in Germany, with its toll of over six million victims, had aroused universal indignation. Was the world to remain indifferent to inhuman practices of the same kind, merely because the victims were not white, but black or Asiatic ? The Haitian delegation could not accept such a view. There was no legal reason against the General Assembly's adopting the very moderate draft resolution before the Committee, which should help to solve a problem of the greatest importance to all the peoples of the world.

38. Mr. ENGEN (Norway) said that his delegation was glad to see the United Nations using its influence to bring the parties together around the conference table. He agreed with the procedure recommended in the draft resolution and in particular was pleased that the Israeli representative's proposal had been incorporated in the text. It would render the procedure more flexible and make it easier to give useful assistance to the parties. In that connexion he recalled that the Israeli amendment covered one of the main points of a proposal put forward at the General Assembly's fifth session by the Norwegian delegation, among others. His delegation would therefore vote for the revised draft resolution.

39. Mr. Engen felt some doubt, however, as to the wisdom of including in the preamble certain paragraphs the terms of which perhaps ran counter to the purpose of the resolution. For instance, the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs of the preamble were not likely to facilitate the solution of the problem. It would have been preferable for the United Nations to concentrate on seeking methods to help the parties to settle their differences. He therefore asked for a vote paragraph by paragraph, and said that he would not vote for the three paragraphs he had mentioned. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted with a majority sufficient to impress upon the parties the need for renewed efforts to find a solution.

40. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) was glad that paragraph 3 of the operative part of the revised draft resolution provided for a new procedure of conciliation between the parties, and recalled that that solution was similar to the one he himself had advocated in the general discussion. He would therefore vote for the draft resolution and expressed the hope that the Governments of India, Pakistan and the Union of South Africa, in a spirit of mutual understanding, would succeed in finding a peaceful solution to the important question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa.

41. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) said that, as representative of a country where there was no discrimination on racial, colour or any other grounds, any measures which infringed the sacred rights of the human individual were abhorrent to him. For that reason he would vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

42. He wished, however, to point out that the draft resolution confined itself to placing on record the shortcomings of the South African legislation ; it would have been fair to mention that human rights were also disregarded in many other countries. That omission was regrettable.

43. Furthermore, he did not approve of certain paragraphs of the draft. Under the Charter, the General Assembly could exercise only moral pressure through any recommendations it might make. In view of the nature of that pressure, he questioned the advisability of recommending one of the parties to abide by certain rules, after first condemning it for certain measures it had taken ; such condemnation could only impair the effect of the recommendations themselves. For that reason, when the vote by paragraph was taken, the delegation of El Salvador would abstain from voting on the third and fifth paragraphs of the preamble and on paragraphs 4 and 5 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

44. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that his delegation's attitude would be determined by observance of the constitutional, legislative and legal traditions upon which the democracy he represented was based.

45. As regards the question of competence, he pointed out that the Charter placed respect for human rights and any violation thereof on the plane of international law and not on the plane of the old conception of domestic jurisdiction.

46. The only criticism he had to make of the revised draft resolution was that it failed to specify that so far the General Assembly's resolution had not been accepted as a basis of discussion. In particular, the words " *no ha podido aceptar* " in the second paragraph of the Spanish text of the preamble might have been replaced by a more categorical statement of the facts.

47. The representative of Uruguay said that he would vote for the revised draft resolution and hoped that the draft—which represented an attempt by the United Nations to solve the problem of discrimination—would lead to a full settlement of that particular case. The United Nations would thus have proved that freedom and justice were not empty words.

48. The CHAIRMAN announced that, in accordance with the Norwegian representative's request, he would put the text to the vote paragraph by paragraph. He pointed out that in the English text of document A/AC.53/L.20/Rev.1 the words " implementation of enforcement " should be replaced by " implementation or enforcement ".

49. Mr. MACDONNELL (Canada) asked that paragraph 3 of the operative part should be voted on in two parts, the words " in the event that the members of the Commission are not nominated in accordance with paragraphs 1 and 2 above " being voted upon separately.

It was so decided.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised draft resolution submitted by Burma, India, Indonesia, Iran and Iraq (A/AC.53/L.20/Rev.1).

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 47 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 46 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 34 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 48 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The fifth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 40 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution was adopted by 47 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 47 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

The first part of paragraph 3 was adopted by 41 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.

The second part of paragraph 3 was adopted by 44 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 31 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 39 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 41 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

51. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) said that the French delegation had abstained on all those paragraphs of the resolution which, in a case that demanded free and full co-operation between the parties, might appear to convey unnecessarily acrimonious feelings or a premature condemnation. The French delegation had voted against paragraph 4 of the operative part because the specific reference to a national law in that paragraph appeared to encroach too obviously upon the sphere of domestic jurisdiction.

52. Mr. Ordonneau drew the attention of the five delegations which had submitted the draft resolution to the meaning of the vote which had just been taken. The object of the resolution would, he believed, have been best attained by a resolution drafted on really moderate lines in accordance with the Greek representative's suggestion. Such a resolution, leading to true conciliation and adopted practically unanimously in plenary session, would have better served the purpose of the authors of the draft than a resolution adopted by a simple majority.

53. Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) said that he had abstained on the first, second and third paragraphs of the preamble and on paragraphs 4 and 5 of the operative part, as well as on the draft resolution as a whole, in accordance wit the opinion which his delegation had already expressed during previous discussions on the subject with regard to the General Assembly's competence to take cognizance of questions the examination of which was incompatible with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

Printed in France D—93580—January 1952—3,600