

resolution was presented by the United States, the United Kingdom, and Sweden, in favour of which the South African delegation withdrew a resolution which it had put forward. The text of these two resolutions was as follows :—

*Franco-Mexican Resolution :—*

“ THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

“ Having taken note of the application made by the Government of India regarding the treatment of Indians in the Union of South Africa, and having considered the matter :

“ 1. STATES that, because of that treatment, friendly relations between the two member States have been impaired, and unless a satisfactory settlement is reached, these relations are likely to be further impaired ;

“ 2. IS OF THE OPINION that the treatment of Indians in the Union should be in conformity with the international obligations under the agreements concluded between the two Governments and the relevant provisions of the Charter ;

“ 3. THEREFORE REQUESTS the two Governments to report at the next session of the General Assembly the measures adopted to this effect ”

*United States, United Kingdom, and Swedish Resolution :—*

“ THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

“ HAVING taken note of the application made by the Government of India regarding the treatment of Indians in the Union of South Africa, and having considered the matter, is of opinion that, since the jurisdiction of the General Assembly to deal with the matter is in doubt and since the questions involved are consequently of a legal as well as of a factual nature, a decision based on authoritatively declared juridical foundations is the one most likely to promote realization of those purposes of the Charter to the fulfilment of which all members of the United Nations are pledged as well as to secure a lasting and mutually acceptable solution of the complaints which have been made

“ THE ASSEMBLY THEREFORE RESOLVES THAT

“ The International Court of Justice is requested to give an advisory opinion on the question whether the matters referred to in the Indian application are, under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Union.”

Though the United States - United Kingdom - Swedish motion was put forward as an amendment to the main resolution, the Chairman of the Committee insisted on submitting the Franco-Mexican resolution to the vote first. The New Zealand representative, and other supporters of the reference to the Court, were thus deprived of the opportunity of voting on the text, which they would have supported. Having previously declared that he would abstain in Committee on any vote on a substantive resolution, the New Zealand representative abstained from voting on the Franco-Mexican resolution, which was passed by 24 votes to 19, with 6 abstentions.