

(5) Lastly, *Colombia* proposed the establishment of a sub-committee which would examine, in consultation with the delegations of India, Pakistan, and the Union of South Africa, the basis on which negotiations for the settlement of the dispute could be initiated.

After the rejection of the Colombian resolution by a vote of 26 (including *New Zealand*) to 13 with 8 abstentions, and the Norwegian amendment to the Indian resolution by a vote of 27 to 8 with 12 abstentions, the Indian resolution was voted on paragraph by paragraph and then adopted as a whole by 29 votes in favour, 15 against, with 5 abstentions. *New Zealand* opposed the adoption of this resolution because of the view consistently held and expressed that the International Court of Justice should be requested to examine the complex legal problem involved.

The Cuban resolution was then withdrawn, but the joint resolution was voted upon and rejected by 24 votes to 18 (including *New Zealand*) with 6 abstentions.

When the report of the First Committee on the treatment of Indians in the Union of South Africa was considered in *plenary session*, *Belgium*, *Brazil*, *Cuba*, *Denmark*, and *Norway* proposed a draft resolution couched in somewhat similar terms to the previous joint resolution. This proposal called upon the Governments of India, Pakistan, and South Africa to have recourse to the International Court of Justice in the event of the failure of their efforts at negotiation. A large number of speakers reiterated the arguments adduced during the Committee stage. Mr Lawrence (*South Africa*) raised the question of the competence of the General Assembly in the matter, but declared that as an earnest of good will he would vote for the joint draft resolution. Mrs Pandit (*India*) attacked the joint resolution as an invitation to South Africa to delay negotiations in order to appeal to the International Court of Justice, and called for the adoption of the resolution approved by the First Committee, stating that the real issue was one of a challenge to the dignity and respect of her country.

On being put to the vote the resolution of the First Committee was rejected by 31 in favour and 19 against (including *New Zealand*) with 6 abstentions (a two-thirds majority being required for adoption).

The joint resolution was also rejected by a vote of 24 in favour (including *New Zealand*) and 29 against with 3 abstentions.

The *Indian* delegation then submitted a new draft resolution on the subject, but after some discussion as to the appropriateness of such a procedure the resolution was withdrawn.

Consequently, the final position was that no resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on this subject.