

Mr Louw, in his reply, denied that the territory would be absorbed. Proposals to administer South-west Africa as a fifth province had been put forward as far back as 1934, which proved that this was no new policy instituted by the Malan Government.

At the close of the general discussion, the Committee had before it a draft resolution submitted jointly by *Denmark, Norway, and Uruguay*, and a draft resolution proposed by *India*. Certain amendments were offered to the former, some of which were accepted by the sponsors. The resulting draft was moderate in tone. While maintaining the view that South-west Africa should be placed under the trusteeship system, the resolution took note of the assurance given by the South African representative that the proposed new arrangement for closer association of South-west Africa with the Union would not mean absorption of the territory. It recommended that, until agreement was reached with the United Nations regarding the future of the territory, South Africa should continue to supply annually information on its administration, and the Trusteeship Council to examine the information and transmit comments to the Assembly.

The *Indian* resolution (which was later withdrawn and replaced by an amendment to the joint resolution) was framed in much stronger language. It requested the Union Government, "pending the conclusion of a trusteeship agreement . . . not to proceed with measures which, though described as closer political association, amount to the integration of the territory into the Union of South Africa," and further to agree to a visit by a commission appointed by the Trusteeship Council. This commission should report the results of its observation to the Council for submission, together with the Council's comments, to the next session of the Assembly.

This proposal when put to the vote was rejected by 21 votes in favour, 22 (N.Z.) against, with 11 abstentions. *New Zealand* opposed this proposal on the grounds that it would only meet with a blunt refusal on the part of South Africa, whereas the joint resolution (which was eventually adopted by the Committee by 36 votes to 1) was more likely to produce beneficial results. Furthermore, the right of visit was not provided for in the mandate and was inconsistent with Article 80, paragraph 2, of the Charter. In the plenary Assembly debate the representative of *South Africa* appealed to the Assembly to leave the way open for agreement between the United Nations and the Union Government by deleting a paragraph in the joint resolution which maintained the previous recommendations that South-west Africa be placed under trusteeship. The paragraph in question was, however, adopted by 32 votes to 14 with 5 abstentions (N.Z.). The resolution as a whole was then adopted by 43 to 1 with 5 abstentions (N.Z.).