

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 828th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 3 December 1958,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 36:	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):	
(a) Information on social conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;	
(d) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General;	
(e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community;	
(f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General	

Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . 459

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 36

- Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3806, A/3807, A/3808, A/3809/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/3810, A/3811 and Add.1, A/3812 and Add.1, A/3813 and Add.1, A/3814, A/3815 and Add.1, A/3816, A/3837, A/C.4/L.563/Rev.2) (continued):**
- (a) Information on social conditions (A/C.4/L.565);
 - (b) Information on other conditions;
 - (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/C.4/374, A/C.4/375, A/C.4/385/Rev.1, A/C.4/390);
 - (d) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/3903);
 - (e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (A/3916/Rev.1);
 - (f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General (A/3917/Rev.1 and Add.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.563/REV.2, A/C.4/L.565) (continued)

1. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon), on behalf of the sponsors, submitted the new revised text (A/C.4/L.563/Rev.2) of the draft resolution on international collaboration in respect of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories in Africa.

Page

2. After taking all the aspects of the question into consideration the sponsors had agreed to incorporate mention of the Trust Territories in the draft resolution. They had been encouraged to do so by the representative of Israel, who at the previous meeting had quoted General Assembly resolution 746 (VIII) as an example. Moreover, the Cameroons under British administration was administered as an integral part of Nigeria, which was an associate member of the Economic Commission for Africa. Thus, in any matter of the kind it was quite permissible to deal with both Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories in a single resolution. Suggestions made by the representatives of Yugoslavia and the Philippines had also been incorporated in the new text.

3. The sponsors felt that such a resolution would help the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, and he therefore commended it to the members of the Committee.

4. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) suggested that the debate on the revised draft resolution should not be prolonged. His impression was that virtually all delegations were prepared to support the draft resolution, as was his own, although he had some doubts whether such a resolution was really necessary.

5. His delegation had not been convinced by the arguments adduced in favour of including Trust Territories in the draft resolution. He felt that the best solution would be to put the draft resolution to the vote as soon as possible. He would ask for a separate vote on those passages relating to Trust Territories and those which called upon various countries to take certain action.

6. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, as the new revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.563/Rev.2) had not yet been distributed, the Committee should proceed with its consideration of the ten-Power draft resolution concerning racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/C.4/L.565) and the amendments thereto.

7. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), introducing the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566) to the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565), said that his Government's attitude regarding race relations was described in the statement he had made earlier (820th meeting, para. 46), when he had said that the United Kingdom was dedicated to the advancement of all communities without discrimination on grounds of race, colour or creed and was therefore committed to the progressive removal of all restrictions based upon race as soon as it might be practicable. As might be expected from that statement, his delegation was in sympathy with the spirit and essence of the ten-Power draft resolution and would like to be able to vote in favour of it but could not do so unless certain passages which indicated that the information transmitted was inadequate and that the progress made had been limited

were amended. The proposed amendments would make the wording of the draft resolution more acceptable to the administering Powers and would not affect the principle involved.

8. With regard to the first amendment concerning the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, he did not think it was necessary for the General Assembly to conclude that the information transmitted on human rights was inadequate, for respect for human rights in any country could be assessed only in the light of social legislation and practices as a whole. That total picture was to be found in the body of information transmitted on social conditions. It would be recalled that he had spoken at great length (820th meeting, paras. 4-6) on the adoption of certain practical social measures which reflected his Government's views concerning human rights. The information transmitted was thus quite adequate and offered abundant evidence of the extent to which human rights were safeguarded in Territories administered by the United Kingdom. For that reason his Government, in supplying information under the specific heading of human rights, confined itself to a general statement. By way of illustration he quoted from the United Kingdom's most recent general statement on the subject, as referred to in the summary prepared for 1957 (A/3806). According to that statement, the British concept of human rights and fundamental freedoms was based on general acceptance of a principle of liberty which was so fundamental that its existence was taken for granted; hence current legislation on the matter, whether in the Non-Self-Governing Territories or the United Kingdom itself, was principally concerned not with the establishment of theoretical rights but with the clarification of the means of preserving and giving effect to rights which already existed.

9. He did not think there was evidence to justify the suggestion in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution that progress had been limited and had been confined to certain Territories. The report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3837) showed that there had been reasonable progress in those Territories as a whole. His Government recognized that much remained to be done but it felt that what the administering Powers needed was encouragement rather than criticism. He did not understand the use of the word "increasing" in the fourth preambular paragraph, for the importance of race relations was something which was and always had been absolute. Hence the wording of the draft resolution might be improved by the deletion of that word, as also of the words "intensify the promotion and encouragement of" in the fifth preambular paragraph, which it would be sufficient to replace with the word "promote". Finally, he felt that the words "pay special and urgent attention" in operative paragraph 2 should be amended, since the United Kingdom had been paying constant attention to the matter of improving race relations for many years and felt that it had made progress in that direction. In his view the best way to encourage further progress would be to urge the administering Powers to keep up a continuous effort, for what was required was not so much a sudden spectacular drive as steady, day-to-day progress.

10. If the amendments were accepted by the sponsors of the ten-Power draft resolution he thought that a very large vote in favour of the draft resolution on

that important subject was possible. In view of the importance of the matter and the fact that the amendments would not alter the sense of the draft resolution, he thought it would be worth-while to suspend the meeting after other representatives had stated their views, in order to allow the sponsors of the draft resolution and of the amendments to try to agree on a final text.

11. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand), speaking as one of the sponsors of the amendments (A/C.4/L.566), said that the New Zealand Government and people were strongly opposed to discrimination of any kind. Hence his delegation supported the purpose of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565) but it thought that the amendments would remove certain imperfections and inaccuracies. Far from weakening the text, they might increase its practical effect, for they would make it easier for the administering Powers to support it.

12. As the draft resolution was of a general character and related to all Governments transmitting information under Article 73 e of the Charter, it must be regarded by his delegation as directly concerning New Zealand. With regard to the second preambular paragraph, he observed that his Government furnished the Secretary-General with exactly the same report on race relations, human rights and women's rights in the Non-Self-Governing Territories under its administration as it submitted to Parliament. That information was supplemented by its statements in the Committee on Information. He was therefore reluctant to vote in favour of a resolution which suggested that despite the best efforts of his Government the information it submitted was inadequate. That preambular paragraph taken in conjunction with operative paragraph 2 gave the draft resolution as a whole a categorically critical tone which he did not think the sponsors had intended. With regard to the third preambular paragraph, it was disappointing to his Government to find that the very considerable progress it had made in the matter of race relations should be regarded as limited. Finally, his Government was already paying special and urgent attention to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 644 (VII); indeed, it had introduced a policy which was in accordance with the spirit of that resolution before the resolution itself had been adopted. It therefore regretted the implication that the resolution was not being implemented.

13. He agreed with the United Kingdom representative's observations concerning the third and fourth preambular paragraphs.

14. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that while his delegation would find it difficult to accept some of the amendments it could agree to others. He therefore welcomed the suggestion for a recess.

15. Mr. MEIET (Libya) said that the principles expressed in the ten-Power draft resolution were of particular concern to his delegation in view of the existence of a large community of Libyans in the Territory of Chad who had for years been complaining to the Libyan Government of the unjust treatment they received from the French authorities. His Government would spare no effort to ensure that Libyans living in Chad were fairly treated in accordance with the basic principles of human rights.

16. Apart from that particular question, his Government felt that racial discrimination anywhere in the

world was contrary to moral principles. He was glad to note that the United Kingdom representative was fundamentally in agreement with the sponsors of the draft resolution, and he welcomed the suggestion that an effort should be made to reconcile it with the proposed amendments.

17. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that the Libyan representative's statement about the treatment of Libyans in Chad was devoid of any foundation. In any case, the administration of that Territory was now in the hands of representatives of the indigenous inhabitants and he would be glad to bring the Libyan representative's statement to their attention.

18. With regard to the ten-Power draft resolution, he would only say that although his country had always been in the vanguard of those who championed the cause of racial equality he could not vote affirmatively because the text did not reflect the real situation.

19. Mr. MEIET (Libya) said that he could provide the French representative with details supporting his statement if requested to do so.

20. Mr. WESTERMAN (Panama) recalled that at the Tenth Inter-American Conference, held at Caracas in 1954, his country had submitted a proposal on racial discrimination which had become an integral part of the Declaration of Caracas enjoining the Governments of the American States to adopt a series of measures designed to implement the principles of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man.^{1/} In 1955 his Government had signed the Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Co-operation with the United States which included provisions aimed at terminating all discriminatory practices affecting the rights and privileges of Panamanians and other non-United States citizens working in the Canal Zone. The situations to which those instruments related could not, of course, be compared to situations existing in Non-Self-Governing Territories, for they were the concern of fully independent countries, but he had referred to them because they were illustrative of Panama's attitude with regard to racial discrimination. It was in keeping with that attitude that his delegation had accepted the invitation to co-sponsor the present draft resolution. Under the terms of Article 73 b of the Charter all efforts in the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be directed towards the development of self-government, which in turn must be based on democratic principles. As the existence of racial discrimination was incompatible with those principles, to permit such discrimination in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was to violate the letter and spirit of the Charter, to say nothing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

21. One of the most important indications of the status and the power of a group was its place in the economic structure. Prejudice and discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories were nowhere more clearly evident than in the barriers to economic advancement which were placed in the way of the indigenous inhabitants. Employment opportunities were important not only in the narrow economic sense but also in terms of their influence on the whole way of life of individuals and the institutional structure of social groups.

^{1/} Organization of American States, *Annals*, Vol. VI, Special Number, 1954 (Pan American Union, Washington, D.C.), p. 115.

Another aspect of the matter was the psychological danger inherent in the practice of racial discrimination, for it could permanently damage the personality of those against whom it was directed. If it was the task of education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories to train leaders, it was important to ensure that those leaders were not encumbered with a sense of inferiority which would impair their effectiveness in guiding their people towards the attainment of the objectives of the Charter.

22. The draft resolution before the Committee sought to infuse new meaning into the terms of General Assembly resolution 644 (VII), and its adoption would give effect to the concepts of human rights and respect for the individual. The sooner racial prejudice was eliminated and harmonious racial relations established in Non-Self-Governing Territories, the sooner would it be possible to carry out in those Territories an effective policy of economic advancement and social justice.

23. He was in favour of the suggestion that an effort should be made to reconcile the texts of the draft resolution and the amendments.

24. Mr. Usman SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said that the very slow rate of political development in some Non-Self-Governing Territories was to be attributed to the subordination, on racial grounds, of the interests of the indigenous inhabitants to those of the administering Powers. The separation of the people inhabiting a territory into first and second-class citizens would, if allowed to continue, make it impossible for the political aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants to be realized. The reluctance of certain administering Powers to submit political information was doubtless to be explained by the fact that such information would reveal the incompatibility of their racial policies with contemporary standards of national and international life. It was therefore only proper that the General Assembly should remind certain administering Powers that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were paramount and that to permit the introduction of discriminatory racial laws would be contrary not only to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but also to the intent of Chapter XI of the Charter. In view of the recommendation in operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 644 (VII) it was fitting that the second and third preambular paragraphs of the ten-Power draft resolution should note the inadequacy of the information transmitted on human rights and the limited progress made. With regard to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, he observed that the problem of race relations was assuming ever greater importance in the wake of the rapid constitutional changes taking place in some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and it was therefore appropriate that the Administering Members should be requested to pay special and urgent attention to the implementation of the terms of resolution 644 (VII). There was nothing in the draft resolution which could be interpreted as discriminating against any particular administering Power.

25. The effect of the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566) would be to change considerably the original intent of the draft resolution. The deletion proposed in the first amendment would render the second paragraph of the preamble meaningless. If the second amendment were adopted there would be no point in

approving the draft resolution at all, since it had been drawn up precisely because the sponsors considered that there was little if any progress in race relations in certain Territories. Similarly, in view of the slow rate of progress it was appropriate that the General Assembly should note the increasing importance of such progress for the attainment of the objectives of the Charter. As the fourth and fifth amendments were dependent on the others there was no need for him to comment on them. Despite his objections to the amendments, however, he would welcome an opportunity to consult their sponsors in order to ascertain what measure of agreement could be reached before a vote was taken.

26. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) said that in the interests of having as strong a resolution as possible on the subject of discrimination he would urge the Committee to approve the text as it stood.

27. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he was glad to note that the United Kingdom and New Zealand representatives were anxious to reach a wide measure of agreement on the vital question of race relations. He would not object to a recess but would first like to try to dispel the impression some members seemed to have that the ten-Power draft resolution was unreasonable.

28. In reply to the comments of the United Kingdom and New Zealand representatives he would point out that whereas the Standard Form included a separate item on human rights under the general heading of social conditions there was no section dealing specifically with that item in the report of the Committee on Information, the relevant information transmitted having been so meagre that the Committee had been obliged to include it under other headings. Hence it was correct to state that the information so transmitted was inadequate. If the administering Powers preferred that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be redrafted in a positive form so that it would note the need for more adequate information rather than the inadequate nature of such information, his delegation would have no objection. What it could not agree to was the suggestion that it should be satisfied with the information thus far received.

29. With regard to the second amendment he observed that while the sponsors appreciated the steps already taken they could not, in drafting a resolution on a subject which had been considered by a specialized committee, do other than base themselves on the recommendations made by that committee. Section XII of the Committee on Information's report on social conditions (A/3837, part two) clearly showed that the steps taken constituted but limited progress and that further action was imperative. Moreover, in conformity with the observations of the Committee on Information the sponsors of the draft resolution wanted to show that they recognized the progress which had been made in certain Territories; for that reason he thought that the word "certain" should be retained in the third preambular paragraph.

30. As far as the third amendment was concerned, he observed that in view of the great changes which had taken place in the world during the past decades, particularly in Africa where the new political and social awakening of the people was bringing with it a desire for equality, the importance of measures to

ensure equal treatment for all was unquestionably increasing.

31. Similarly the words "intensify the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms" in the fifth preambular paragraph reflected the feeling of the Committee on Information that present efforts to promote that purpose were insufficient. Hence "intensify" was exactly the word which the sponsors felt to be appropriate in that paragraph, the whole sense of which would be lost if it were deleted. In the present time of change the question of race relations had an ever more important bearing on the maintenance of peace throughout the world. For that reason he felt that the amendment to that paragraph was substantive in character and would be difficult for the sponsors to accept.

32. Finally, while his own delegation did not feel strongly about the fifth amendment it thought that the original wording of operative paragraph 2 would actually strengthen the hand of the administering Powers themselves in combating the resistance of certain elements in the Non-Self-Governing Territories to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 644 (VII). That resolution had specifically recommended the examination of all existing legislation which in any way encouraged racial discrimination. So far the United Nations had not been told that such laws had been abolished. That meant that several years after the adoption of the resolution the steps taken to implement it had not been adequate.

33. With regard to the New Zealand representative's statement he could only say that, while the sponsors of the draft resolution would like to be able to pay a tribute to those administering Powers which had done most to eliminate racial discrimination, the established procedure for dealing with Non-Self-Governing Territories obliged delegations to generalize. The sponsors had therefore tried to reach a compromise which would give credit where credit was due and at the same time stress what still remained to be accomplished.

34. Mr. EILAN (Israel) proposed the suspension of the meeting in accordance with the United Kingdom representative's suggestion.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.45 p.m. and resumed at 6.5 p.m.

35. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) regretted to have to inform the Committee that all attempts to reach an agreed text had proved unsuccessful. The Committee would therefore have to vote on the amendments and the ten-Power draft resolution separately.

36. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that in a spirit of conciliation the sponsors of the five-Power amendments would now revise them in an attempt to meet the views of the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565). They therefore proposed that the second paragraph of the preamble should be replaced by the following: "Noting the desirability of providing more complete information on human rights"; the second amendment remained unchanged; in the fourth paragraph of the preamble the words "and increasing" should be deleted and the words "particularly under modern conditions" inserted after the word "relations"; and in operative paragraph 2 the word

"urgent" should be replaced by the word "continuous".^{2/}

37. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked whether the United Kingdom delegation would be prepared to agree that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be amended to read: "Noting the need for providing more adequate information on human rights".

38. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) was unable to accept that suggestion.

39. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) moved the closure of the debate on the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565) and the relevant amendments, in accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

40. Mr. KELLY (Australia) opposed the motion on the grounds that the amendments raised important issues of principle and that he would be unable to vote on them until he had seen them in writing.

41. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) also opposed the closure of the debate because he felt that delegations should be given time to express their views on the revised five-Power amendments.

42. The CHAIRMAN put the Greek representative's motion for closure of the debate to the vote.

The motion was rejected by 24 votes to 13, with 26 abstentions.

43. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) moved that the debate on the draft resolution on international collaboration in respect of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories in Africa should be closed and that the Committee should proceed immediately to a vote.

It was so decided.

44. At the request of Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN called for separate votes on the words "and Trust" in the third paragraph of the preamble and on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.563/Rev.2).

The Committee decided, by 44 votes to 6, with 13 abstentions, to retain the words "and Trust" in the third paragraph of the preamble.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 50 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN then put the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.563/Rev.2) as a whole to the vote.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 64 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

46. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that he had not participated in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, for reasons which he would explain after a vote had been taken on the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565).

47. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that, despite his delegation's feelings of goodwill towards the Economic Commission for Africa, he had felt constrained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because in his opinion it went beyond the terms of the

item under discussion and the competence of the Fourth Committee with respect to that item. Speaking personally, he conceded the possibility that the draft resolution might have been the subject of a valid vote if the Committee had taken a prior decision to resume its consideration of the report of the Trusteeship Council in conjunction with the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, or if, before a vote had been taken, the General Assembly had amended agenda item 36 so as to permit the consideration by the Committee of certain matters affecting Non-Self-Governing Territories, Trust Territories and the metropolitan territories of independent Member States.

48. However, he would not be surprised if the consensus of opinion among jurists eventually favoured the view that the draft resolution was more properly one for consideration by the Second Committee.

49. He had not been impressed by the argument that General Assembly resolution 746 (VIII) constituted a precedent. The overwhelming weight of precedent supported the view that resolutions dealing with Non-Self-Governing Territories should deal exclusively with those Territories and not by extension with Trust Territories.

50. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said he had voted against the inclusion of the words "and Trust" in the third paragraph of the preamble because he considered that those words went beyond the scope of the item under discussion. That view in no way affected the action taken by his Government, since it had already applied for the admission of Somaliland as an associate member in the Economic Commission for Africa. For that reason his delegation, despite its misgivings about the correctness of the procedure followed by the Fourth Committee, had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

51. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) observed that the draft resolution just voted upon had been circulated during the debate on another draft resolution, and the Committee had been given no opportunity to discuss it before voting.

52. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it considered it only logical that matters which affected both Non-Self-Governing Territories and Trust Territories should be dealt with together. The resolution would perhaps provide a good precedent for the future; there were two other sub-items of agenda item 36—the question of the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community, and offers of study and training facilities—which resembled questions dealt with in connexion with the report of the Trusteeship Council. It might be advantageous in future years to debate those topics as also the question of international collaboration, as they affected Non-Self-Governing Territories and Trust Territories together. The Fourth Committee could take a procedural decision to that effect at the beginning of the General Assembly's fourteenth session.

53. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said he had already explained why his delegation had abstained in the vote on the words "and Trust" in the third paragraph of the preamble.

54. With regard to the two operative paragraphs on which a separate vote had been taken, his delegation

^{2/} The revised text of the amendments was subsequently distributed as document A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1.

considered that the question of associate membership in the Economic Commission for Africa had been fully and exhaustively discussed in the Economic and Social Council. As far as United Kingdom Territories were concerned almost all of them were already associate members. In his view operative paragraphs 2 and 3 were unnecessary and he had therefore abstained in the vote.

55. Mr. KELLY (Australia) formally requested the Secretariat to note the statement by the representative of Iraq that the draft resolution had been voted on without discussion. That observation, in which he concurred, should be recorded since it explained why the decision taken could in no circumstances be regarded as a precedent.

56. Mr. Irving SALOMON (United States of America) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because the United States had supported the establishment of the Economic Commission for Africa, would co-operate with it and was anxious for its complete success. He approved of the substance of the resolution. Nevertheless his vote should not be construed as agreement with the incorporation of questions concerning Trust Territories and questions concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories in the same resolution. In his view that was procedurally wrong. He agreed with those representatives who had expressed the view that separate resolutions should be adopted concerning Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories since they were dealt with in separate Chapters of the Charter. He had therefore abstained in the vote on the inclusion of the words "and Trust". If a separate draft resolution had been presented concerning the Economic Commission for Africa in connexion with Trust Territories his delegation would have supported it whole-heartedly.

57. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said he had voted against the inclusion of the words "and Trust" for reasons which had already been advanced by a number of delegations. He had considerable misgivings about the procedure which had been adopted and did not share the view of the representative of Iraq that it constituted a good precedent. The New Zealand delegation regarded it as a bad precedent. He reserved his delegation's position on any future draft resolutions which might be submitted in accordance with that procedure.

58. He had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because his delegation had great sympathy with its objectives and with most of its substance.

59. Mr. GOEDHART (Netherlands) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because his delegation approved of its substance. He had, however, been obliged to oppose the inclusion of the words "and Trust" because they went beyond the scope of the item under consideration.

60. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) protested against the assertion made by the representatives of Iraq and Australia that the Committee had not been given time to discuss the draft resolution. In her view ample time had been given to debate the text and the proposed amendments.

61. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that he had been surprised to hear the representative of Iraq say that the draft resolution had been voted upon without discussion. That was scarcely accurate; a discussion on

the first revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.563/Rev.1) had taken place at the 827th meeting and various amendments and suggestions had been put forward. The representative of Iraq had asked for a further revised text; that text had been prepared but it had not been possible to deal with it at the beginning of the meeting. Nevertheless it had been in the hands of the members of the Committee for two hours. In moving the closure of the debate, the representative of Liberia had merely wished to save time, since further debate seemed unnecessary. The remarks of the representative of Iraq were the more regrettable in that the representative of Australia had taken the opportunity of placing his own interpretation on them.

62. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that he was fully aware that the draft resolution had been discussed at the previous meeting but he had hoped that, when the second revised text appeared, there would be an opportunity for representatives to express their views. The representative of Liberia had, however, moved the closure of the debate and in consequence the second revised text had not been discussed.

63. The point he wished to make was that in future debates there should be at least a token discussion before a vote was taken. That was a matter of principle.

64. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) pointed out that the Australian representative had not opposed the motion for the closure of the debate on that particular draft resolution.

65. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he had been under the impression that, by opposing the earlier motion for closure of the debate, he had established a case against the premature closure of any debate. He favoured not merely a token discussion, but a genuine discussion. If any attempt were made to telescope items referring to the Non-Self-Governing Territories and to the Trust Territories, the administering Powers might well be reluctant to offer the co-operation which they had freely given in the past. His delegation's attitude towards the renewal of the Committee on Information would depend on the respect shown by representatives for the distinctions expressed in the Charter.

66. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) said that his delegation had voted in full knowledge of the facts and the debate had given a clear indication of the position of the different delegations. He wished it to be recorded that his delegation had voted on the draft resolution after due consideration.

67. The CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee would resume discussion of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565) regarding racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

68. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that the basic purpose of the draft resolution was to secure an early and full implementation of the recommendations on racial discrimination in General Assembly resolution 644 (VII). That resolution had been adopted in 1952 and the Committee now found that progress had not been as rapid as it should have been. The question was therefore an urgent one.

69. The revised five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1) sought to delete any reference to the inadequate nature of the information transmitted. The Committee on Information itself, however, had re-

ferred in its report (A/3837, part two, para. 156) to the limited scope of information on the subject. It was difficult to understand how representatives who had voted in favour of the adoption of that report could find the phraseology of the draft resolution objectionable. The progress envisaged in General Assembly resolution 644 (VII) had clearly not been achieved and there was therefore every justification for a reference to the limited progress made. The reference to special and urgent attention in operative paragraph 2 was also fully justified. He would like to see the original text of the draft resolution maintained.

70. Mr. MACQUARRIE (Canada) said that the subject of racial discrimination was of vital concern to all delegations. Racial discrimination unhappily existed in many parts of the world and was not confined to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He felt that the sponsors of the draft resolution and those of the amendments might yet reach agreement. After reading the reports and listening to one debate, he could not subscribe to the use of the word "inadequate" to describe the information transmitted. Progress had of course been limited, but he did not see the point of so describing it in the draft resolution. He was opposed to such implications, which served no useful purpose; the object of draft resolutions should be to further the

ideals of the United Nations. His country had at one time been a Non-Self-Governing Territory under the administration of two Powers which were still administering such Territories. Its experiences in those days led it to have considerable faith in the treatment given by those Powers to their dependent peoples.

71. The proposed amendments were reasonable; if they were adopted, the draft resolution would command almost unanimous support.

72. Mr. WESTERMAN (Panama) expressed his gratification at the references the United Kingdom representative had made (826th meeting, para. 76) to his delegation's suggestions. He hoped that positive results would be achieved as soon as possible for the benefit of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

73. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) emphasized that his country was firmly opposed to racial discrimination; in fact, a law had been passed in Brazil in 1951 which made such discrimination an offence. His delegation would accordingly vote in favour of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565) with the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1).

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.