

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 829th
MEETING**

Thursday, 4 December 1958,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
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) . . .	467

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) (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.565) (continued)

1. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that, at a time when equality of human rights could be regarded as one of the essential conditions of the dignity and integrity of the human person, racial discrimination represented a shameful relic of a past era. The Iranian delegation

therefore gave its unqualified support to the ideas expressed in the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565), which dealt with a situation on which the General Assembly had previously stated its views in resolution 644 (VII). His delegation regretted that it had not yet been possible to reconcile the views of the sponsors of the draft resolution with those of the sponsors of the amendments to that text. While it could not compromise on the principles by which the Committee should be guided, his delegation wished to do all it could to help reconcile the different points of view.

2. Referring to the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1), he thought that the first of them, which pertained to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, would appreciably improve the original wording and that its adoption should give rise to no difficulty. The second amendment, which related to the third preambular paragraph, called for some reservations, for it altered the meaning of the text; it would be better to keep the meaning of the original and to have a text for the third preambular paragraph in which the General Assembly noted further that the progress made in certain Territories towards the removal of practices and the abolition of laws based on racial grounds had been limited. The third amendment, which concerned the fourth preambular paragraph, was an improvement; it could not be said that the importance of race relations was "increasing" and it was true that modern conditions made the problem particularly acute. Lastly, it might be possible to reach an agreement on the fourth amendment, which pertained to operative paragraph 2, if the words "in the future" were inserted between "pay" and "special" and if the word "urgent" were replaced by the word "constant" rather than by "continuous", as proposed in the five-Power amendments.^{1/}

3. Thus amended, the ten-Power draft resolution might perhaps obtain the support of the administering Powers responsible for putting it into effect and it would then be possible for the Committee, at a later stage, to judge of their sincerity. His delegation urged the sponsors of the draft resolution and those of the amendments to agree to such a compromise solution so that the draft resolution could be unanimously adopted.

4. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) thought that it was possible to reach agreement on the very serious problem which had led the sponsors of the draft resolution to submit their text. It would be regrettable if after having received the support of a majority of the Committee the draft resolution was likely to remain a dead letter. He hoped that the constructive suggestions made by the Iranian delegation would be accepted both by the sponsors of the draft resolution and the sponsors of the amendments.

^{1/} The amendments submitted by Iran were subsequently distributed as document A/C.4/L.567.

5. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) considered that the first of the five-Power amendments appreciably altered the meaning of the draft resolution. The sponsors of the draft resolution were prepared, if necessary, to accept the following wording for the second preambular paragraph of their text: "Noting the need for providing more adequate information on human rights". Such a necessity did in fact exist, for without such information the Committee on Information and the Fourth Committee would find it impossible to form an opinion of the true situation. Moreover, the words "more complete information", which were proposed in the first amendment, seemed to imply that the information provided was already complete, whereas in fact it was not even adequate. In the event of a separate vote, his delegation considered that the wording it had just proposed should be put to the vote first. The second five-Power amendment, which related to the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, was not acceptable, for it was a fact that the progress made in certain Territories was limited and it was important to make that clear. The third amendment, which pertained to the fourth preambular paragraph, could be justified and the sponsors of the draft resolution would not oppose its adoption. Lastly, with respect to operative paragraph 2, to which the last amendment referred, his delegation felt that its wording accurately reflected the spirit of the report of the Committee on Information. It would not, however, object to the Iranian representative's proposal for the addition of the words "in the future" to that paragraph, but it had reservations about the replacement of the word "urgent" by the word "constant".

6. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) thought that it was high time the General Assembly asked the administering Powers to take the necessary steps to put an end to all forms of racial discrimination in the Territories for which they were responsible. Although the ten-Power draft resolution did not sufficiently emphasize the urgent nature of the problem, the Bulgarian delegation, in a spirit of compromise, was prepared to vote in favour of that text as it stood.

7. The five-Power amendments did not, as had been claimed, represent minor changes in the draft resolution. For instance, the second amendment deleted any reference to the limited nature of the progress made. Moreover, the United Kingdom representative had already implied that he would interpret the amended text of operative paragraph 2 as meaning that the problem was in no way urgent and would take several years and even decades to solve. The point at issue was whether the Committee was prepared to agree to the continuance of discriminatory practices for some time to come or whether it should request those concerned to take the urgent steps needed to put an end to those practices.

8. There were a number of objections to the proposals made by the representative of Iran, which failed to meet the needs of the situation. It now seemed clear that there was little hope of obtaining a unanimous vote on the draft resolution.

9. The Bulgarian delegation therefore proposed the following amendments, to provide the Committee with a wider choice: (a) in operative paragraph 2 the words "and take urgent practical measures for" should be substituted for the words "pay special and urgent attention to"; (b) the following new operative paragraph 3 should be added: "Invites the Administering Members

to include in the annual reports submitted under Article 73 e of the Charter a special section on the measures taken by them in the implementation of the present resolution".^{2/}

10. The Bulgarian delegation thought that those amendments would meet with the approval of the delegations which wanted the draft resolution to be strengthened rather than weakened. If the sponsors of the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1) withdrew them, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565) in its original form.

11. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden) recalled that the Swedish delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 644 (VII). Racial discrimination was unquestionably an evil which should be abolished. The ten-Power draft resolution could, however, be improved by some slight amendment. It would be a great pity if members of the Committee were unable to reach agreement on a text when they were of one mind on the substance of the problem. It was for that reason that her delegation was one of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1.

12. The amendments proposed by the Iranian representative were constructive and the sponsors of the five-Power amendments were willing to accept them. The representatives of India and Iraq appeared to think that the Committee on Information had noted only the absence of specific measures and the inadequacy of the progress made. In the view of the Swedish delegation, a different conclusion could be drawn from section XII of the report on social conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories, submitted by the Committee on Information (A/3837, part two). The situation was admittedly not perfect but the Committee on Information noted in its report that encouraging developments had taken place and that specific measures for the promotion of better race relations had been taken. If the amendments proposed by the representative of Iran were adopted, the draft resolution would give a more accurate picture of the situation as described in the report, without relinquishing the basic idea of the original text, the primary purpose of which, in her opinion, was to re-emphasize the principle of non-discrimination and not to criticize the policy pursued in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was eminently desirable that the Fourth Committee should, by a large majority, adopt the amendments, modified in accordance with the suggestions of the representative of Iran.

13. Mr. ARAMBURU (Peru) said that as the representative of a country where racial discrimination in any form was unknown he was opposed to any measure entailing such discrimination. It must be admitted that discriminatory practices still existed in some Non-Self-Governing Territories. It must also be admitted that the administering Powers were endeavouring to put an end to them. The text of the ten-Power draft resolution constituted a strong criticism of the policy pursued by the administering Powers without recognizing the efforts they were making. It would be preferable for the Committee to adopt a draft resolution encouraging the administering Powers to pursue their efforts; for that reason the Peruvian delegation would support

^{2/} The amendments submitted by Bulgaria, as later amended (see para. 27 below), were subsequently distributed as document A/C.4/L.568.

the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1) and the amendments proposed by the Iranian representative.

14. His delegation urged the administering Powers to continue to regard themselves as morally bound to apply the existing laws in their entirety or, if necessary, to draft the necessary legislation under which all those who violated the fundamental principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would be convicted and punished.

15. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that after hearing the representatives of Iran and Mexico the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken a joint position with regard to the five-Power amendments. They were prepared to accept the first of those amendments, with the changes proposed orally by the representative of India, and the third. They could not, however, accept the second and the fourth.

16. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that as one of the sponsors of the amendments he did not consider that the statement of the Venezuelan representative represented any great effort at conciliation. The sponsors of the draft resolution had previously intimated that they were prepared to accept the third amendment; in fact all they were now doing was to accept the second amendment as altered by the proposal of one of their number: the representative of India. In reply to the remarks of the Bulgarian representative, he stated that the amendments the United Kingdom delegation had submitted at the previous meeting did not affect the substance of the draft resolution and that his delegation had never argued that the problem was not urgent or that there was no need for immediate measures. It had said that such measures should be applied steadily and continuously over a period of years. The representative of Bulgaria had also asserted that the wording proposed by Iran for operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution removed all sense of urgency from the recommendation in that paragraph. That was not so, since the word "Urges" clearly indicated that the recommendation which followed it was of an urgent character. Although the amendments submitted by Iran implied a criticism of the administering Powers, his delegation was prepared to accept them in a spirit of conciliation. It was also prepared to accept, as part of a general agreement, the wording the representative of India had proposed for the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. He urged all members of the Committee to display the same spirit of conciliation and to accept the compromise amendments submitted by Iran and India, so that there might be no need to put the draft resolution to a vote. The Bulgarian amendments were not in any way conducive to a compromise.

17. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that racial discrimination continued to exist in Non-Self-Governing Territories, although the General Assembly, at its seventh session, had adopted resolution 644 (VII) recommending to the administering Powers the abolition in those Territories of discriminatory laws and practices contrary to the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. At the current session, therefore, the General Assembly should above all note that the administering Powers had failed to comply with that resolution and should recommend to them the immediate adoption of practical measures for the abolition of the racial dis-

crimination which was still widely practised in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Although the ten-Power draft resolution already constituted a compromise, the representatives of the administering Powers, and particularly the United Kingdom representative, were trying to weaken that text in order that they might be able to justify the maintenance of racial discrimination in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The United Kingdom representative had proposed the deletion of the word "urgent" in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution but he could not give any reason for that proposal. Yet that seemed to be the only appropriate word, since no one could deny that the problem of racial discrimination in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was extremely urgent. Moreover, discrimination not only continued to exist *de facto*; despite General Assembly resolution 644 (VII), it also remained in the laws applied in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and it was difficult to see that anything else but lack of desire on their part prevented the administering Powers from abolishing those laws. He drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the United Kingdom representative's words to the effect that the Bulgarian amendments moved in the opposite direction. He pointed out that those amendments mentioned the necessity of taking "urgent practical measures" for the abolition of racial discrimination. The United Kingdom representative's words thus clearly showed that the United Kingdom wanted the opposite course, namely, to maintain the shameful racial discrimination in its Territories.

18. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution unanimously recognized that progress had been made towards the elimination of racial discrimination in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and he assured the representative of Sweden that the text was not intended to imply any criticism of the administering Powers. It was simply based on the conclusions that followed from section XII of the report on social conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3837, part two), and more particularly from paragraphs 165 and 166. In the light of those conclusions, the sponsors of the draft resolution considered that the progress made had been limited and that the administering Powers should pay special and urgent attention to the problem of discrimination. The importance of the problem was underlined by the fact that, at the Bandung Conference in 1955 and at the Accra Conference in 1958, the representatives of the African and Asian countries had adopted special resolutions calling for the abolition of racial discrimination.

19. In conclusion, he would assure Member States responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories that the intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution had been to assist them in combating discrimination in those Territories, and he urged the Committee to adopt the text unanimously.

20. Mr. YANG (China) said that his delegation condemned racial discrimination, but realized that it represented a complex and serious human problem. It was clear from the report on social conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories submitted by the Committee on Information, and particularly from paragraphs 157 to 162, that the situation was developing in the right direction. That fact should be recognized, even though the progress made was not as satisfactory or as rapid as might be desired.

21. His delegation was prepared to vote for the draft resolution in its original form. He thought, however, that the amendments proposed by the five Powers would bring the text more closely into line with the conclusions of the report on social conditions. He would therefore vote for those amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1) and he hoped that they would be adopted unanimously. He also hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution and the amendments would give sympathetic consideration to the Iranian representative's suggestions.

22. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that, in his delegation's opinion, racial discrimination in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was a political problem and might lead to serious difficulties in those Territories unless it was settled speedily. Urgent measures should therefore be taken to that end, and the amendment proposed by the Bulgarian representative to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would best serve that purpose. His delegation favoured a draft resolution which would help to bring about a radical change in the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. From that standpoint, it found the draft resolution generally satisfactory and it could not accept amendments which were not in accordance with the facts.

23. The amendment the Iranian representative had proposed to the second preambular paragraph improved the text of that paragraph, but there was no justification for the proposal to delete any reference to the fact that the progress made had been limited.

24. He did not understand the point of the five-Power amendment relating to "modern conditions" proposed to the fourth preambular paragraph. Those words were regrettably reminiscent of the idea of colonialism adapted to modern conditions which had been much discussed in the Committee some years before and had been used as an argument to justify the alienation of the land of thousands of indigenous inhabitants for the benefit of a handful of European settlers. He also had serious reservations with regard to the original text of that preambular paragraph. What was important was not equality among the races, independently of their numerical importance in a given Territory, but complete equality between individuals.

Mr. Rodzinski (Poland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

25. Mr. EL-RIFAI (Jordan), explaining his delegation's position on the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1), said that he would not vote for the first amendment in its present form, but would support it if it were modified as proposed by the representative of India. Although his delegation could not accept the second amendment, it would not oppose the Iranian amendment relating to the same preambular paragraph, since it hardly altered the meaning. If the Committee rejected that last amendment, his delegation would vote for the original text. The delegation of Jordan supported the third amendment. With respect to operative paragraph 2, it would vote in favour of the Iranian amendment, which had been accepted by the United Kingdom representative on behalf of the sponsors of document A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1.

26. His delegation was not at present in a position to comment on the amendments proposed by the representative of Bulgaria and reserved the right to do so later, if necessary.

27. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that, since he wished to facilitate the task of the sponsors of the draft resolution and to adhere as closely as possible to the original text, he would modify his first amendment. He accordingly proposed that the text of operative paragraph 2 should be retained and that the words "and take urgent practical measures for" should merely be inserted after the words "pay special and urgent attention to".

28. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) thanked the representative of Ceylon for the explanations he had given the Committee. He noted that the divergency of opinion was confined to the third preambular paragraph and to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

29. The representative of Ceylon had said that he wished to retain the original text of the third preambular paragraph because he believed that the progress made in certain Territories had been limited; the Iranian amendments, in fact, contained the same idea and took account of the problem mentioned by the representative of Ceylon. With respect to operative paragraph 2, the amendments of Iran clearly expressed the idea of urgency to which the representative of Ceylon attached importance and the French text even contained the expression "Prie instamment", which adequately conveyed that idea. His delegation thought that the two positions were not very far apart and that the amendments of Iran met the wishes of both parties. For its part, it was prepared to accept those amendments and requested the Committee to follow suit, in the hope that it would be possible to adopt a resolution by a large majority.

30. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) deplored the assertion made by some representatives that his delegation was prepared to sacrifice principles which it strongly supported and which it would uphold again on every occasion. A text drafted in unduly strong terms would not bring about any change in the situation unless an undertaking was obtained from the administering Powers. He was anxious, therefore, that the proposal should receive the approval of those Powers and especially of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom delegation's acceptance of the Iranian amendments was tantamount to an undertaking on its part and that was a very important fact. Moreover, the proposals of Iran scarcely affected the meaning of the draft resolution, and they conveyed the ideas mentioned by the representative of Ceylon.

31. His delegation was prepared to approve the amendment which the representative of India had proposed concerning the second preambular paragraph, particularly in view of its acceptance by the sponsors of the amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1).

32. Replying to the observations of the representative of Yugoslavia concerning the reference to "modern conditions", he said that emphasis should be placed on the importance of the problem of racial discrimination in modern life, since that problem was becoming increasingly important in present-day conditions.

33. He asked the delegations concerned to reconsider the two amendments which he had proposed in the light of their underlying purpose.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

34. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela), speaking in reply to the representative of Yugoslavia, explained that during

the informal discussion which had taken place the previous day, some delegations had expressed the view that discrimination was a fundamental problem and could not logically be said to be increasing in importance. The sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to delete the word "increasing" and to include a reference to "modern conditions", as proposed by the five Powers in their amendments, because the racial discrimination which had already existed in Non-Self-Governing Territories had been aggravated by changes in living conditions and by urbanization.

35. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) added that the "modern conditions" referred to in the third five-Power amendment had no connexion with the idea of "modern colonialism". The expression "modern conditions" should be understood as meaning social freedom and industrial and economic development. That amendment had not, therefore, altered the meaning of the resolution; it had merely brought it closer to reality.

36. Replying to the representative of Bulgaria, who had argued in favour of strengthening the draft resolution, he said that the text accurately reflected the feelings and aspirations of its sponsors. The Bulgarian amendment to operative paragraph 2 amounted to repeating the idea of urgency without strengthening the text; it was, therefore, unnecessary. With respect to the proposed inclusion of a reference to "practical measures", he pointed out that the draft resolution already recalled General Assembly resolution 644 (VII), which itself listed a number of practical measures. Thus that amendment, too, would not make the original text any stronger.

37. With respect to the new paragraph which the Bulgarian delegation proposed to add after operative paragraph 2, he agreed with it in substance but recalled that the form in which the administering Powers were required to furnish information had already been specifically defined. That paragraph would not, therefore, add anything new.

38. In fact, the ideas in the Bulgarian amendments were already contained in the draft resolution. Moreover, a resolution which was adopted unanimously would carry more weight than a resolution drafted in strong terms.

39. Mr. BUSNIAK (Czechoslovakia) recalled that racial discrimination was one of the most serious

problems in Non-Self-Governing Territories and that its solution was a prerequisite for the solution of other serious problems in those Territories. The ten-Power draft resolution did not reflect the point of view of the majority of delegations and still less the situation existing in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, since it failed to indicate its gravity. The Czechoslovak delegation had supported that proposal in the hope that the Committee would reach a compromise. If amendments were adopted which would weaken the proposed text, the resolution would no longer bear any relation either to what had been said in the Committee or to the situation which existed in the Territories.

40. Reference had been made to the importance of adopting a resolution unanimously. That had been the case with General Assembly resolution 644 (VII), but the results achieved during the six years since its adoption were hardly decisive.

41. The Czechoslovak delegation would not accept either the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1) or those which had been proposed by the representative of Iran. If, as had been said, those amendments did not alter the meaning of the draft resolution, there seemed to be no reason why it should not be adopted as it stood.

42. The Czechoslovak delegation would vote for the text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565), with the amendments accepted by its sponsors. It could not agree to any other changes in the proposed text.

43. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) moved the closure of the debate.

44. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) and Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that they were opposed to the closure of the debate, since they wished to state the views of their delegations and to discuss the new position taken by the sponsors of the various proposals before the Committee.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Iranian representative's motion for closure of the debate.

The motion was carried by 15 votes to 14, with 28 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.