



CONTENTS

Agenda item 57:

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (continued):

(a) *Measures to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued);*

(b) *Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General (continued)* 99

Chairman: Mrs. Halima EMBAREK WARZAZI (Morocco).

AGENDA ITEM 57

Elimination of all forms of racial, discrimination (continued):

(a) Measures to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) (A/6303, chap. XI, sect. I; A/6403, A/6412, E/4174 and Add.1-2, Add.2/Corr.1 and Add.3-9; A/C.3/L.1345-1349);

(b) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/6405 and Add.1)

1. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) introduced, on behalf of Algeria, Chile, Guinea, India, Iran, Jamaica, Mauritania, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.1349 and said that Liberia should be added to the list of sponsors, its earlier amendment (A/C.3/L.1348) having been incorporated in the new document. The purpose of the amendments was to make the text recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6403, annex) more precise, and in some cases to strengthen it. The amendments to the preamble were clear and self-explanatory. Under the fifth amendment, the States referred to in operative paragraph 3 would be called upon to comply with all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in the past on the question of racism and apartheid. The sixth amendment would strengthen the wording of operative paragraph 5, and the seventh amendment would reformulate operative paragraph 6 in a manner which took into account all the views expressed in the Committee and spelt out more precisely the action that Member States should take in the educational and cultural field. The new paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 proposed in the eighth amendment would proclaim 21 March as

International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in memory of those who had died fighting against racism and apartheid at Sharpeville in 1960 and would ensure that the item under discussion remained on the agenda of the General Assembly.

2. He had been most impressed by the spirit in which the drafters of the new amendments had worked together, and he regretted that their objective had been described by some delegations at the preceding meeting as the attainment of a "compromise". There could be no compromise or bargaining on such a subject as the elimination of racism; rather, the sponsors of the various earlier amendments, joined by the representatives of Belgium and France, had sought, in a spirit of co-operation, to perfect the formulation of certain points in their proposals. Although many delegations had not participated in the consultations, all the regional groups had been represented, and he appealed to all delegations to become co-sponsors of the amendments, thus setting the whole world an example of unanimity on the subject.

3. Mr. G. E. O. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) noted with satisfaction that the Committee, having adopted under agenda item 95 (Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories) a draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1344) on racial discrimination as it particularly affected colonial countries and on apartheid in South Africa, was about to adopt another, wider text. His delegation wished to become a sponsor of the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349) which would improve the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council and clarify some points on which his delegation considered that text to be somewhat obscure. He would support the draft resolution, thus amended, in its entirety, because it would deal with three types of racial discrimination—open discrimination, of the kind found in statute books, by a minority against the majority, as in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and some of the Portuguese Territories; discrimination by the majority against a minority, as in the United States; and a more subtle form of discrimination, to be found not in statute books but in the minds of the people of a country, which operated in terms of education, housing, and so forth, and which would be covered by operative paragraphs 5 and 6. Operative paragraph 4 would, by implication, deal to some extent with discrimination as between States, bearing in mind the terms of article 11 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which all eligible States would be asked to ratify or accede to. Such discrimination was

becoming increasingly widespread, and the Committee might usefully pay more attention to it at future sessions.

4. Mrs. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that her delegation had not participated in the general debate on the item under discussion because it had already done so in the Economic and Social Council and had expressed its views on racial discrimination during the discussion of item 95 and on other occasions. Before the draft resolutions and amendments were put to the vote, however, she wished to remind the Committee of the wise words of Pope Paul VI on the subject of pride and its consequences in his address to the General Assembly at its twentieth session. Pride and self-glorification were the cause of many forms of racial discrimination, an evil which had tended to divide humanity into white and coloured peoples. More specifically, it was in "Western" countries that millions of black people were still subjugated and living in poverty; in South Africa the cruel system of apartheid prevailed, in Southern Rhodesia the indigenous inhabitants were discriminated against in their own land by a handful of settlers, and in the United States the black man, who had been forced to migrate to that country and had been enslaved there, was still discriminated against by whites. The time had come for the delegations of the countries responsible for such conditions to stop making pious statements and to join in a unanimous stand against racial discrimination. If the Press would also join in the crusade, instead of writing useless articles on such questions as whether apartheid and racism constituted violations of human rights, it would be fulfilling the purpose envisaged in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, as reformulated in the seventh amendment in document A/C.3/L.1349.

5. In the view of her delegation, South Africa's membership in the United Nations was incompatible with its obligations under the Charter, and she wondered why the representatives of that country continued to sit with other delegations and to make pious statements.

6. The mere signing and ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, with reservations, was meaningless; what was important was that the signatories should put its provisions into effect in their own countries.

7. Her delegation would support the draft resolution recommended by the Council and the latest amendments, and it appealed to all the other delegations, including those which might not agree with all its views, to do likewise in the interest of unanimity.

8. Mr. OCAMPO (Philippines) said that the Philippine people had a profound regard for racial equality and harmony, and its Constitution extended the protection of basic human rights and freedoms to citizens and non-citizens alike, irrespective of colour, race or ethnic origin. Those traditions enabled his delegation whole-heartedly to support the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6403, annex), whose many constructive elements constituted

a forward step in the progress of the United Nations towards the attainment of the human rights goals proclaimed in the Charter.

9. In the view of his delegation, the stress laid on education in operative paragraph 6 was specially meritorious. The Philippine Government, believing that education had an indispensable and crucial role to play in furthering human equality and brotherhood and eradicating racial prejudice and discrimination, had adopted as one basis for the selection of reading matter for schools the inclusion of literature of other nations, in order that young people might learn of the lives of other peoples. The educational system sought to inculcate in youth the ideals of peace and understanding among nations and to cultivate a friendly attitude towards all peoples. The challenging task of developing in the future leaders and citizens of the world a strong and abiding respect for human rights for all, irrespective of race, should be the subject of an intensified and imaginative campaign by the United Nations, its Member States, the specialized agencies and regional and non-governmental organizations, which should work out co-ordinated programmes at the international, regional, national and local levels.

10. The latest amendments (A/C.3/L.1349), and particularly the proposed new version of paragraph 6, improved and strengthened the Council's text. The proclamation of 21 March as International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination would be a fitting memorial to the African martyrs of Sharpeville.

11. Mr. RIOS (Panama) remarked that his delegation had never had any difficulty in supporting United Nations texts on human rights, such rights being fully protected by the Constitution of Panama. The importance it attached to respect for human rights had been demonstrated by its whole-hearted support of the Costa Rican proposal for the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. As a member of the Economic and Social Council, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution before the Committee, but it was prepared to support the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349), which would improve the text and make it more emphatic. He hoped that the amendments would gain the unanimous support which was desirable in matters of human rights, and that ways would be found to eradicate practices based on the degrading theory of racial superiority that had been one of the causes of the Second World War.

12. While supporting the latest amendments (A/C.3/L.1349) in general, he found the seventh amendment rather confusing, and he therefore suggested that operative paragraph 6 might be replaced by the following two paragraphs:

"Appeals to Member States, with a view to helping to eradicate racial discrimination and other similar practices, to adopt without delay, in their respective scholastic plans and programmes, the most effective measures for inculcating in children and young people the ideals of human brotherhood and solidarity;

"Also appeals to Member States, for the purpose stated in the preceding paragraph, to undertake a vigorous and sustained campaign, through the most influential media of cultural dissemination, such as

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1347th meeting, para. 32.

the Press, radio, television, and so forth, aimed at enlightening the community concerning the falsehoods and fallacies of racism and other prejudices which have for so long been, and are, the cause of unhappiness and despair to large segments of mankind."

13. He believed that the text he had suggested was more practical, in that it placed the main emphasis on the education of young people. As the United States Government had found in endeavouring to enforce legislation prohibiting racial discrimination, it was extremely difficult to eradicate from the minds of men ideas and prejudices implanted in their youth.

14. Mr. NGYESSE (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation endorsed the draft resolution recommended by the Council (A/6403, annex) and also the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349, which strengthened and improved it. The amendments submitted by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Iran and Syria (A/C.3/L.1347) were also acceptable to his delegation, but he was not sure of their present status. Although his delegation had not participated in the general debate on the present item, it had made its position on questions of racial discrimination abundantly clear under previously discussed items. His country knew no such discrimination internally and vigorously opposed it elsewhere. Its domestic measures had been reported in writing to the Secretary-General and orally in the Committee. The Democratic Republic of the Congo would shortly sign and ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. He urged delegations to give their moral support to those still suffering racial discrimination by adopting the draft resolution and amendments unanimously.

15. Mr. N'GALLI-MARSALA (Congo, Brazzaville) expressed approval of the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349) in the formulation of which his delegation would have liked to have been able to take part.

16. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that in participating in the drafting of the new amendments he had been deeply impressed by the spirit of real co-operation which had prevailed, for which a tribute was due to all participants and especially those from African and Asian countries. As the Iranian representative had rightly said, the object had not been a compromise—there was no possibility of compromise on the present issue—but the attainment of full agreement between various positive points of view. One of the prime goals was to ensure that as many States as possible signed and ratified or acceded to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Convention was not just another legal document, but an instrument with positive and progressive implementation clauses which could promote the humane and peaceful solution of many of the problems which justifiably preoccupied members of the Committee.

17. While he would like to be able to heed the Iranian representative's appeal and co-sponsor the draft resolution and the new amendments to it, it was necessary for him to recall that his delegation and several others had had reservations about the Council's text at the time of its drafting, particularly in con-

nexion with operative paragraph 1, which categorically linked practices of discrimination with colonialism. He suggested for the consideration of members simply that the end of that paragraph be altered to read "... such discrimination as occurs in colonial territories". With that change, his delegation would gladly become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

18. Mrs. TSATSOS (Greece) said that her country had been among the first to sign the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and was now taking the necessary steps towards its ratification. The subject under discussion was, in her view, well covered by the Convention and the draft resolution now recommended by the Council. The co-operation and understanding shown in the preparation of the new amendments gave promise of a resolution that could be adopted unanimously, and she urged the withdrawal of any amendments which might impede unanimous action. Her delegation supported the Council's draft resolution and the new amendments to it, and hoped that they would be accepted in a spirit of mutual understanding.

19. Mr. RESICH (Poland) took exception to the proposition which appeared to be gaining ground that the Convention in some way superseded the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It was important to note that the Convention would have effect only for States parties to it, while the Declaration applied not only to those States but to all others as well.

20. Article 9, paragraph 3, of the Declaration called upon States to take measures, "including legislative and other measures". The reference to "other measures" was important, for racial discrimination was a complex issue, one that was, *inter alia*, political, economic, humanitarian, ethical, philosophical and religious. The United Nations Charter was founded on the principle of human dignity and equality and was designed among other things to achieve international co-operation by promoting respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction. Every aspect of the issue of discrimination, including international co-operation, peace and security, must be taken into account and every manifestation of discrimination, particularly if systematic and organized, must be resolutely combated. Article 9, paragraph 3, of the Declaration and article 4 (b) of the Convention called for the prohibition of racist organizations, a point which had been appropriately dealt with in the amendments submitted by Algeria, Burundi, Guinea, Mali and Mauritania (A/C.3/L.1346). In view of the accommodation which had been reached, however, he would support the new amendments proposed (A/C.3/L.1349). He endorsed the suggestion made by the Panamanian representative, for education was indeed essential for the elimination of discrimination.

21. Mr. SIRI (El Salvador) said that his country fully supported United Nations action in the matter of racial discrimination but felt no need to adopt special domestic measures since racial discrimination had never existed and could never arise in El Salvador. Some 97 per cent of the country's people were of mixed indigenous and Spanish blood and all were proud of their dual heritage. There were no significant groups

that had not been integrated into the nation's life through the mixing of blood and full mutual acceptance. Moreover, the country's laws provided for full equality before the law, the enjoyment of human rights and freedoms by all, the prohibition of all forms of slavery and servitude and respect for the dignity of the human person. He would not deny that there were differences between people in El Salvador, for instance in social, economic and cultural matters, but they were due not to racial hostility of any kind, but to problems peculiar to under-developed countries, problems which the Salvadorian Government was making strenuous efforts to overcome.

22. His Government was considering the Convention with a view to making it a law of the Republic as soon as possible. His delegation supported both the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6403, annex) and the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349). He was glad that those amendments did not include the fourth of the amendments submitted by India, Nigeria and Pakistan (A/C.3/L.1345), which he would have had to oppose because of possible impairment of the principle of non-intervention, abuse of State power and lack of competence of the Third Committee. He hoped that the new amendments would be adopted unanimously.

23. Mr. GUEYE (Senegal) proposed, in accordance with rule 115 of the rules of procedure, that a time-limit of five minutes should be imposed so that the Committee might move rapidly to a vote.

It was so decided.

24. Mr. AKPO (Togo) said that his delegation had not spoken on the items considered so far in the Committee, not because of any lack of interest or concern, but because it knew that there could be no doubt about its position, which it had made plain through affirmative votes on all the proposals designed to do away with practices of discrimination and the barbarous policy of apartheid. In the same spirit his delegation supported and would like to co-sponsor the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349). It was particularly pleased with the choice of 21 March as the date for the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Lastly, he believed that consideration should be given to the constructive suggestion made by the French representative.

25. Mrs. HARRIS (United States of America) thanked the Iranian representative for his statement, which had accurately described the process by which the new amendments had been prepared. In that process the views of the United States had been fully considered. Her delegation wished to become a sponsor of the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349).

26. At the previous meeting the Bulgarian representative had referred to the United States statement which accompanied its signature of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and which concerned the question of compatibility with the provisions of the United States Constitution. That representative had claimed that United States law permitted prosecution of citizens merely on grounds of propounding of ideas. She believed that he had been referring to the 1950 law requiring individual members of a particular political

group to register with the Government. That law had been widely opposed within the United States and on 15 November 1965 the Supreme Court had unanimously declared that it could not be enforced because certain of its provisions violated the Constitution. The traditional United States view was that the mere propounding of ideas should not be prevented and that unpopular ideas should be given a full hearing. The denial of a fundamental right to any group, however small or out of step with the thinking of the general community, could lead to the denial of that right to the community as a whole. On the basis of experience the United States knew that it was dangerous to try to eliminate legislatively even the most reprehensible ideas.

27. Mr. QUADRI (Argentina) said that his delegation could have voted in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its present form. It could not, however, have accepted the fourth amendment in document A/C.3/L.1346, not because that idea was not embodied in his country's legislation, as could be seen from the information it had submitted (see E/4174), but because that idea was based on article 4 of the Convention on which his delegation had had to abstain, even though it agreed with the substance of the idea expressed.

28. In his view, the wording of the first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1349, concerning the sixth paragraph of the preamble, did not convey the idea intended.

29. With regard to the second amendment, his delegation was not convinced that racial discrimination and apartheid constituted an obstacle to the maintenance of peace within the very precise meaning given to that term in the Charter. However, since the preamble indicated that those manifestations constituted only one obstacle to peace, he could nevertheless support that paragraph. The Spanish text of operative paragraph 6 should be brought into line with the English text. However if there were a consensus in the Third Committee in favour of the draft resolution and the amendments, he too would support them.

30. Mr. WAHLUND (Sweden) said that his delegation and that of Finland had been impressed by the spirit of co-operation and goodwill that had led to the submission of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349, since it was particularly important that so vital a resolution should contain no controversial elements. The two delegations wished to be listed as sponsors of those amendments.

31. Mr. SAKSENA (India), on behalf of the sponsors, withdrew the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1345, in favour of the new text (A/C.3/L.1349) that his delegation had co-sponsored with other African and Asian delegations.

32. The French representative's suggestion concerning operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6403, annex) was unacceptable to his delegation, which felt that, by any definition, colonialism constituted a negation of human rights and fundamental freedoms since it implied the domination of outside peoples over indigenous peoples and therefore it

was correct to say that racial discrimination was inherent in colonialism.

33. Mr. RUMBOS (Venezuela) said that the Latin American delegations appreciated the fact that the African and Asian delegations had been receptive to their suggestions in the informal drafting group. Since the new compromise text (A/C.3/L.1349) omitted the controversial fourth paragraph of the three-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1345), he could support it unreservedly. He appreciated the French representative's position on operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. The Latin American delegations, however, supported that paragraph as it stood.

34. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that she, too, had been struck by the constructive spirit which had prevailed in the informal discussions leading to the submission of document A/C.3/L.1349, and particularly by the sponsor's efforts to take into account the views of others. The new amendments would improve the draft resolution, especially with regard to the question of the education of children in a spirit free of racial prejudice.

35. Her delegation would have liked to support the draft resolution, but, like the French delegation, had reservations with regard to operative paragraph 1 for the reasons which she had made clear in her delegation's statements on agenda item 95. If the French representative's suggested amendment to that paragraph were adopted, she would be able to support both the draft resolution and the amendments unreservedly. The unanimous approval by the Third Committee of a resolution on such an important subject would greatly hearten those individuals and organizations throughout the world which were working devotedly for the elimination of all racial prejudice.

36. Mrs. RAMAHOLIMIHASO (Madagascar) supported the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349. Her delegation was particularly satisfied with the sixth and seventh amendments and with the proposal to designate 21 March as International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. The Turkish delegation and her own wished to be listed as sponsors of those amendments. She appealed to the French representative not to press his suggestion concerning operative paragraph 1 of the draft.

37. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) welcomed the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349, which in his view would improve the draft resolution. Although his country had not yet signed the Convention, it expected shortly to become a party to it. He welcomed the proposal to place the present item again on the agenda for the twenty-second session and hoped at that time to hear that the representatives of Portugal and South Africa had taken steps to bring their actions into line with the Charter. He particularly welcomed the proposed revision of operative paragraph 6 and the proposed new operative paragraph 8. He hoped that the French representative would not press his suggestion, which would cause difficulties for other delegations. His delegation wished to become a sponsor of the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349).

38. Mr. GRONDIN (Canada) said that his delegation, too, wished to sponsor the new amendments and the draft resolution as a whole, which it had also sponsored

in the Economic and Social Council. His delegation would support the French representative's suggestion if it were put to the vote.

39. Mr. LUKYANOVICH (Byelorussian SSR) regretted that operative paragraph 4 proposed by the five Powers (A/C.3/L.1346, fourth amendment) had been withdrawn because it considered that the outlawing of racist organizations was essential to the elimination of racial discrimination. Since that point was the subject of article 9, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which had been adopted unanimously, his delegation would interpret the fifth amendment in document A/C.3/L.1349 as a call to all countries where racial discrimination persisted to enforce all the provisions of the Declaration, including article 9 of the Declaration.

40. While the new amendments (A/C.3/L.1349) did not strengthen the draft resolution as much as his delegation would have wished, it would nevertheless support them, and on behalf also of Iran and Syria, would withdraw the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1347. Since his delegation could not accept any further weakening of the draft resolution, it could not support the French representative's suggestion. To take up that suggestion went against the Committee's decision to close the discussion, and, moreover, he emphasized that the point raised by the representative of France had only been supported by the representative of the United Kingdom.

41. Mr. GUEYE (Senegal) said that the delegations of Senegal and Rwanda wished to join in sponsoring the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349.

42. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) appealed to the French representative to withdraw his suggestion because it was in fact true that practices of discrimination were inherent in colonialism, as could be seen, for example, from the fact that in some countries before their independence even theatre audiences had been segregated by race.

43. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that her delegation supported the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349 and was particularly appreciative of the efforts which the sponsors had made to accommodate the views of others. However, she regretted the removal of one amendment which she thought should not have been considered controversial. Since the mental sickness of racist organizations was unfortunately contagious, she thought such organizations should be considered like typhoid carriers and could not understand how their isolation could be considered a violation of individual rights and, as such, controversial.

44. She could not support the French representative's suggestion. While it might be true that in individual cases the imposition of colonial rule had not always and necessarily expressed itself in racial contempt, the domination of one people by another on the grounds of their inherent superiority, which was what colonialism was, was of its nature racial discrimination.

45. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) thanked the United States representative for the information she had given in reply to his previous statement. He had not, however, been referring to the subject of the Supreme Court

decision she had mentioned, but to Title 18 of the United States Code (1964 Edition).

46. Moreover, as could be seen from the information submitted by the Council of Europe (see E/4174/Add.2 and Corr.1), articles 1 and 2 of the model law drawn up to serve as a basis for the legislation of member countries made it an offence to call for or incite to hatred, intolerance, discrimination or violence against persons on the grounds of colour, race, ethnic or national origin or religion or to publish written matter aimed at achieving such effects, and article 4 and 5 dealt with the prosecution and/or prohibition of organizations whose aims or activities fell within the scope of articles 1 and 2.

47. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) announced that the following countries had become sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349: Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Columbia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Upper Volta.

48. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) suggested that, in view of the consensus which seemed to be emerging, the Committee should vote first on the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349, as a whole, and secondly on the draft resolution, as amended, as a whole. The French and United Kingdom delegations might place on record their reservations to operative paragraph 1.

It was so decided.

49. Mr. DU BUISSON (South Africa) said that his Government fully supported all the ideals enshrined

in the United Nations Charter on the subject of human rights, but that the present draft resolution criticized and singled out his Government in a complete misrepresentation of its policy and he consequently wished to place on record that it was not possible for his delegation to support it.

50. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1349.

The amendments were adopted by 89 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6403, annex), as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 88 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

52. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that his delegation unfortunately had to make the same reservation to operative paragraph 1 of the text just adopted as it had in the Economic and Social Council. If practices of discrimination were inherent in colonialism, one might logically assume a link between such practices and colonialist régimes. However, racial discrimination sometimes persisted even after the end of colonialism due to conflict between different racial communities. Moreover, practices of discrimination were often found in countries which had never known colonialism. His delegation's reservations to that paragraph were more theoretical and practical than political, because France had ceased to be a "colonialist" country in 1958, as under the French Constitution it had recognized and implemented the right of self-determination in all the territories under its sovereignty.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.