



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 37, 39 and 41:</i>	
<i>Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter;</i>	
(b) <i>Information on economic conditions;</i>	
(c) <i>Information on other conditions;</i>	
(d) <i>General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;</i>	
(e) <i>New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued).....</i>	165

Chairman: Mr. Adnan M. PACHACHI (Iraq).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEMS 37, 39 AND 41

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4360-4368, A/4371, A/C.4/L.643 and Add.1 and 2) (continued):

- (a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter (A/4105-4109, A/4114, A/4124, A/4128 and Corr.1, A/4129, A/4131, A/4134, A/4136, A/4137, A/4142, A/4144, A/4152, A/4162 and Corr.1, A/4165-4167, A/4175, A/4178, A/4181, A/4192-4195, ST/TRI/SER.A/15/vol.5);
- (b) Information on economic conditions (A/4371);
- (c) Information on other conditions (A/4371);
- (d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;
- (e) New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Eco-

nomie Community: report of the Secretary-General (A/4470);

Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4471 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1) (continued)

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4473 and Corr.1 and Add.1, 2 and 3) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.643 AND ADD.1 AND 2) (continued)

1. Mr. WEEKS (Liberia) said that it was an accepted principle that all peoples were entitled to a life free from bondage, injustice and discrimination. Racial discrimination was contrary to the Charter, violated basic human rights and was a menace to the peace and prosperity of the world. It was an illusion to speak of the relaxation of international tension while the gross discrimination which he himself had witnessed in such Territories as Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique still prevailed. As UNESCO had established, there was no question of superiority as between one race and another; differences were due solely to circumstances and the opportunities available. How was it possible to speak of developing self-government when the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were discriminated against and debarred from participating in plans for economic, social and political development? In Angola, for example, discrimination existed in wages, in education and in health questions; no opportunities were open to the indigenous inhabitants where employment was concerned and they were debarred from acquiring land.

2. Racial discrimination, despite the General Assembly's pronouncements against it, still existed. There were representatives who voted for its abolition but returned to their countries and continued to practise it. Sweeping statements of policy which were not accompanied by action were meaningless.

3. At the previous meeting, the United Kingdom representative had said that he could not accept the wording of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.643 and Add. 1 and 2. The whole emphasis of that paragraph, however, was on the immediate revocation of all laws and regulations tending to sanction discriminatory practices and his Government could not agree to any alteration in its wording. At its 1024th meeting the Committee had approved a draft resolution (A/C.4/L.641 and Add.1) about the training of indigenous civil and technical cadres; he could not see how such training was to be carried out if racial discrimination was to be maintained.

4. His delegation supported the Haitian amendment (A/C.4/L.646) and was anxious, not only that the draft resolution should be approved unanimously, if pos-

sible, but that its terms should be applied in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

5. Mr. THAPA (Nepal) observed that the problem of racial discrimination would not have existed in the civilized world if the administering Powers had realized that all men were born equal; differences of race or colour did not make any race more fortunate or better endowed intellectually. Given modern technology and resources, any race could be equal to the most advanced peoples of the world. The theory of racial discrimination had always been adopted by victorious tribes in relation to other tribes defeated by them in battle.

6. The racial discrimination existing in many Non-Self-Governing Territories could not be tolerated and it was his delegation's belief that racial relations could be improved there if the administering Powers genuinely made the attempt. Moreover, his delegation did not believe that racial discrimination was deeply rooted in individuals; it had rather been created by ruling classes as an excuse for their domination.

7. His delegation was happy to be a sponsor of the draft resolution and had no objection to the Haitian amendment.

8. Mr. Najmuddine RIFAI (United Arab Republic) said that there was surely no one who questioned the principle upon which the draft resolution was predicated. Racial discrimination was a violation of human rights and a deterrent to the progress of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was the moral duty of all to put an end to so shameful an evil, for which the administering Powers bore a heavy responsibility. The United Kingdom representative had pointed out that some progress had been made with regard to racial discrimination in the Territories for which his country was responsible. But piecemeal measures, however progressive, failed to meet the requirements of the day. Racial discrimination was held in universal abhorrence, was contrary to the Charter and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and was a danger to peace. It was no longer possible for the administering Powers to justify the existence of discriminatory laws on their statute books. The Committee should see to it that measures were taken immediately to put an end to racial discrimination in all its forms. He hoped that the draft resolution would be approved unanimously.

9. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that his delegation had always denounced racial discrimination wherever it existed. The Constitution of the Union of Burma laid down that all persons, regardless of birth, religion, sex or race, were equal before the law and it prohibited arbitrary discrimination between one citizen or class of citizens and another. His delegation fully supported the spirit of the draft resolution as it stood and would find it difficult to agree to any amendments introducing changes in its substance.

10. In the Non-Self-Governing Territories, racial discrimination was designed to set one race against another for the benefit of the colonial Power. In those Territories racial discrimination took many forms, some of which were actually embodied in legislation; its chief manifestations were the denial of equality of political opportunity, the denial of equality of social opportunity, the denial of religious freedom and the denial of equality before the law. Yet all men were equal and no man or woman was intrinsically good or evil.

11. His delegation supported the Haitian amendment; the word "citizens" was used in the Burmese Constitution.

12. Mr. SRDANOV (Yugoslavia) said that it was apparent from the progress report^{1/} that racial discrimination still existed in many forms, especially in Africa. His delegation was strongly opposed to it and felt that it was high time to put an end to the privileges enjoyed by immigrants, especially Europeans, and denied to the indigenous inhabitants. Discrimination, whether on the grounds of race or for any other reason, was obviously a by-product of the colonial system and constituted yet another reason for the abolition of that system. His delegation fully endorsed the views on the subject of racial discrimination expressed by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories in paragraph 188 of part two of its report (A/4371). It would have preferred the word "Urges" to be used instead of "Requests" in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which it whole-heartedly supported.

13. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that, in his Government's view, discrimination on the grounds of race or colour could not be tolerated anywhere in any circumstances. The United Nations had a special responsibility where the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were concerned and the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories were paramount was enshrined in the Charter. The overwhelming majority of the new Member States came from Africa, which had been the scene of the most extreme racial discrimination ever known. It was a sad commentary on civilization that Member States had to sit in conference to urge administering Powers—who claimed to be Christian nations—to refrain from a practice which flouted the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the moral conscience of every right-thinking person.

14. At the previous meeting the United Kingdom representative had drawn attention to certain practical difficulties which operative paragraphs 2 and 3 would cause his Government. He did not wish in any way to underestimate those difficulties and, indeed, it would be churlish to deny that some progress had been made in the efforts to eradicate racial discrimination, especially in the Territories administered by the United Kingdom. However that did not mean that his Government viewed the situation with equanimity. The Committee on Information had devoted a whole section of its report to racial discrimination and had observed in paragraph 178 of part two that it was in the Territories where race relations still gave rise to the most difficult problems that the participation of the indigenous inhabitants in the development of those Territories had progressed least. It was time that the Committee made it perfectly clear that it would not continue to regard with restraint the presence on the statute books of the Territories of laws which, directly or indirectly, recognized, encouraged or sanctioned racial discrimination.

15. He agreed with the United Kingdom representative that legislation alone could not solve a problem which was a legacy of history and social practices. Neverthe-

^{1/} A/4105-4109, A/4114, A/4124, A/4128 and Corr.1, A/4129, A/4131, A/4134, A/4136, A/4137, A/4142, A/4144, A/4152, A/4162 and Corr.1, A/4165-4167, A/4175, A/4178, A/4181, A/4192-4195, ST/TRI/SER. A/15/vol.5.

less, the law was the manifestation of the general will and of the authority of the State and it should therefore set the example. A change in the law was a necessary first step. It would be a step in the right direction if individuals were told that discrimination on the ground of race or creed made them liable to criminal prosecution. Discriminatory legislation existed in an acute form in Northern and Southern Rhodesia, in Kenya and Uganda, and it prevailed in the so-called provinces of Portugal. It should be removed immediately; the least that could be expected was that the indigenous inhabitants should not be insulted in their own lands. If the United Nations was not to lay itself open to a charge of hypocrisy, it should insist on immediate action being taken. He urged the United Kingdom representative not to seek to weaken the draft resolution but to support it.

16. Mr. MIYAZAKI (Japan) recalled that his country had brought up the question of racial discrimination for the first time at the Versailles Peace Conference and that ever since then it had steadfastly adhered to the principle of non-discrimination. His delegation was anxious that the draft resolution should be unanimously approved; otherwise it would be considerably weakened. But even if unanimity were not obtained, his delegation was prepared to support it as it stood.

17. Mr. BAMALLI (Nigeria) said that no words were too strong to condemn racial discrimination. It was not based on reason nor was there a shred of moral justification for it. Mere physical brutality was insignificant compared with racial discrimination, which deprived men of their dignity and destroyed their personality. He did not agree that racial discrimination could not be dealt with by legislation: in Nigeria it was illegal and legislation would at least serve as a deterrent. The sponsors were not asking for new legislation: what they asked was that existing laws which encouraged racial discrimination should be revoked. In resolution 644 (VII) the General Assembly had recommended to the Administering Members the abolition in the Non-Self-Governing Territories of discriminatory laws and practices contrary to the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Eight years had passed, yet such laws still existed in those Territories and action was required to ensure that they were brought to an end immediately.

18. The sponsors were not fighting one form of discrimination in order to replace it by another: what they aimed at was political equality for all the inhabitants of the Territories. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the sponsors had refrained from using the words "indigenous inhabitants" or "citizens" in paragraph 3; the word "inhabitants", which excluded soldiers garrisoned in a Territory and other temporary residents, was meant to include all persons of whatever race or colour who had made the Territory their permanent home. He therefore appealed to the Haitian representative to withdraw his amendment; "citizens" was a narrower term than "inhabitants" and provided a dangerous loophole.

19. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that France was proud of its record as a pioneer in the struggle against racial discrimination, which it had fought both by legislation and by enabling all races and religions to participate in the French Assemblies. Racial discrimination was contrary to the very customs of the French people, to whom that practice was unknown. Of the various types of discrimination, that based on race was surely the most odious.

20. It was not enough to adopt laws prohibiting racial discrimination; efforts must be made to change the customs of the people, for it was there that the heart of the evil lay. The more subtle and insidious forms of discrimination must be combatted as vigorously as the more overt forms.

21. His delegation endorsed the provision in the draft resolution that measures to solve the problem of race relations should include the extension to all inhabitants of the full exercise of basic political rights, but he emphasized that that was merely one means of achieving the goal. A few years earlier France had been reproached for having introduced universal suffrage into its Non-Self-Governing Territories, on the ground that it was going too fast for the traditions of the peoples; but those traditions had proved to be merely prejudices.

22. Although the French delegation did not think that the problem could be solved merely by the adoption of laws, the draft resolution represented a good step forward and his delegation would vote in favour of it.

23. Mr. Zaïd RIFAI (Jordan) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolution because it held that no evil was greater than condoning racial discrimination. The concept that one race could be inherently better than another and that relations between individuals should be determined by the colour of their skin violated all the principles of the civilized world. The worst manifestation of that evil was the use of force to implement it.

24. He failed to understand the United Kingdom representative's objection that the Administering Members could not revoke laws passed by the Territorial legislatures without damaging the constitutional structure of those Territories. The Territorial legislatures were not responsible to the United Nations, but the Administering Members were. The Committee could not accept laws condoning racial discrimination adopted by a legislature dominated by a white minority. It lay with the Administering Members to ensure that such laws were revoked; how they were to do so was their own concern.

25. With regard to the Haitian amendment, he felt that the word "inhabitants" in operative paragraph 3 served the purposes of the draft resolution better than the word "citizens".

26. Whereas in the draft resolution approved at the Committee's 1026th meeting his delegation would have preferred a statement welcoming the progress made in various Non-Self-Governing Territories, it could not say the same in the present case, for the only possible progress that could be made in the matter of racial discrimination was its complete abolition. Individual measures, such as those mentioned by the United Kingdom representative, might help but real progress was not achieved by the alleviation of certain laws but only by a total revocation of all laws and regulations tending to encourage or sanction discriminatory policies and practices.

27. Mr. KUKAN (Libya) said that his delegation considered the draft resolution to be of vital importance. It was fully in conformity with the policy of the Libyan Government, which had always condemned racial discrimination. His delegation could only regret that, according to paragraph 177 of part two of the report of the Committee on Information, racial discrimination persisted in several Territories and was reinforced by

laws and regulations. It was high time for the colonial Powers to change that policy, for the non-self-governing peoples could no longer tolerate injustice and inequality. He strongly supported the draft resolution in its present form.

28. Mr. GASSOU (Togo) said that his delegation attached great importance to the draft resolution. Throughout history, and particularly during the last fifty years, racial discrimination had been a source of untold human suffering. The history of Nazi Germany was a terrible example of what evils were caused by the elevation of racial discrimination to the level of national policy.

29. The colonial system was founded on racial discrimination, which would disappear only with the disappearance of the colonial system.

30. However bad religious and social discrimination might be, racial discrimination led to far more disastrous consequences. When extended to the economic sphere, it often served as a pretext for the denial of political rights. While he realized that racial discrimination could not disappear overnight, all laws should be directed toward bringing about its earliest possible eradication. His delegation hoped that all Member States would vote in favour of the draft resolution in the spirit in which they had subscribed to the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

31. Miss SHELTON (Cuba) observed that her country was completely free of racial discrimination and was repelled by that practice. She agreed with the Committee on Information that the adoption of suitable legislation would be a great step towards the eradication of racial discrimination. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was particularly constructive and would provide a basis for the abolition of such practices wherever they existed. She endorsed the recommendation in paragraph 3 and thought that the establishment of political equality in a multiracial society would be the most rapid means of eliminating minority privileges.

32. She supported the Haitian amendment and would vote in favour of the draft resolution, whose sponsors she congratulated.

33. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that racial discrimination was a subject which caused deep concern to his delegation. As early as 1946, in resolution 103 (I), the General Assembly had condemned the practice in terms which could hardly be bettered. His delegation had supported that resolution and it was therefore natural that it should fully endorse the draft resolution now before the Committee. Racial discrimination was not only a violation of human rights and a deterrent to progress; it was an offence against human dignity and the brotherhood of man. Other resolutions had already condemned it, and for some years the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had been examining discrimination in all its aspects. It was a sad commentary on the times that, despite the efforts made to eliminate it, the cancer of discrimination remained. His delegation would have been prepared to go even further than the sponsors and would have been glad if the words "including the adoption of legislation prohibiting or punishing such practices" had been added at the end of operative paragraph 2, though he was not making a formal proposal to that effect.

34. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that his delegation whole-heartedly supported the draft resolution. Racial discrimination was one of the most repulsive phenomena known to the world and, what was worse, in the Non-Self-Governing Territories it was practised under the authority of the United Nations. He wondered what the indigenous inhabitants must think of the lofty ideals proclaimed by the United Nations when they themselves saw that only a minority in their countries had the right to vote, that the best land was appropriated by that same minority and that wages differed with the colour of the skin. Thus the prestige of the United Nations itself was at stake. The colonial Powers who claimed to have assumed a sacred trust paid lip-service to equality, yet they were responsible for one of the most inhuman practices ever devised, a practice which was used by the small minority of foreign settlers to overwhelm the vast majority of indigenous inhabitants whose interests, according to Article 73 of the Charter, were supposed to be paramount.

35. The United Kingdom representative desired to see the word "immediately" in operative paragraph 2 replaced by some such expression as "as soon as possible". But what did that expression, so beloved of the United Kingdom delegation, mean? The land reform in Kenya, referred to at the previous meeting by Sir Andrew Cohen, might throw some light upon that; according to a Kenya newspaper, the Minister for Agriculture had announced that some fifty small farmers—who could be of any race—would be settled on parcels of land early in 1961 but that in later years it was hoped that the annual figure would be about a thousand farmers. At that rate, in a Territory of some 6 million inhabitants, the process might well take a hundred years. The United Kingdom representative had also mentioned the need for protective legislation, but if the draft resolution was implemented no protective legislation would be needed since the inhabitants would possess the right to vote.

36. Again, the United Kingdom representative had claimed that laws could not be revoked without damaging the constitutional development of the Territory. In fact, revocation would have more far-reaching results than that; it would wreck that development and set up another régime under which the people would have full democratic rights. In Malta, the United Kingdom had not had such a hesitant approach towards constitutional changes, which proved that cases did exist where such developments could take place.

37. In quoting General Assembly resolution 103 (I), the United Kingdom representative had been disingenuous, since he had mentioned only the last part of that resolution, whereas the General Assembly had referred to the need to put an immediate end to racial discrimination. The United Kingdom had supported that proposal in 1946, yet claimed to be unable to vote for the draft resolution now before the Committee.

38. Mr. BA (Mali) said that, although his country had not suffered from racial discrimination as had other countries, it was well informed of their sufferings and required no direct proof of the evils of that system. It was colonialism which had given rise to racial discrimination; once colonial domination was brought to an end, racial discrimination would also disappear. Although the adoption of laws against racial discrimination would not eliminate the practice immediately, it would certainly constitute progress in that direction. The Constitution of Mali, for example, contained an

article making racial or any other kind of discrimination punishable by law. The racist mentality, which caused certain races to hold the scientifically untenable belief that they were superior to others derived from colonialism and imperialism; that scourge, which was an anachronism in the present era, must disappear from the face of the earth.

39. He had been surprised to hear the United Kingdom representative refer, in his eloquent speech against racial discrimination, to the difficulty of abolishing that practice. Yet General Assembly resolution 103 (I) constituted an admirable precedent and there seemed to be a general desire to find a means of bringing racial discrimination to an end. The world was tired of fine statements; no matter what the difficulties were, the time had come for the subjugated countries to be freed and for racial discrimination to be universally condemned and to disappear from the Non-Self-Governing Territories as quickly as possible.

40. He endorsed the Haitian amendment, which deserved serious consideration. Obviously full political rights could not be extended to short-term residents or transients but should be enjoyed only by the citizens of a country. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted and fully implemented.

41. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela), expressing his support of the draft resolution, pointed out that no racial discrimination of any sort existed in any of the countries of Latin America. In considering the draft resolution it would be well for the Committee to remember that the United Nations had been founded at the conclusion of a terrible and destructive war which had been characterized by an extreme manifestation of racism on the part of Nazi Germany.

42. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) recalled that the Latin American countries, which were themselves free of any racial discrimination, had vigorously defended the principle of non-discrimination since the very beginning of the United Nations.

43. He considered that the suggestions made by the United Kingdom representative at the previous meeting would merely delay the implementation of the measures called for in the draft resolution. As the Bulgarian representative had recalled, General Assembly resolution 103 (I) had declared that it was in the higher interests of humanity to put an immediate end to racial discrimination and had called on Governments to take the most prompt and energetic steps to that end. Since that resolution, adopted in 1946, had used the word "immediate", the General Assembly should now demand not the gradual but the immediate implementation of those measures. He appealed to the United Kingdom representative to withdraw his suggestions.

44. He appreciated the motives which had inspired the Haitian amendment but pointed out that in many countries and Territories citizenship had from ancient times been the privilege of a few. The term "inhabitants" used in the draft resolution was broader in scope than the term "citizens", since many people in the Territories were nationals without citizenship rights. To extend political rights to citizens only would simply assist the Administering Members, which were not prepared to modify the qualification for citizenship except gradually. He was therefore unable to accept the Haitian amendment.

45. Mr. ACET (Turkey) moved the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

46. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) opposed the closure of the debate because he wished to reply to some of the comments made about his amendment.

47. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) opposed the closure of the debate because he wished to reply to the United Kingdom representative.

The motion for closure was rejected by 35 votes to 4, with 25 abstentions.

48. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that both the Portuguese Government and the Portuguese people strongly repudiated racial discrimination in any form and had embodied that principle in their Constitution. Racial discrimination had no basis in philosophy, religion or natural law. Since the draft resolution was in complete harmony with the Portuguese policy in that regard, he would vote in favour of it.

49. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia), replying to the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative at the previous meeting, recalled that when quoting paragraph 97 of part one of the report of the Committee on Information during his statement in the general debate (1018th meeting), he had omitted the last part of the paragraph because he considered it to be less important. Furthermore, he had admitted that progress had been made in United Kingdom Territories in the matter of racial discrimination, though not as much as was claimed by the United Kingdom representative.

50. Paragraph 177 of part two of the Committee's report stated: "In some cases, discriminatory practices survived because of personal or group attitudes; in others they were reinforced by law and regulation". It was to the last phrase in particular that his delegation had drawn attention.

51. The United Kingdom representative had objected to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on the grounds that immediately to rescind or revoke all laws and regulations which tended to encourage or sanction discriminatory policies and practices would in some instances result in injustice to the very people whose rights the draft resolution was designed to protect. It was, however, the duty of the Administering Members under Article 73 a of the Charter to protect the people against abuses. The object of the draft resolution was not the revocation of legislation which protected the indigenous people but of legislation which resulted in injustice to them.

52. The United Kingdom representative had referred to the qualitative franchise which existed in certain United Kingdom Territories and had said that great progress had been made. In many instances, however, the qualifications required were such as to exclude the majority from voting. The only real way to liberalize the franchise was to grant universal suffrage.

53. With regard to the amendment proposed by the representative of Haiti, the Ethiopian delegation considered citizenship to be governed by nationality laws, which were outside the province of the Committee. The Committee should simply urge the Administering Members to give the people the right to vote and leave it to the Territories themselves to legislate in the matter.

54. Mr. KIZIA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation was in favour of the immediate

liquidation of racial discrimination, of which Nazism had been the most acute manifestation. It therefore welcomed the draft resolution and would vote in favour of it.

55. Mr. FARAHMAND (Iran) whole-heartedly supported the draft resolution. Racial discrimination was contrary not only to the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but to the principles of human dignity.

56. Mr. EL AMIN (Sudan) maintained that the racial policy followed in many Non-Self-Governing Territories in Africa and elsewhere was contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Moreover, it created a dangerous situation which might even lead to a conflagration. He considered that the draft resolution would help to eradicate such practices.

57. With reference to the amendment proposed by the delegation of Haiti, he pointed out that the word "citizenship" had not the same meaning in English as in French. Since the majority of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were now British-administered, it would be better to use the word "inhabitants", which would cover all those people who made the Territory their home. The word "citizen" had a legal connotation and could be extended to anyone, including even visitors, at the discretion of the Government. His delegation therefore supported the original text.

58. Mr. WEEKS (Liberia) said that in view of the arguments that had been advanced, especially by the representative of Bolivia, he would vote in favour of the original text. He appealed to the representative of Haiti to withdraw his amendment.

59. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) said that racial discrimination was abhorrent to the people of his country. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution, although it had some reservations with regard to the wording of operative paragraph 3.

60. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) recalled that according to the United Kingdom representative certain discriminatory laws were necessary for the protection of the indigenous inhabitants. For example, he had said that in Uganda Europeans and Asians could not hold land without special permission from the Government. That was clearly not discrimination against the indigenous population but a measure designed to protect their interests. The United Kingdom representative had stated that he would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution if the word "immediately" in operative paragraph 2 were replaced by the words "as soon as possible". The delegation of Pakistan was unable to see what objection there could be to the word "immediately" and would vote in favour of the draft resolution as it stood.

61. Mr. LAMANI (Albania) said that his delegation was ready to support any step towards the immediate eradication of racial discrimination in all fields and would therefore vote unreservedly in favour of the draft resolution. All efforts to weaken the draft resolution should be resisted. His delegation could not subscribe to any statements designed to justify the prolongation of that repugnant practice.

62. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that he had explained his views at the previous meeting when submitting his amendment. As was well known, the administering Powers regarded all persons in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, whatever their race,

as inhabitants. Full political rights were enjoyed by certain privileged classes which represented a minority of the population. As long as that state of affairs continued the political organs in those Territories would consist largely of representatives of those privileged classes. The only way of remedying that injustice would be for political rights to be granted only to citizens of the Territories, or, in other words, to people who had adopted the nationality of, and identified themselves with, the country in which they lived.

63. Mr. SINGH (India) expressed the hope that the representatives of Mali and Haiti would reconsider their views regarding the substitution of the word "citizens" for "inhabitants", in operative paragraph 3. He would point out that the majority of the Territories under consideration were British- or Portuguese-administered. The term "citizen" did not exist in United Kingdom Territories; there were British subjects and British protected persons. Hence if the word "citizen" were adopted the question would arise to whom it applied. Any attempt to define citizenship in the Non-Self-Governing Territories would be dangerous because it would be defined by the legislatures of the Territories, which were dominated by people of European origin. The word "inhabitants" appeared in Article 73 of the Charter. Its meaning was clear and precise; it referred to people born in a Non-Self-Governing Territory or who had adopted one of those Territories as their home and had as much right to vote there as any other permanent residents of the country.

64. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) emphasized that his Government entirely supported the spirit of the draft resolution and would subscribe to almost the entire text without any qualification. He had hoped that the small changes which he had suggested would be acceptable to the Committee, in which case he would have been able to vote in favour of the draft resolution. He believed that if the United Kingdom could have supported the resolution it would have been more effective. His Government's dedication in removing the cause of racial discrimination in the areas for which it was responsible constituted as great a contribution as that by any other Government. He had already explained why it would be impossible for him to vote in favour of the draft resolution as it stood. He would be obliged to abstain, because the United Kingdom Government had too much respect for both the spirit and the letter of any resolution adopted by the United Nations to vote in favour of any measure it was not convinced it could carry out.

65. He did not believe that carrying out the resolution immediately would have the effect desired by its sponsors. His delegation recognized the need for speed but it did not consider that it would be right to proceed immediately in the vital matter of the franchise. In the view of his delegation, the demand in operative paragraph 3 for the immediate grant of the universal franchise went somewhat beyond the scope of racial discrimination. The United Kingdom Government had been progressively introducing wide qualitative franchises in its Territories, many of them on a non-racial basis, and it felt that that was the right way to proceed.

66. His Government was absolutely opposed to racial discrimination in any form. Although unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution, it would nevertheless continue its task and do its utmost in the Territories

for which it was responsible to eradicate racial discrimination and to achieve the objectives of the draft resolution.

67. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia), replying to the representative of Haiti, pressed for the retention of the word "inhabitants" in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. His point was that the so-called protected persons should enjoy all the rights of citizenship. The draft resolution would achieve nothing if it called for the exercise of political rights by citizens, i.e., by persons who already possessed them.

68. Mr. BA (Mali) urged that the main point of the resolution was that the right to vote should be enjoyed by all citizens or nationals of a Non-Self-Governing Territory but not by people who, though they had settled there, retained the nationality of their country of origin.

69. His delegation was opposed to the deletion of the word "immediately".

The Haitian amendment (A/C.4/L.646) was rejected by 33 votes to 9, with 32 abstentions.

70. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

71. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 3.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

At the request of the Liberian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.4/L.643 and Add.1 and 2, as a whole.

Gabon, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 74 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.