



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Agenda item 58:</i>	
<i>Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) . . . . .</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Preamble (continued) . . . . .</i>	<i>67</i>

**Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico).**

**AGENDA ITEM 58**

Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) (A/5803, chap. IX, sect. I; A/5921; A/C.3/L.1208-1212, L.1216-1225, L.1226 and Corr.1, L.1228, L.1230; E/3873, chap. II and annexes I and III)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.3/L.1228, which contained the list of amendments to the draft Convention adopted by the Commission on Human Rights, submitted by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1015 B (XXXVII) and set out as an annex to the note by the Secretary-General (A/5921).
2. In view of the fact that, with the exception of two, the various amendments to article I, were concerned with the need to specify what was meant by racial discrimination, he suggested that the delegations concerned should consult together with a view to preparing a joint text.
3. He reminded the Committee that the meeting would be devoted to consideration of the preamble of the draft Convention.

**PREAMBLE (continued)**

4. Mr. TAYLOR (New Zealand) said that if, as Poland had proposed in its first amendment (A/C.3/L.1210), the word "nazist" was inserted before the word "practices" in the sixth preambular paragraph, that would give the impression that other racist practices were not "capable of disturbing peace and security among peoples".
5. With reference to the sixteen-Power proposal (A/C.3/L.1226 and Corr.1) that the phrase "and to ensure understanding and respect for the dignity of the human person" should be added at the end of the fourth preambular paragraph, his delegation thought that the sponsors had had in mind operative paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 1904 (XVIII) which contained the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; in the resolution the word "securing" had been used

whereas the amendment used the word "ensure". He wondered whether it would not be preferable to reproduce exactly the wording of the Assembly resolution.

6. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) said that the phrase in question had been taken textually from the Spanish version of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in 1963. He therefore asked that the wording of the resolution should be reproduced exactly in the other versions of the proposal.

7. With regard to the amendment relating to the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft Convention, the sixteen Powers had asked for the deletion of the words "as evil racial doctrine and practices have done in the past", not because they failed to recognize the danger of such racial doctrines and practices, but because they wished to strengthen the paragraph. Since some delegations had requested that the phrase should be retained, the sponsors would reconsider the question carefully.

8. Mr. MACDONALD, speaking as representative of Canada, said that his delegation had warmly welcomed the draft Convention. He congratulated all those who had taken part in the drafting of the text, the study of which was one of the most important tasks before the twentieth session of the Assembly. Human rights activities were an essential part of the work undertaken by the United Nations to maintain peace and to enable all to live in dignity. The long-term aim was to create a society whose scale of values would be based solely on merit. For the present, it was essential to guarantee for all complete freedom of choice. That was why his delegation, which deplored in particular the scourge of anti-Semitism, wished it to be specially mentioned. Some delegations claimed that the draft Convention should either give an exhaustive list of all forms of racial discrimination or avoid listing any. In his view that choice of alternatives was somewhat artificial. Reference to a particularly evil form of discrimination would in no way limit the application of the text.

9. His delegation considered the present preamble a very satisfactory starting point: it summarized the principles, practices and beliefs inherited from the past, offered new prospects for the future and gave all peoples cause for hope. However, one should know how far to go: the Committee could not hope to make the preamble an exhaustive text; in any case, it was its strength and not its length that was important.

10. His delegation had examined the various amendments and had considered with regard to each one whether the text was worded in sufficiently general terms, whether the thought which had inspired it was consistent with the great humanitarian traditions, and whether the proposal was a reasonable one, likely to

gain wide support, and offering any real improvement. His delegation had also wondered whether the Committee was perhaps not altering the document too much and transforming itself into a drafting committee.

11. After having considered the amendments in that spirit, he had decided to support the third Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.1210) and the first, second and third amendments submitted by Colombia and Senegal (A/C.3/L.1217); he had no fundamental objection to the fourth amendment, but felt that it was perhaps superfluous. His delegation was not opposed to the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.1219), but wondered whether it strengthened the text. It would vote in favour of the Lebanese amendments (A/C.3/L.1222) and the first, second and fourth amendments submitted by the sixteen Powers (A/C.3/L.1226 and Corr.1); his delegation did not think that the third amendment was really important, but could nevertheless accept it.

12. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) saw no need to mention the various kinds of discrimination. A convention should be in sufficiently general terms to enable the largest possible number of States to accept it.

13. His delegation would be prepared to adopt the preamble in its present form and could support only the amendments submitted by Romania and Lebanon.

14. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) said that the preamble succeeded in reconciling different points of view and in maintaining a certain balance between principles and objectives; it was in keeping with the spirit of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which had already been adopted.

15. His delegation would prefer to see the preamble adopted in its present form but could approve those amendments which did not introduce any very significant changes, such as the Lebanese amendments, the Romanian amendment and the amendments submitted by the sixteen Latin American Powers, with the exception of the third of those amendments; there was no need to change the sixth preambular paragraph which reaffirmed principles that had already been adopted and that should be stated again in the same terms. If that paragraph were amended to include new ideas which had not been previously affirmed by the General Assembly, such as the one contained in the proposal of the sixteen Latin American Powers, it would be necessary to change the word "Reaffirming" at the beginning of the paragraph.

16. With reference to the New Zealand representative's remarks, he too favoured repeating the words used in General Assembly resolution 1904 (XVIII). He could support the amendments submitted by Colombia and Senegal, but wondered whether it was really necessary to introduce new ideas which might not be acceptable to all. For the same reason he asked the representative of Poland not to press his first amendment.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that the comments which had been made concerning the second amendment submitted by the sixteen Powers would be taken into account.

18. Mrs. SEKANINOVA (Czechoslovakia) said that, as she had stated on many occasions, the Czechoslovak

Government and people condemned all pseudo-scientific theories which sought to establish the supremacy of any race. They also condemned all manifestations of racial prejudice.

19. Racial discrimination persisted; it had survived colonialism and the defeat of the Nazis. But there were now in existence two documents of cardinal importance: the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Both should be mentioned in the preamble. The new international instrument should be clear and concise and should not omit any essential points: nazism was one of the most dangerous forms of racial discrimination and should be expressly condemned. As the representative of Uruguay had recalled, it was the struggle against nazism which had led to the founding of the United Nations and it was therefore natural that the Organization should make special efforts to prevent the rebirth of that scourge, particularly now that Africa, in spite of the many efforts which were being exerted, was experiencing the tragedy of a racist policy which was a form of imperialism. The power of the racist organizations should not be underestimated. They had considerable financial and material resources at their disposal and were sometimes organized on an international scale. They represented a permanent threat to democracy and peace, especially when they enjoyed official support, as was the case of the German revanchist movements.

20. The draft preamble constituted a satisfactory basic text. Her delegation would vote in favour of the first Polish amendment, the Romanian amendment and the first, second and fourth amendments submitted by the sixteen Powers, but it could not support the third of those amendments, since it weakened the text. It supported the Lebanese amendments but thought that the amendments submitted by Colombia and Senegal should be more clearly worded. It was her earnest hope that the Assembly would adopt unanimously, at its present session, the text of a convention condemning racial discrimination.

21. Mr. BECK (Hungary), referring to the third amendment proposed by the sixteen Powers, said that he would like the phrase "as well as the harmonious coexistence of persons even within the same State" to be added to, instead of substituted for, the phrase "as evil racial doctrine and practices have done in the past".

22. On the question of condemnation of nazism, he considered that anti-Semitism should not be regarded as a form of racial discrimination. As Judaism was primarily a religion, it would be more appropriate to refer to anti-Semitism in the context of the discussion of religious intolerance. It was nazism which had made anti-Semitism a political viewpoint and had created the aberrant doctrine according to which the Jews were not the followers of a particular religion but members of a separate racial group. In referring to anti-Semitism it was important to guard against the use of nazi terminology. Hungary had suffered greatly from nazism, which had claimed many victims not only among the Jews but also the Gypsies and the Slavs. As anti-Semitism was but one aspect of nazism, he saw no reason why the Convention should condemn anti-

Semitism and not nazism, the historic importance and horrible consequences of which fully justified a specific reference to it. Moreover, anti-Semitism was probably not the most odious practice at the present time: why should the Convention mention anti-Semitism and say nothing about apartheid?

23. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) said that he was in favour of the original draft. In his view, the first Polish amendment was of a controversial nature; all racist practices were certainly evil and nazism was a barbarous and shameful doctrine, but to mention the word nazism and not the other forms of racial discrimination would limit the scope of the Convention. His delegation would support the amendments submitted by Colombia and Senegal and fully endorsed the Romanian amendment. It had no objection to the other amendments.

24. Mr. PLAKA (Albania) recalled that his delegation had repeatedly condemned all forms of racial discrimination. He supported all the amendments which improved the draft but thought that the third amendment proposed by the sixteen Powers was not realistic. It had too broad a meaning, and went outside the limits of the question before the Committee.

25. Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan) said that, generally speaking, he approved the draft Convention. He was willing to support the preamble, which was the result of a compromise and had been drafted most carefully. The first Polish amendment would limit the scope of the Convention. Mankind had undoubtedly suffered terribly from nazism but it had suffered equally from other racist doctrines. Accordingly, all forms of racial discrimination should be condemned without distinction.

26. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that the draft Convention was one of the most important texts which the United Nations had ever undertaken to prepare. He was quite satisfied with most of the amendments to the preamble, with the exception of the first Polish amendment; he feared that the reference to nazism would lead other delegations to propose specific references to other forms of discrimination, such as fascism, neo-fascism, Zionism or colonialism. Although his delegation was opposed to discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic or national origin, and condemned nazism and anti-Semitism, it did not believe that that particular form of racial discrimination should be singled out for mention and requested the Polish delegation to modify its amendment to read "nazi practices of racial discrimination".

27. Mr. SAKSENA (India), referring to the same amendment, said he feared that an express reference to nazism might weaken the text of the draft Convention. A historic document such as the instrument under consideration should not be narrowly dated, for it would then lose its universality; it should be formulated in quite general terms so that it would be applicable to the entire world. His Government was second to none in detesting nazism and abhorring its dangerous doctrines and practices. However, nazism was only one form of racial discrimination and the text should either mention all forms or none at all.

28. With regard to the first amendment submitted by the delegations of Colombia and Senegal (A/C.3/L.

1217), he asked the sponsors exactly what they meant by "racial barriers" and "civilized society". He felt that the insertion of the term "civilized society" without a precise definition might weaken the text, as it could be interpreted that racial discrimination was permissible in a society which interested Powers might dub as uncivilized. Indeed, the practice of racial discrimination should be universally condemned.

29. He supported the Romanian amendment, however, since it would improve the text.

30. With reference to the second amendment submitted by the Lebanese delegation (A/C.3/L.1222), while he appreciated the reasons which had led that delegation to propose the use of the word "Alarmed" in place of the word "Concerned", he thought that it was not the States Parties to the Convention but the countries practising discrimination which should be alarmed; he proposed the expression "Deeply concerned" or "Gravely concerned".

31. Finally, his delegation endorsed the first of the sixteen-Power amendments to the preamble but it had reservations concerning the third amendment, for it did not fully understand what was meant by the term "coexistence". In its opinion, coexistence was a contingent concept; the aim of the draft Convention was co-operation between different races, and not merely their coexistence.

32. Generally speaking, his delegation favoured a clear and brief text which would not be liable to be misunderstood or lend itself to different interpretations.

33. Mrs. BEN-ITO (Israel) welcomed the draft Convention and expressed approval of the text as a whole; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel had observed in the General Assembly (1352nd plenary meeting) that there would be no more appropriate way to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the defeat of Nazi Germany than to adopt the draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

34. Her delegation approved most of the amendments to the preamble which had been submitted to the Committee. It supported the Romanian amendment and the first of the Colombian and Senegalese amendments but had reservations concerning the second of those amendments.

35. With regard to the suggestions of the sixteen Powers, her delegation endorsed the first, second and fourth amendments, but not the third, because it considered that the original wording was stronger and should be retained.

36. The considerations which had prompted the sponsor to submit the first amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1210 were readily understandable. The delegation of Israel had frequently stated that, for reasons which she did not need to recall, it could not fail to subscribe to any condemnation of Nazi theories and practices. Nazism was not merely an aberration of the past; it was a scourge which continued to ravage the world and the tragedy to which it had led made it essential that the United Nations should avail itself of every opportunity to condemn it unequivocally. Nazism was not just another form of racial discrimina-

tion and the disaster it had caused should be an example and a warning.

37. The Convention was addressed to future generations, it was true, and its purpose was to enunciate the general principles by which they should be guided, but the present generation, which had known the atrocities of nazism and which had the task of drawing up the Convention, could not fail to refer to nazism. It was tragic in fact, that some could ask, after barely twenty years had elapsed, whether it was necessary to mention and condemn nazism in a convention such as the one before the Committee.

38. With regard to anti-Semitism, which had been mentioned frequently in the course of the discussion, she reserved the right to speak again in due course when the Committee addressed itself specifically to the amendment on that question. However, she wished to state that her delegation associated itself with the lucid and sensible observations made by the representatives of Uruguay and Canada; it was not the time for controversies over the meanings of words, for the problem was too grave and burning an issue to lend itself to such exercises. The Jewish people knew exactly what anti-Semitism was, for it had too long been its victim, whether for racial, religious or other reasons; to those who had suffered from racial discrimination, qualifiers were not important.

39. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that his delegation was among those which regarded the drafting of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination as one of the most important tasks which the Third Committee had ever had to perform; it involved both a work of humanitarian importance and the preparation of a legal instrument.

40. France would have preferred to see the Committee retain the wording of the preamble adopted by the Commission on Human Rights, which it regarded as satisfactory. While recognizing that the desire to improve or enrich the draft under consideration was legitimate, it shared the view that caution was required in adopting new amendments. His Government had always believed, for reasons of principle, that a legal instrument should be worded in general and abstract terms in order to permit the accession of the greatest possible number of parties and to ensure a universal defence against an evil present in all ages.

41. His delegation would not, of course, base its present stand solely on a concern to vindicate the French Government's traditional attitude. It was fully aware that the abstract concept of racial discrimination could legitimately call to mind one particular manifestation or another, past or present, of racial prejudices, and its greatest concern was the establishment of an effective and applicable text.

42. Nevertheless, with regard to the first Polish amendment, it must be observed that the mention of one particular form of racial discrimination was liable to weaken the scope of the Convention.

43. Miss KING (Jamaica) considered that as a statement of general principles introducing a legally binding instrument, the text of the preamble adopted by the Commission on Human Rights had considerable merit. Her delegation nevertheless welcomed all amendments

which could help to clarify and strengthen the text.

44. The Jamaican delegation approved the amendments submitted by Lebanon and Romania and the first, second and fourth amendments of the sixteen-Power proposal but could not support the third amendment; it believed that the proposed words should not replace the words of the original text but should be added to them. With regard to the same sixth preambular paragraph, her delegation could not accept the first Polish amendment, since it saw no reason for mentioning one particular form of racial discrimination to the exclusion of other forms.

45. Her delegation approved in principle the amendments to the preamble submitted by Colombia and Senegal (A/C.3/L.1217) but was not fully satisfied with the term "racial barriers"; she would be happy to hear a somewhat fuller explanation of that term. Jamaica supported the oral amendment made by the Yugoslav representative at the previous meeting to replace the words "to the ideals" by "not only to the ideals but also to the requirements", since it improved the wording of the new paragraph proposed in the first amendment of Colombia and Senegal.

46. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) said that the sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1226 and Corr.1 were willing to retain the original wording of the sixth preambular paragraph and add the words "as well as the harmonious coexistence of persons even within the same State."

47. For the benefit of the Indian delegation, he explained that there was a problem of translation in connexion with the word "coexistence"; the Spanish word "convivencia" accurately rendered the sponsors' idea, since it denoted living together in harmony, thus going beyond the word "coexistence". The Spanish version was therefore satisfactory.

48. Miss TABBARA (Lebanon) said that her delegation favoured the amendments which strengthened the text of the preamble. It approved the Romanian amendment, which introduced an important principle that had been stated earlier in the preamble to the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and in article 7 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It therefore endorsed the Romanian proposal but suggested including a statement to the effect that the principle on which the amendment was based was contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, if necessary, revising the paragraph to accord with the wording adopted in the two Declarations.

49. With regard to the sixteen-Power proposals, the Lebanese delegation welcomed the change made in the amendment to the sixth paragraph, with the reservation that the new expression should be inserted before, not after, the words "as evil racial doctrine and practices have done in the past". She also suggested that in the amendment to the eighth paragraph the proposed expression should be inserted not after the words "Resolved to" but after the words "in order to", so that everything relating to objectives would be grouped in one part of the sentence.

50. With regard to the amendments submitted by Colombia and Senegal (A/C.3/L.1217), her delegation

fully approved the substance of the first amendment but pointed out that it introduced the new concepts of "racial barriers" and "civilized society", which the delegations should have an opportunity to examine in detail before taking a decision. Consequently, her delegation could not support that amendment; moreover, she found it hard to reconcile the second amendment with the fourth sixteen-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1226 and Corr.1) and she requested the Colombian and Senegalese delegations either to withdraw their second amendment or to consult with the sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1226 and Corr.1 in order to arrive at agreement on the wording of an amendment to the eighth preambular paragraph.

51. In connexion with the first Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.1210), she would repeat that her country forcefully condemned nazism. For reasons of principle, however, her delegation would be opposed to the inclusion of that word in the preamble—the principle involved being its stand against the mention of a single example of racial discrimination. To mention one example would restrict the scope of the text, article II of which condemned all forms of racial discrimination with equal vigour. Moreover, it would be unjust to mention one example without enumerating all the rest and, in the view of her delegation, any enumeration would necessarily be incomplete.

52. She wished to make it clear, in connexion with the second Lebanese amendment, that her delegation had used the word "Alarmed" because the word was stronger and appeared in the text of the Declaration; it therefore stood by the proposal.

53. Mr. SANON (UPPER VOLTA) said that his delegation was satisfied with the text of the preamble adopted by the Commission on Human Rights, though it recognized the merits of the amendments that had been submitted.

54. With regard to the first Polish amendment his delegation believed that the text should remain general in nature and therefore should not mention any particular form of racial discrimination.

55. He welcomed the first and second amendments submitted by the Colombian and Senegalese delegations (A/C.3/L.1217) and suggested merely that the word "idéals" in the French text should be replaced by the word "idéaux".

56. His delegation also supported the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.1219), the Lebanese amendments (A/C.3/L.1222) and the third of the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1226 and Corr.1).

57. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom), referring to the Romanian amendment, said that her delegation endorsed the comments of the Lebanese representative; it agreed that the wording of the new paragraph should be modelled on that of article 7 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and suggested, to that end, that the words "in their right to be protected by" should be replaced by the words "before the law and are entitled to equal protection of" (A/C.3/L.1230).

58. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) expressed surprise that almost all delegations thought it necessary to say that discrimination

did not exist in their countries. There were no doubt very few countries in the world whose legislation contained provisions favouring discrimination. But it was surely hardly possible to make the same blanket affirmations when it was no longer the sphere of law and principles that was concerned but that of custom and practice. In any case, it was not the task of members of the Third Committee to report on what was happening in their respective countries.

59. Referring to the sixteen-Power amendments, he took note with satisfaction of the statement by the Argentine representative concerning the sixth preambular paragraph and expressed support of the other changes suggested.

60. He noted that the first Polish amendment, introducing a specific reference to nazism in the sixth preambular paragraph, had been criticized by many delegations which feared that reference to a particular form of discrimination might deprive the text of the general character it should possess. But the sponsor of the amendment no doubt gave the word nazism a very broad meaning; covering all the forms of discrimination resembling nazism and based on the same principle, without regard to time and frontiers, i.e., fascism as well as the discrimination practised in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. He could well understand that the countries which had suffered from nazism—Israel, in particular—should wish to see a specific reference to that doctrine in the text of the Convention, especially as he himself had similar feelings about apartheid, the form of discrimination of which members of his own race were the victims. Since the draft Convention referred specifically to apartheid it might also refer to nazism; and he was therefore prepared to support the first Polish amendment.

61. Mr. SAKSENA (India) thanked the Argentine representative for his explanation of the word "co-existence". He wondered if the words "harmonious coexistence" should not be replaced by the words "harmonious living" in the English text.

62. Mr. SY (Senegal), replying to the delegations which had requested an explanation of some of the terms used in document A/C.3/L.1217, said that "racial barriers" existed wherever communities were separated from each other on the basis of racial criteria, as was the case in South Africa, where autonomous indigenous communities were being created. For those who were the victims of that form of discrimination the idea of racial barriers was as specific as that of geographical or customs barriers for others.

63. Replying to the United States delegation, he explained that "civilized society" meant any normative society guided by an ethical outlook whose fundamental general principles were laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; its opposite was savage society, which was dominated by the idea of might is right.

64. With regard to the first Polish amendment, he thought it better not to make specific reference to certain forms of racial discrimination such as nazism, since the draft convention dealt, as its title indicated,

with the elimination of "all forms of racial discrimination".

65. Mr. RESICH (Poland) said he wished to explain once again that in his view nazism should be mentioned in the sixth preambular paragraph because it was the most flagrant manifestation of racial discrimination and provided a perfect example of the racial doctrines and practices which had in the past disturbed peace and security among peoples; moreover, reference to nazism would make it possible to understand the historical circumstances which had led the General Assembly to call for the convention under consideration.

66. In order to allay any fear that the amendment in question would limit the scope of the convention, his delegation would agree to the addition of the words "and other similar practices" after "nazist practices".

67. His delegation was prepared to accept the wording suggested by the Nigerian representative, supplemented by the words "and other similar practices". If that was accepted the other forms of racial discrimination need not be enumerated.

68. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that the Committee's debates were on a very high level, and he had followed them with great interest. His delegation was grateful to the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities for completing the draft convention, which Kuwait approved in principle.

69. Turning to the amendments to the preamble proposed by various delegations, he expressed agreement with the comments made by the Lebanese representative on the sixteen-Power amendments and the changes she had proposed. He would also support the Lebanese amendments, which strengthened the text, as well as the Romanian amendment, provided that the comments of the Lebanese delegation were taken into account.

70. With regard to the second amendment submitted by the delegations of Colombia and Senegal (A/C.3/L.1217), he would also suggest that they consult with the representatives of the sixteen Powers concerning their fourth amendment (A/C.3/L.1226 and Corr.1) in order to reach agreement with them on a joint text.

71. Turning to the first Polish amendment, he thanked the sponsor for the explanations he had given, but regretted that he was unable to endorse his argument. An instrument which should be general in scope and addressed to posterity should not be limited in time and space, as reference to an episodic and circumscribed form of racial discrimination would necessarily make it. If reference was made to nazism, it would be necessary to list all forms of racial discrimination, which was of course impossible. In his delegation's view, the text under study should be universal in scope, and he wondered if it would not be appropriate to entitle it "Universal Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination". In conclusion, he urged Poland and the delegations which supported its amendment to take the French representative's comments into account and avoid limiting the scope of the draft under discussion.

72. Mr. INCE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation fully supported the principles laid down in the draft Convention and all the amendments calculated to strengthen the text. It also supported the second Lebanese amendment concerning the seventh preambular paragraph, on the grounds that the manifestations of racial discrimination taking place in certain parts of the world justified the use of the word "alarmed" which, being stronger than the word "concerned", better expressed the deep anxiety which those manifestations aroused in Member States.

73. In spite of the persuasive arguments of the Tanzanian representative, his delegation was opposed to any reference to nazism which might give rise to an endless enumeration. He supported the other changes proposed in the first Polish amendment and would also support the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.1219), even if the sub-amendment submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1230) were adopted.

74. His delegation reserved the right to return to the amendments submitted by Colombia and Senegal at a later stage of the discussion.

75. Mr. PONCE DE LEON (Colombia) disagreed with the suggestion that the amendment submitted by his country and Senegal involved unnecessary repetition. With regard to the expression "racial barriers", he was prepared to accept any other expression which would convey the same idea more felicitously.

76. U VUM KO HAU (Burma) supported the Romanian amendment as further amended by the United Kingdom representative.

77. Miss GROZA (Romania) explained that her delegation had submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.1219) because it felt strongly that everyone had the right to be protected by the law, and that the principle should be enunciated in a text of general scope such as the draft Convention before the Committee. She was prepared to accept the sub-amendment suggested by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1230), which did not affect the substance of the amendment.

78. With regard to the Lebanese representative's suggestions, she considered that since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was referred to in the second preambular paragraph, after which the Romanian amendment would be inserted, it was unnecessary to refer to the Declaration again.

79. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan) said he hoped that the Polish representative, who had accepted the Nigerian representative's suggestions, would also accept his own proposal that the words "fascist, colonial, tribal, Zionist and other similar practices" should be inserted in the sixth preambular paragraph.

80. Mr. MANGWAZU (Malawi) said that his delegation unreservedly supported the draft Convention and recognized its great importance. Malawi, whose Constitution condemned all forms of racial discrimination, took pride in being one of the countries of East and Central Africa in which profound racial harmony reigned.

81. He shared the fear that a reference to nazism might limit the scope of the draft Convention and give rise to a listing, necessarily incomplete, of all forms

of discrimination. Moreover, it was not impossible that another form of discrimination, perhaps even more dangerous than those of the past, might appear somewhere in the world after the Convention had been approved. To mention one form or another of dis-

crimination might also create misunderstandings between countries and arouse resentment. His delegation had no objection to the other amendments.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.