

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1374th
 MEETING**
 (Closing meeting)

Wednesday, 15 December 1965,
 at 10.45 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| <i>Agenda item 58:</i> | |
| <i>Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (concluded)</i> | 503 |
| <i>Agenda item 65:</i> | |
| <i>Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (concluded)</i> | 509 |
| <i>Conclusion of the Committee's work</i> | 509 |

Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO
 (Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 58

Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed with the explanations of vote on the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination which had begun at the previous meeting.

2. Mr. BABAA (Libya) congratulated the Committee on its unanimous adoption of the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which his country hoped would prove an effective weapon in the fight against racial discrimination. The adoption of the Convention would rank among the major achievements of the Assembly's twentieth session.

3. Libya had no racial discrimination and deeply deplored racist practices elsewhere. It had been happy to participate in the Third Committee's present effort and thanked those delegations which, through their constructive proposals, had made unanimous adoption of the draft Convention possible. Some delegations had wished to enumerate such forms of racial discrimination as fascism, nazism and Zionism. Although his delegation opposed those forms of discrimination it had supported the majority view that particular forms should not be enumerated. His country had suffered from fascism, which it strongly condemned along with colonialism, anti-Semitism and Zionism. Regarding the latter two practices, he observed that Arabs could not be anti-Semites since they themselves constituted the majority of Semitic peoples. Their religion and culture did not permit them to engage in any discriminatory practices. Jews had lived in North Africa for centuries, contributing to the region's cultural development. Anti-Semitism had in the recent period been exploited, and indeed

at times fomented, by Zionists in order to gain political ends. The State of Israel had adopted the practice of forcing Jews to immigrate from other parts of the world, and the peaceful Holy Land had been turned into an exclusive State where discrimination was rife. Israel practised racial discrimination against many groups, including certain sects of Jews. Its brand of discrimination was the ugliest form of colonialism known in modern times and worse than all the nazi crimes. A number of Israel's leaders came from South Africa and were experts in apartheid. His delegation therefore appreciated the efforts of those delegations which had introduced amendments condemning Zionism along with other racialist doctrines.

4. His delegation's vote in favour of the draft Convention was an indication of its profound devotion to the principles of non-discrimination.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the Libyan representative's remarks, which were not properly an explanation of vote and which referred to matters decided by the Committee at an earlier stage of its deliberations, were out of order. He urged members to confine themselves to explaining the votes they had cast at the previous meeting.

6. Mr. HOYLE (Australia) said that his delegation had consistently supported the idea of drawing up international instruments to combat racial discrimination wherever it existed. It had co-operated with other delegations in elaborating the draft Convention and had voted in favour of the text as a whole. The draft Convention contained several imperfections, however, and some of the articles as they now stood might limit the acceptance and application of the Convention. Article 4 required further study, since in its present form it seemed to infringe individual rights in the matter of freedom of expression and association to a degree that was not necessary for the fulfilment of the Convention's aims. Article 5 attempted to define as rights some matters which would be enforceable as such in very few countries. Article 15 tended to duplicate and encroach on the work of other bodies and would extend the work of organs set up under the Convention beyond their proper field of operation among States Parties.

7. He feared that the three articles he had mentioned might be a source of future difficulties. Nevertheless, he believed that, as a result of the Committee's efforts the basis had been laid for further progress towards the achievement of the objectives of the United Nations Charter in the field of human rights.

8. Mr. NETTEL (Austria) said that the draft Convention was the product of admirable efforts on the part of delegations. Some provisions were the result

of compromise, which was always necessary in a multilateral legal instrument, whose provisions must form part of the internal legal systems of all parties no matter how widely their systems differed. In the circumstances, the Committee had achieved a remarkable degree of success.

9. Some of the articles still caused his delegation concern. His country had a long-standing internal constitutional order which already provided for the widest protection of human rights. In the earlier discussions his delegation had mentioned some of the domestic difficulties which certain articles would create. Nevertheless, in the vote on the draft Convention as a whole, his delegation had borne in mind the importance of the principles enunciated, particularly in articles 1 to 7, and of the impact which acceptance of the draft Convention by the greatest possible number of States would have in the human rights field. It believed that the Convention would be a truly historic instrument in the fight against racial discrimination. For those reasons it had voted in favour of the draft Convention as a whole.

10. Mr. MACDONALD (Canada) said that he had been happy to vote in favour of the draft Convention as a whole and to participate in its elaboration. The Convention was another of the great pioneering instruments by means of which the United Nations was laying the groundwork for civilized life on an ever-increasing scale. He hoped that the Convention would attract wide support and serve to crystallize new attitudes in the struggle against racial discrimination. His delegation had abstained in the vote on article 4, which dealt with matters currently being reviewed in Canada by a Royal Commission; he was pleased to observe that the Royal Commission's findings so far accorded with the recommendations in article 4. His delegation had also abstained on article 15, the provisions of which it held to be bad politics and worse law. With respect to the federal State clause, he was aware of the wide opposition to the inclusion of such clauses in United Nations instruments and in deference to the views of the majority he had not intervened in the debate on that point. He wished to remind members, however, that Canada was a federally organized State, that many of the matters dealt with in the Convention came within the exclusive legislative authority of the provinces and that it would therefore be necessary for the Canadian Government to enter into negotiations with the provincial governments before Canada could implement the Convention fully. He believed, however, that the negotiations could be carried out quickly and successfully.

11. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) said that her delegation had been very pleased to vote in favour of the draft Convention, which she was sure would be of great service to mankind. She thanked the delegations which had submitted amendments and proposals in order to make the text widely acceptable. Racial discrimination was one of the most urgent problems of the day, closely linked with the struggle to preserve world peace. The problem's solution lay not in the adoption of texts but in the implementation of such measures as those prescribed in the draft Convention. The lessons of history should prompt all concerned to take immediate action to eradicate

racial discrimination. In the present age of great scientific and technological progress no one could remain indifferent to the effects on the human being of the theories and practices of racial superiority.

12. She congratulated the Committee on having accomplished so much in so short a time. Despite the widest divergencies of opinion, the Committee had been able, during the course of the session, to adopt several important documents, including the draft Convention.

13. Mr. COMBAL (France) congratulated the Committee on the results it had achieved during the session. It had among other things succeeded in elaborating a long, complex and very important instrument—the draft Convention just adopted. His country, which had always taken the view that the struggle for democracy was inseparable from the struggle for wider respect for human dignity and man's fundamental rights and freedoms, naturally hailed the action taken by the Committee. The latter's achievement was particularly significant in that the Assembly was now for the first time invited to approve a draft Convention, with measures of implementation, designed to ensure the international protection of one of man's fundamental rights. The Committee was thus able to look ahead confidently to its other tasks, particularly the completion of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights.

14. For the reasons he had given, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft Convention as a whole. It had criticized some of its provisions and its criticisms had been reflected in its vote on the various articles. It had been able to vote in favour of all the substantive articles except article 4, and it had abstained on articles 14 and 15, which, in its view should have been made a separate protocol. Despite the substantive imperfections and drafting which at times appeared improvised and hasty, his delegation hoped that the text might soon become, through signature and ratification, an international Convention applied by a great number of States. That result could be reasonably anticipated, however, only if the instrument remained subject to the generally accepted rules of international law, particularly in regard to the formulation of reservations by acceding States. Those rules admitted the possibility of signature and ratification accompanied by reservations, although they clearly proscribed reservations which ran counter to the spirit and principles of the instrument. He would caution against any attempt to prohibit reservations concerning the draft Convention, for such a prohibition would make it difficult if not impossible for many States to accede, and the instrument would thus fail to become a true Convention and a useful weapon in the fight against racial discrimination.

15. Mr. VARGAS (Colombia) said that his delegation had asked for a separate vote on the opening words of article 4 paragraph (a), since the provision ran counter to his country's laws and would stand in the way of Colombia's ratification. His delegation would state its reservations on that provision in plenary meeting. Regarding article 15, despite Colombia's consistent anti-colonialist position, his delegation had legal reservations which it would voice in plenary meeting.

16. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) said that his delegation, which had not been present during the voting on the draft Convention, fully supported that text. Its position was based on Bolivian tradition and laws, and it profoundly hoped that the Convention would help to end racial discrimination everywhere. The Convention's provisions, by becoming rules of law, should be a decisive factor in man's struggle for a better future. The unanimous adoption of the draft Convention gave reason to hope for wide and effective implementation. The draft was probably not perfect, but it was an outstanding achievement in the circumstances.

17. Mr. EL-HADDAD (Yemen) said that his delegation had given full support to the draft Convention as a whole, although it had abstained in the vote on article 13 for reasons of a legal nature. He hoped that the Convention would put a rapid end to all forms of racial discrimination. The Committee was to be congratulated on its successful work in drafting the Convention.

18. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) welcomed the adoption of the draft Convention and expressed the hope that all Member States would sign and ratify it. His delegation viewed the instrument as a great step forward for mankind and the United Nations. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft Convention as a whole, although it had abstained on articles 14 and 21.

19. Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) said that, while the Convention was not ideal, it nevertheless represented a great step forward. Different races and religions lived harmoniously side by side in Tunisia, but her country, far from being self-satisfied, felt that its efforts to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination had only just begun. The delegations which had participated in framing the Convention must urge their Governments to ensure the practical implementation of its humanitarian principles, which must not be allowed to become a dead letter. However, her delegation feared that the Convention had, unfortunately, lost a great deal of its effectiveness when, at the 1368th meeting, the article dealing with reservations (clause VI) had been deleted by a vote of 25 to 19 and her delegation shared the doubts of many delegations about the validity of that decision. She understood the difficulties experienced in that connexion by some States and appreciated the spirit of co-operation and conciliation that had been shown in an effort to remove from the political arena all questions of a humanitarian character. She hoped that the States which were already, despite difficulties, making vigorous and courageous efforts to eliminate racial discrimination would continue to advance towards that goal.

20. Mr. NUTI (Italy) said that his delegation had supported all constructive proposals made with the object of strengthening the Convention and making it as widely acceptable and as balanced as possible because the Italian Government and people rejected any doctrine of racial superiority. His delegation's vote in favour of the draft was an earnest of Italy's moral acceptance of the Convention and its determination to put it into practice. The implementation of the Convention would not only contribute to the elimination of racial discrimination but would also help to prevent even the inculcation of racist ideas. His delegation hoped that

the Convention would soon become obsolete through the attainment of its goals.

21. Mr. SAKSENA (India) said that the adoption of the Convention represented a landmark in the struggle of the United Nations to promote respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was a happy augury that such a large area of agreement had finally been found; and it was gratifying to note that there had been no vote against or abstention on the draft Convention as a whole.

22. The Convention, as a compromise, was obviously disappointing to those who wanted a stronger instrument, those who wanted certain passages deleted, and those who felt that some provisions, especially the measures of implementation, could be more precisely worded. In several instances the number of abstentions had exceeded the number of affirmative or negative votes; for example, one question had been decided by a vote of 16 to 10 with 62 abstentions. Nevertheless, the Convention was a good instrument, and no basic principles had been sacrificed for the sake of compromise. The unanimous adoption of the sixth preambular paragraph was an unequivocal refutation of the theory and practice of nazism which had been so cruelly and barbarously practised in the past, and apartheid, which was practised so arrogantly by the Government of South Africa. Article 1, which had also been adopted unanimously, contained as precise a definition of racial discrimination as it was possible to find.

23. His delegation especially welcomed the adoption of the Convention because the Indian people were partisans of racial and religious harmony and India itself had traditionally been a melting pot of human beings of almost every race. After achieving independence, his country had consistently pursued, both nationally and internationally, a policy of racial harmony and its Constitution already included the basic principles of the Convention, as well as provisions for judicial remedy of violations. One of the first attempts to combat racial discrimination had been made by the Indian leader, Mahatma Gandhi, from 1907 to 1914 in South Africa, that citadel of racial discrimination. He was glad that Gandhi's vision was now embodied in a legal document adopted unanimously by the United Nations. However, the Convention was merely a document. If all States accepted it and implemented it, it would usher in a new era of human rights and dignity; if they did not, it would remain but a scrap of paper. He therefore hoped that the adoption of the Convention would be followed by constructive action to eliminate racial discrimination not in words, but by deeds.

24. Since the Convention was a legal document, it required careful study by the Governments that were to sign it. The Indian Government would give the Convention earnest and thorough consideration because it was eager to play its full part in freeing those human beings who were suffering from the oppression of racial discrimination.

25. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) expressed her delegation's satisfaction and pride at the great victory achieved by the Third Committee in the fight against one of the most hated forms of human intolerance,

racial discrimination. The heat sometimes generated by the debate had been due to the passion felt by the young countries which were disregarding all obstacles in their desire to alleviate human suffering. It was the merit of the Convention that, despite differences of view and background, through understanding, wisdom, legal skill and a spirit of co-operation and compromise, unanimous agreement had been reached on a non-political and universal Convention. It was a source of gratification that the goal of millions of human beings suffering from racial discrimination had been brought nearer and that countries, especially those in which racial discrimination was a problem, would pass from words to action by accepting and implementing the Convention.

26. Mr. COCHAUX (Belgium) said that his delegation regarded the unanimous adoption of the Convention as that essential step which the sincere partisans of human rights had sought for years. His delegation regretted that the issue of anti-colonialism, which had now been almost exhausted, had been constantly injected into the debate, and rejected as dangerous and contemptible any effort to divide the Committee. Despite those manoeuvres, the Third Committee had the satisfaction of having produced the most important achievement of the twentieth session of the General Assembly. That had been accomplished by all delegations working together despite their differences. The text having been adopted, it was now necessary to implement it.

27. With regard to article 4, paragraphs (a) and (b), his Government reserved its right to interpret and implement those provisions to the extent compatible with the Belgian legal system, which was impregnated with a concern for the rights of the individual vis-à-vis, and even against, the State and embodied certain fundamental freedoms which could not be infringed.

28. The adoption of the Convention's measures of implementation was a very important step because it represented the first time that a convention had included specific provisions relating to execution. Those measures of implementation were not, however, completely satisfactory and he deemed it unfortunate that some had shown a desire to turn the Convention machinery into a new weapon to be used against certain States. He had already explained his delegation's position on the original article XIII (bis); that article had now become article 15 and was less dangerous in its new form in that the procedure provided for would be controlled by a committee, which would consist of Parties to the Convention and should be composed of impartial experts.

29. His delegation welcomed article 14 as a recognition of the scope of the right of the individual to escape constraint, through international machinery. He was also glad that the article dealing with reservations to the Convention had been deleted. It would be a serious mistake to reopen the issue, especially in view of the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice in 1951,^{1/} which the Secretary-General had consistently followed. The rules now being worked out by the International

Law Commission also took account of the Court's advisory opinion.

30. Great hope was placed in the Convention, and his delegation trusted that it would be implemented in the same spirit and that a large number of States would take the necessary action to put its high ideals into practice.

31. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) said that the adoption of the Convention by the Third Committee represented a decisive step forward in one of the most important activities of the United Nations, the strengthening of the freedom and the dignity of the human being. The Latin American delegations had taken an active part in framing the Convention because they realized the need to strengthen it and make it legally precise in order to ensure wide ratification. Despite their objections to some provisions, they were sure the Convention would be honestly applied by all parties, would be ultimately embodied in national legislations, and would apply to all forms of racial discrimination, even those not specifically mentioned.

32. However, the text was by no means perfect. His delegation had reservations with regard to article 4, paragraph (a). In its view, that clause was inconsistent with the majority view and could cause difficulties at the ratification stage which could have been avoided by different wording. It also had serious doubts concerning article 21, dealing with the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Nevertheless, his delegation was satisfied with the adoption of the Convention, which had been made possible by the reconciliation of very divergent views. In that connexion, he noted that the Argentine delegation had taken the initiative at the Second Special Inter-American Conference, which had met at Rio de Janeiro concurrently with the Third Committee's session, in submitting a proposal which had led to the adoption of a statement on racial integration in America (resolution XXV) which went even further, in some respects, than the Convention just adopted by the Committee.

33. In conclusion, his delegation hoped that the Convention would be rapidly put into force and would prove to be truly effective.

34. Mr. ESPEJO (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft Convention because to do otherwise would have been to forget the bitter lessons of its people's own history and would have been contrary to the public policy of his country, which abhorred discrimination in any form. Despite weaknesses in the text, the Philippines regarded the adoption of the draft Convention as a forward step, however short, towards making the brotherhood of man a reality. It was in conformity with a section of the Pastoral Constitution on The Church in the Modern World, recently promulgated by Pope Paul VI, deploring discrimination of any kind. He could not say what action his Government would take with respect to the Convention, but he hoped that a recent statement by the President-elect of the Philippines, to the effect that his Administration would comply in good faith with General Assembly resolutions and Security Council decisions in combating the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa, offered sufficient assurance of the kind of reception it would receive.

^{1/} Reservations to the Convention on Genocide, Advisory Opinion of 28 May 1951: I.C.J. Reports 1951, p. 15.

35. Mr. ABDEL-HAMID (United Arab Republic) observed that the twentieth session would always be recalled as the occasion on which the representatives of the Asian and African countries had succeeded in overcoming the obstinate attempts of the colonialist Powers to frustrate further steps towards the elimination of racial discrimination. Those Powers had shown their true face when, at the preceding meeting, one delegation had said that it had been obliged, for reasons of solidarity, to abstain from voting on certain principles. His country, which had always fought against racial discrimination, appealed to the colonialist Powers to give their support to the objectives of the draft Convention and to refrain from undermining it. At the 1366th meeting, the United Kingdom representative had stated that her country had liquidated the largest colonial empire that had ever existed; it was necessary to point out, however, that it had done so only because of the heroic struggle of the colonial peoples. The Committee had also been told of the existence of certain liberties in the Western world; yet when article 15 of the draft Convention had come up for discussion, the colonialist Powers had decided that freedom of expression was not for export. Some of those Powers wished to appear as the champions of liberty, but they had committed crimes in their own countries and elsewhere for which they wanted the peoples of Asia and Africa to pay. With reference to the Belgian representative's remarks at the present meeting, he would merely say that the record of Belgium and of the United Arab Republic showed clearly where their Governments stood. The only respect in which his delegation could agree with the colonialist Powers was in acknowledging that the Chairman had shown statesmanship during the debate and had guided the Committee on several occasions.

36. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that he had invited statements in explanation of vote, not in exercise of the right of reply.

37. Mrs. SEKANINOVA (Czechoslovakia) said that the draft Convention was an instrument of great importance for the eradication of an evil which, having its roots in the past, was alien to and incompatible with the tremendous progress characteristic of the contemporary world. Even though some parts of the text represented a compromise, the draft Convention would have great legal and moral value. Her delegation, bearing in mind the bitter experience of the recent past, particularly welcomed the adoption of article 4 and was glad that, although it had been decided not to mention specific forms of racial discrimination, it had been made quite clear that the Convention fully applied to nazi and neo-nazi ideas and organizations.

38. With respect to the articles relating to measures of implementation and the final clauses, her delegation had abstained in the votes on article 12, paragraph 1 (b), and article 14 because those provisions were inconsistent with the generally recognized principles of international law. It has voted against article 17, paragraph 1, because of its views on the question of universality. It had also voted against article 21 in its present form because Czechoslovakia, like a number of other countries, did not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and because the wording of the article was

contrary to both the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the Court. Nevertheless, her delegation had voted whole-heartedly in favour of the draft Convention as a whole and the two draft resolutions submitted to the Committee.

39. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) welcomed the unanimous adoption of the draft Convention. Despite imperfections in the text—for instance, in article 4—her delegation had voted in favour of the draft Convention as a whole because it considered it an outstanding United Nations instrument and was confident that it would serve effectively to combat racial discrimination in all its forms.

40. Mrs. BANGOURA (Guinea) observed that her country, after sixty years of colonization during which the people had been deprived of all their rights, had naturally given its whole-hearted support to the draft Convention. Racial discrimination was not an African phenomenon, but had been imported by the colonialists, and it had been prohibited by the Constitution of Guinea as soon as independence had been achieved. There were still some weaknesses in the draft Convention—indeed, even the Government of South Africa would be able to ratify it in its present form—and the African group therefore reserved the right to submit amendments when it was discussed in the plenary. Nevertheless, it represented a major step forward, and all that remained was for its provisions to be put into practice through ratification, so that Africans suffering because of their colour would have an instrument to invoke before the United Nations.

41. Mr. MARTINEZ MORCILLO (Spain) said that his country did not practise racial discrimination of any kind. His delegation's vote in favour of the draft Convention was without prejudice to the right of his Government to decide, at the time of ratification, what reservations it might make. Such reservations would not, however, apply to matters of substance. Some of the articles relating to measures of implementation must necessarily be viewed in the light of his country's general position in matters of foreign policy, and his delegation had accordingly abstained from voting on article 21. Some others gave rise to doubt concerning their scope and, in that connexion, his delegation had voted in favour of article 15 on the understanding that the functions of the proposed committee under the terms of that article would be purely advisory.

42. Mrs. DE GROTEWOLD (Guatemala) said that her delegation had been happy to vote in favour of so historic an instrument as the draft Convention. She hoped that the Convention would be ratified by a large number of States, although she shared the doubts expressed in that regard by the representative of Argentina. Her delegation would urge its Government to ratify the instrument as soon as possible, but believed the formulation of some reservations might prove necessary.

43. Mrs. MBOJANA (Uganda) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft Convention because of the importance of that text and for reasons already mentioned by other speakers.

44. Mr. RIOS (Panama) observed that his country, having suffered racial discrimination on its own soil,

abhorred and repudiated such practices. His delegation considered the draft Convention to be a most important achievement, ranking with the United Nations Charter itself and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some delegations had drawn attention to defects in the text, but no human endeavour was perfect. His delegation had whole-heartedly supported the draft Convention and could assure the Committee that it would be ratified by its Government, subject to whatever reservations might be deemed necessary in the light of its domestic and foreign policies.

45. Mrs. DE BROMLEY (Honduras) expressed her delegation's pleasure at the unanimous adoption of the draft Convention which, despite its imperfections and the reservations which some States would have to make, would undoubtedly help to promote greater awareness of the unity of the human race.

46. U VUM KO HAU (Burma) said that his delegation wished, on the occasion of the unanimous adoption of the draft Convention, to reaffirm that racial prejudice and national and religious intolerance were, by tradition, non-existent in Burma. The Third Committee could feel proud of the work it had done for the promotion of human rights.

47. Mr. JÁTIVA (Ecuador) welcomed the unanimous adoption of the draft Convention. The latter embodied principles that also governed the way of life of his country, whose population was the result of a process of racial integration. Although he was sure that his Government would give early attention to the question of ratification, his delegation had been obliged to express reservations of a purely juridical nature concerning article 4, particularly paragraphs (a) and (b), which might be incompatible with the right to freedom of expression and association guaranteed in his country.

48. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) observed that his delegation, having co-sponsored part of the text, did not need to emphasize the importance it attached to the draft Convention. Until the shameful practice of racial discrimination was abolished throughout the world, the international community could hardly pride itself on its other achievements. He hoped that the unanimous adoption of the draft Convention might lead the rulers of those parts of the world where racial discrimination was most rampant—Southern Rhodesia, South Africa, the Territories under Portuguese administration in Africa, and Palestine—to see reason, so that the practice of such discrimination might give way to justice and respect for all human beings.

49. Mr. KEITA (Mali) said he wished to place on record that his delegation, which had been unavoidably absent when the draft Convention as a whole had been put to the vote, would have voted in favour of an instrument which enjoyed such general support.

50. Mr. N'UMBU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation had been glad to vote in favour of the draft Convention as a whole, despite its reservations concerning articles 8 and 18. It only remained for a large number of countries to ratify the instrument, in order that racial discrimination might be finally prohibited.

51. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft Convention because racial discrimination was a terrible evil which still existed and which the Convention could help to eliminate.

52. Mr. INCE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation's vote had reflected its well-known stand on the question of racial discrimination. The unanimous adoption of the draft Convention was a historic step forward in the fight against that evil.

53. Miss TABBARA (Lebanon) remarked that her delegation's participation in the drafting of certain articles was evidence of its interest in human rights in general and particularly in the question of racial discrimination. As her delegation had supported all the articles when they were put to the vote individually, it had naturally voted in favour of the draft Convention as a whole.

54. The CHAIRMAN observed that some speakers had made statements which went somewhat beyond an explanation of vote. As a result, other representatives had expressed the wish to exercise their right of reply and, although the granting of that right might not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Chair felt unable to deny it if the representatives in question insisted.

55. Mrs. BEN-ITO (Israel) said she deeply regretted that the representative of Libya had seen fit to mar the last meeting of the Committee's session by attacking her country and the liberation movement of the Jewish people. While she appreciated that those remarks had been declared out of order, she could not relinquish her right of reply. It was unnecessary for her to repeat what she had previously said concerning Zionism, a noble and ancient movement which had seen tragic suffering and was certainly not vulnerable to any slurs that the representative of Libya might devise. Zionism needed no defence to those who had open minds and were informed of its nature, and any explanation would be wasted on delegations which closed their ears.

56. Where anti-Semitism was concerned, the Arab world had not the clean record it claimed.

57. The CHAIRMAN said he felt that the representative of Israel was entering upon a discussion of matters that had not been raised in the statement to which she was replying. Strictly speaking, moreover, in referring to a part of that statement which had been declared out of order, she was herself out of order.

58. Mrs. BEN-ITO (Israel) said that, having been allowed to exercise her right of reply, she had understood that she could reply to remarks made by the representative of Libya which would appear in the summary record. In deference to the Chair, however, she would say no more.

59. Mr. LAMPTEY (Ghana) and Mr. ABDEL-HAMID (United Arab Republic) said that, in view of the Chairman's remarks, they would refrain from exercising their right of reply.

60. Miss TABBARA (Lebanon) added that, since the Israel representative's reply had been addressed to the whole Arab world, she hoped that the summary

record would reflect the indignation of the Arab delegations on the subject.

AGENDA ITEM 65

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (concluded)* (A/5929; A/C.3/L.1321/Rev.1)

61. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) expressed regret that the Committee had not found time to consider the draft Covenants at the present session. Now that the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination had been disposed of, her delegation regarded the draft Covenants as the Committee's most important item of business. The means of fighting racial discrimination and other violations of human rights would not be complete until the draft Covenants and their implementation measures had been adopted. To judge from the Committee's discussions, the world suffered greatly from racial discrimination, but no particular country seemed to have it. It was, in fact, only through freedom of speech that cases of racial discrimination were revealed.

62. The USSR representative had spoken at the previous meeting slightly of behind-the-scenes manoeuvres in which some delegations had engaged during the consideration of the draft Convention. Her delegation regarded it as entirely normal and natural to try to persuade other delegations that certain aspects of a convention could be improved by changes, while at the same time supporting the purposes of the convention as a whole. If that was "manoeuvring", then all negotiation was "manoeuvring". And in the negotiation of the draft Covenants at the next session, the United Kingdom delegation would hope to manoeuvre together with the USSR delegation.

63. Mr. LAMPTEY (Ghana) said that his delegation, too, regretted that the Committee had been unable to

consider the draft International Covenants on Human Rights at the present session. While his delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Japan (A/C.3/L.1321/Rev.1), he suggested that the words "in the light of the provisions on these matters which may be incorporated in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination with" in operative paragraph 2 of that draft should be deleted, because the Convention should not in all cases serve as a precedent for the Covenants, especially in view of the number of reservations expressed. Moreover, the words were unnecessary.

64. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) proposed that the words "due to the lack of time" in the first preambular paragraph should be replaced by "owing to its heavy agenda".

65. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) accepted the Iranian representative's suggestion on behalf of the sponsors. With regard to the Ghanaian representative's suggestion, the sponsors had used the words in question because they wished the inclusion of measures of implementation in the first Convention on human rights to be adopted to serve as a precedent. However, in deference to that representative's wishes, they would agree to the deletion of those words.

66. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Japan (A/C.3/L.1321/Rev.1), as orally revised.

The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously.

Conclusion of the Committee's work

After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared the work of the Committee concluded.

The meeting rose at 2.5 p.m.

*Resumed from the 1370th meeting.