

In paragraph 1 of Article 1 of the present text there is included the phrase, "including persons struggling against colonialism". While we are not in any sense opposed to the idea behind this, nevertheless we believe that this phrase is redundant in the sentence and could therefore lead to confusion. In the text of this paragraph it is Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that establishes the category of persons whose asylum, having been granted by a particular state, shall be respected by other states. If a person struggling against colonialism satisfies the criterion in this sentence, in that he is entitled to invoke Article 14, then this section will apply, whereas if he isn't, it will not. Thus, however worthy of consideration such persons may be, so to particularize them in a general clause is, in the view of my delegation, undesirable.

Paragraph 2 of Article 2 is also in our view somewhat ambiguous. We would have preferred it so to have been worded that it made quite clear that it does not imply an interference with the sovereignty of any state granting asylum. That is to say, we consider that only the state granting asylum has the right to determine whether or not it is in fact experiencing difficulty in granting or continuing to grant such asylum. Other states, whether acting individually, jointly or through the United Nations, should only be free to offer to lighten the burden of the state in difficulties when that state itself has made clear that it wishes such help.

Mr. Chairman, it is concerning parts of Article 3 that my delegation is perhaps most doubtful, particularly as regards paragraph one thereof. First of all, though this may be only a matter of drafting, we find that the inclusion of the phrase "or, if he has already entered the territory in which he seeks asylum" appears to establish a different category of asylees. It too appears to us to be