

Delegation, together with a number of Arab delegations, claimed that, if anti-Semitism was to be cited, then "Nazism, neo-Nazism, and Zionism" should also be specifically condemned. Lengthy discussion took place on these proposals, but in the end the Third Committee voted to leave the text free of any mention of particular forms of racism except *apartheid*. Canada voted against this decision, along with 12 other member states, as it wished to see maintained the reference to anti-Semitism.

The second issue related to Article IV and its relation to freedom of expression and of association. Some delegations wanted to phrase it in such a way as to make it obligatory for states parties to prohibit organizations which promoted discrimination, even when incitement to violence was not involved, while others were concerned that such a stipulation could be construed as infringing upon and endangering freedom of expression and of association. A compromise was finally arrived at, which took the form of a reference to another article of the convention which stipulated that certain rights must be maintained and respected. Although Article IV as revised was approved by a large majority, Canada and other Western states abstained when certain paragraphs of the article were put to the vote, as they did not meet completely the concern that they had expressed earlier. The third point, discussed at length, concerned measures of implementation. From the outset, most of the Western delegations favoured strong measures of implementation which went beyond a simple reporting procedure, but a number of other delegations were initially reluctant to accept this view. During the debate, however, most of them changed their position and agreed not only to a system of reports whereby signatory states had to report periodically on the steps which they had taken to give effect to the convention but also to a procedure which would make it possible for a signatory state to complain to a special committee set up under the convention if, in its view, another signatory state was not carrying out its obligations under the convention. In what was perhaps the most notable feature of the convention, it was also agreed to allow individuals in states parties to appeal directly, if their governments so allowed, to the special committee if they considered that they were victims of a violation of the convention. A fourth provision, recommended by a number of Afro-Asian members, related to the receipt and handling by the committee of copies of petitions from individuals in overseas territories, even if the administering powers concerned were not states parties to the convention. Canada and other Western delegations abstained in the vote on this proposal because they were opposed to the principle and precedent involved.

The convention, as amended, received the unanimous approval of the Assembly. The Canadian Delegate, in explaining his vote, said that: