CANADIAN DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY
(FIFTEENTH SESSION)

RELEASE ON DELIVERY

PRESS RELEASE NO. 18
October 31, 1960

Press Office
750 Third Avenue
YU 6-5740

STATEMENT MADE BY DR. A. ANSTENSEN, CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE ON THE FOURTH COMMITTEE, IN EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON DRAFT RESOLUTION L.643 ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES.

Mr. Chairman,

As my Delegation did not take part in the debate preceding the vote on this resolution, we should now like to explain briefly why we voted in favour of it. In any other deliberative body, one would perhaps regard any explanation of a vote cast along with such an overwhelming majority as redundant. I have by now discovered that the Fourth Committee is a very unusual deliberative body, however, and I have therefore requested the privilege of an explanation. If it takes a little time, please don't blame me.

First of all, my Delegation wishes to congratulate the sponsors on their success - I should say, on our success; because Mr. Chairman, my Delegation, and the people of Canada whom we represent, detest racial discrimination in all its forms and will give full support to any reasonable attempt which promises to lead to the eradication of this inhuman practice, especially in the NSGT's. In this connection, I should mention that our Canadian Parliament, in its last session, passed an "Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms". This Act guarantees, among other fundamental rights, the right of the individual to protection of the law without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex. We can now only hope, and diligently work together toward the end, that the aims of the resolution we have passed will be achieved as soon as possible.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, may I indicate why in this case we have voted for the obvious intent of the sponsors and the spirit of the resolution, while having some reservations about the wording employed:

(1) Firstly: we felt, and still feel, that the wording of operative paragraph 2 and, more especially, of paragraph 3 might have been rephrased; not to "remove the sense of urgency" from the resolution, but to fit it to the practical realities which the application of it must now face. We still believe that politics - good politics, I mean - is the art of the possible. - There is a proverbial phrase in the English language, which cautions against heedless and precipitate action by saying that one "should not throw out the baby with the bath." One can readily understand and wholeheartedly support the urgent desire to throw out the dirty bath water of racial discrimination and of "colonialism" as that word is understood here (I trust you could hear my quotation marks); but one must be pardoned for wanting to make certain that the baby is not still in it.

(2) Secondly: the distortion of truth and of the meaning of words in certain remarks made by some speakers in the debate nearly succeeded in turning my Delegation against the resolution. The reference to the distinguished Representative of Ireland as a supporter of "colonialism" has been dealt with. I shall limit myself to one other example: we were told that "only die-hard colonialists would dare to speak against the draft". Dare to speak, indeed! Mr. Chairman, my Delegation wishes it to be distinctly understood, that we shall dare to speak as we please, according to our best judgment and in conformity with good manners and the rules of procedure, I hope; but otherwise, as we please. That, Mr. Chairman, is good democracy where we come from, and in most of the other countries represented here, where people still dare to speak their minds - no matter how strange that may sound to some ears.

I have referred to the distortion of the meaning of words as one of our difficulties. Trouble with semantics is of course not peculiar to this Committee, but a phenomenon which bobs up with increasing frequency in the ideological conflict of the cold war: words, even in the same language, are made to mean different things by different people.

I believe we shall make better progress in the Fourth Committee if we can make our words mean more nearly the same things.

In closing these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote two very brief sentences from the intervention in the general debate here by the distinguished representative of Pakistan on 18 October (para. 6 of the distributed English text). And I am not quoting out of context. The distinguished Representative of Pakistan said:

> "There are no full-time saints and no full-time sinners. There is a distinction between the states whose policies promote racial discrimination and those who try to overcome it."

That statement has the merits of both accuracy and truth.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.