

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.2/SR.428
12 February 1964
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Sixteenth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 29 January 1964, at 10.20 a.m.

CONTENTS

Draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of
racial discrimination (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.320-L.322, L.329, L.333, L.337,
L.342-L.344, L.352, L.353) (continued)

178

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SANTA CRUZ	(Chile)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. CAPOTORTI	(Italy)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. ABRAM	(United States of America)
	Mr. AWAD	(United Arab Republic)
	Mr. BOUQUIN	(France)
	Mr. CALVOCORESSI	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
	Mr. INGLES	(Philippines)
	Mr. IVANOV	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. KRISHNASWAMI	(India)
	Mr. MATSCH	(Austria)
	Mr. MUDAWI	(Sudan)
	Mr. OSTROVSKY	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. SAARIO	(Finland)
	Mr. SOLTYSIAK	(Poland)
<u>Also present:</u>	Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX	Commission on the Status of Women

Observers from Member States:

Mr. SAJJAD	India
Mr. BARROMI	Israel
Mr. SCHAAPVELD	Netherlands
Mr. MATSEIKO	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Mrs. NASON	United States of America
Mr. MELOVSKI	Yugoslavia

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. FARMAN-FARMAIAN	International Labour Organisation
Miss BARRETT	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Mrs. MEAGHER	World Health Organization

/...

PRESENT (continued):

Secretariat:

Mr. HUMPHREY

Director, Division of Human
Rights

Mr. LAWSON

Secretary of the Sub-Commission

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.320-L.322, L.329, L.333, L.337, L.342-L.344, L.352, L.353) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Sub-Commission to vote on the substantive articles of the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.320, L.322, L.329, L.333, L.337, L.342-L.344, L.352 and L.353), it being understood that the present article V would become article III and that the order of the other articles would be changed accordingly.

The substantive articles of the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination were adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his satisfaction at the unanimity of the Sub-Commission concerning a document which, in his opinion, was of paramount importance.

He said that the draft convention adopted would be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights as an annex to a draft resolution which he read out.*

Mr. MATSCH, explaining his vote, said that the draft convention which the Sub-Commission had just unanimously adopted constituted a great step forward in the effort to eliminate racial discrimination and an advance over the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly (A/RES/194 (XVIII)).

He stressed that the second part of article VIII (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.352) must not be interpreted as limiting the scope of the provisions of the other articles of the convention, which provided for the full and complete implementation of the principle of the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Sub-Commission to consider the document submitted by Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321) concerning the measures of implementation of the convention.

Mr. IVANOV said that he approved of a number of Mr. Ingles's proposals, particularly article 1 of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321, but that the proposed measures of implementation did not seem to him to be strict enough. He then said that he was obliged to leave and that he had asked Mr. Ostrovsky to substitute for him.

* Subsequently published as document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.354.

Mr. CAPOTORTI thought that Mr. Ingles's proposals were very valuable and deserved thorough study, for which the Sub-Commission unfortunately did not have the time. They expressed the common concern with protecting human rights and were patterned particularly on previously adopted instruments concerning discrimination in the field of education and employment.

At a previous meeting, Mr. Soltysiak had pointed out, not without foundation, that in the final analysis the implementation of an international convention depended on the States Parties to it. Nevertheless he thought it would still be desirable to provide international machinery to supervise the implementation of the convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and to prompt the States Parties to respect their obligations fully and to keep the other States Parties informed of the progress accomplished in their territory. Mr. Ingles's proposed measures (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321) were in agreement, on the whole, with his own views on the matter, since they provided for the establishment of both a reporting system and a special Committee, the functions of which were defined in article 2.

The problem had been under study for many years in the United Nations; the Third Committee had taken it up at the last session of the General Assembly, when it had considered the implementation measures of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights.

He believed that two major conclusions could be drawn from the discussions on that topic. The first was that there was unanimous support for the reporting system; Mr. Ivanov, for one, had just given it his approval. On the other hand, the idea of establishing special organs such as that proposed by Mr. Ingles gave rise to controversy. It raised many practical problems - the method of appointing the members of the organ in question, the rules governing its operation, its relationship with existing organs, and the exact definition of its tasks. It was not surprising, therefore, that the General Assembly had not yet succeeded in taking a position on the advisability of establishing special organs to ensure respect for the human rights proclaimed in international instruments.

(Mr. Capotorti)

In the present case, however, the question was less difficult, for the document which the Sub-Commission had adopted and which it was seeking to complete by implementation measures did not relate to human rights in general but to the narrower field of the elimination of racial discrimination. The Sub-Commission could also rely on a precedent, one, moreover, on which Mr. Ingles had based his proposal: the Protocol to the Convention against Discrimination in Education adopted by UNESCO. Those two considerations should help the Sub-Commission to take a position on Mr. Ingles's proposals and, inter alia, on the advisability of establishing the special organ provided for in article 2 of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321, it being understood that the functions of that organ should be clearly defined. For his part, he would prefer the title of Conciliation and Good Offices Committee, which was taken from the Protocol of the UNESCO Convention, to that of Fact-Finding and Conciliation Committee.

Turning to matters of detail, he said that biennial submission of reports, as suggested by Mr. Matsch, might well be more satisfactory. It would be logical for the proposed committee to be elected by the United Nations General Assembly; but that raised the problem of undue influence, because 113 countries were represented in the Assembly, while the number of States Parties to the convention would be, at least at the outset, considerably smaller. That problem would disappear as the number of ratifications increased, but in the meantime it might be decided either that the Committee would be elected not by the General Assembly but by the States Parties or that it would go into operation only after a given number of States had ratified the convention.

In conclusion, he suggested that, since the Sub-Commission did not have the time to examine Mr. Ingles's text in detail, it should approve it in principle and transmit it to the Commission on Human Rights, as it had decided to do with the revised draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance submitted by Mr. Krishnaswami (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.315/Rev.1).

Mr. OSTROVSKY also thanked Mr. Ingles for his valuable contribution to the Sub-Commission's efforts to draft a truly effective convention which would be a further step towards the elimination of racial discrimination.

/...

(Mr. Ostrovsky)

The measures proposed by Mr. Ingles in article 1 were unobjectionable. The system of reports, which was a feature of other international instruments, was unquestionably an excellent means of control and would ensure the application of the convention. The provision in paragraph 3 of the article was also very valuable.

On the other hand, he had certain reservations concerning the establishment of a special committee, as suggested in article 2; he had doubts not so much regarding the nature of the organ as regarding its function. The implementation of an international instrument concluded under the auspices of the United Nations depended, in the final analysis, on the number of States ratifying it. For example, neither the Convention on genocide nor the Convention on slavery had as yet been ratified by a sufficient number of States. In the present world situation, there was therefore reason to question the advisability of establishing a new special committee to implement the convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination before it was known whether the convention would be ratified by a sufficient number of States. Moreover he was not sure that even in the best of circumstances, a special committee such as the one proposed would achieve positive results.

From a practical point of view, he failed to see how the committee which Mr. Ingles had in mind could undertake investigations to verify whether the provisions of the convention had been violated. It was for States to establish the facts and bring them to the attention of the competent United Nations organs when notified of a violation. That had been done with regard to violations of human rights in South Africa. In his opinion, there was no question that a special committee established under the terms of a convention, even if it was composed, as specified in article 3 of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321, of persons of high moral standing, could not play as decisive a role in the matter as the Security Council.

He had similar doubts regarding the conciliation functions of the proposed committee. The compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice was recognized by only a very small number of States and even then with such reservations that the Court's possibilities of action were virtually nil. States rarely had recourse to the Court to settle their disputes; they preferred to use more direct methods. Consequently, it was questionable whether the establishment of an additional body would be of any practical use whatever.

/...

(Mr. Ostrovsky)

The Sub-Commission should provide for measures of implementation based on international experience and on generally accepted criteria. The objective should be to ensure that the convention was applied. Lengthy and thorough study was required before such measures could be worked out and he was therefore against any hasty action in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Sub-Commission that the General Assembly in its resolution 89 (I) had authorized the Economic and Social Council to request advisory opinions from the International Court of Justice.

Mr. ABRAM said that the Sub-Commission's work would be undermined if the draft convention was not accompanied by measures of implementation as forceful as the body of the text. He did not agree with Mr. Ostrovsky, who seemed to place in States a confidence which was not wholly justified by the facts of history. If the Sub-Commission had been certain that States would voluntarily comply with the principles laid down in the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, it would not have imposed upon them, in article II of the convention (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.329), the strict obligation to take effective measures to revise governmental and other public policies and to rescind or nullify any laws and regulations which had the effect of creating or perpetuating racial discrimination wherever it existed. Mr. Ingles was right to seek to impose a measure of control over the sovereignty of States, because it was not good to let them be their own judges. Moreover, all countries did not follow the United States policy of allowing the press to tell the public at home and abroad everything that was happening within their own borders. Consequently, it was to be feared that if the States had exclusive responsibility for reporting acts of discrimination committed in their territory, the reports issued would not always be in keeping with the facts.

For all those reasons, he supported the document submitted by Mr. Ingles.

Mr. OSTROVSKY felt that his arguments had not been correctly understood by some members. It should be borne in mind that at the present time, international law recognized the sovereignty of States. Accordingly, it was the State which was responsible for implementing the draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. No "supra-national" committee could force it to do so. Those were facts which could not be disregarded.

(Mr. Ostrovsky)

To illustrate the point, he recalled that the United States had not ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide or the Convention on slavery and that no one could force it to do so because the decision was a matter of domestic jurisdiction.

Thus, there was no justification for setting up a committee which would have no power. What mattered was to find practical ways of eradicating racial discrimination.

For example, with regard to freedom of movement, if white persons in a particular country were confined to one sector and non-whites to another, only the State could take the necessary steps to abolish that situation; the committee suggested in article 2 of Mr. Ingles' text (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321) certainly could do nothing about it.

Referring to Mr. Abram's allusion to freedom of the press, he pointed out that the press was free only if, instead of reflecting narrow points of view, it defended the interests of the people.

Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO pointed out that the problem raised by the document submitted by Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321) was one of the most serious encountered by the Sub-Commission and the United Nations itself in their endeavours to protect human rights without detriment to the progress already achieved. Of course, in accordance with classic international law, the competence of a State extended no further than the boundaries of its territory. There had been cases, however, in which great Powers or States, posing as champions of civilization, had intervened in the affairs of other States for "humanitarian" reasons, on the pretext that a part of the population of those States was apparently being subjected to tyranny. Consequently, efforts had been made to provide stronger safeguards against the danger of such intervention. The system of capitulations had been abolished. The territorial competence of the State had been defined. After the Second World War, it had been admitted that human rights could not be violated with impunity, because that might give rise to situations that endangered international peace and security. Finally, since the adoption of the United Nations Charter individuals had become subjects of international law.

The problem was accordingly one of protecting the individual and of enforcing respect for the rights which had been granted him, with the least possible

(Mr. Cuevas Cancino)

infringement of the sovereignty of States. He therefore thought that the United Nations should not intervene unless there was a serious violation of human rights and in order to prevent any intervention by another State.

Having said that, he pointed out that the convention would inevitably have repercussions and that the Committee proposed by Mr. Ingles in article 2 not only would have to draw up clearly defined rules but would have to ask States to accept them. Hence the importance of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321. Mr. Ingles's proposals should be examined in the light of the decisions taken by the Third Committee during its consideration of the measures of implementation for the draft International Covenants on Human Rights, for there could be no doubt that the Assembly adopted different points of view according to the rights under consideration.

He would suggest, however, that following the example of UNESCO, the measures of implementation included in the convention should be reduced to a minimum, because the introduction of unduly strict rules was likely to reduce the number of countries which would ratify the convention.

Moreover, as the Sub-Commission, owing to lack of time, would be unable to give full consideration to the provision of machinery which would ensure the protection of individuals, as subjects of international law, without entailing intervention in the internal affairs of States, he thought it would be better for the Sub-Commission not to adopt article 2 and the remainder of the text under consideration in haste. He agreed with Mr. Ostrovsky that it would be sufficient to include article 1 of Mr. Ingles's text (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321), in the draft convention, taking into account the Chairman's statement, on the understanding that, following the example of UNESCO, more detailed measures might later be embodied in a protocol open for signature by States which had ratified the convention.

Mr. CALVOCCRESSI said that in his opinion a draft convention not accompanied by measures of implementation would be a dead letter. He appreciated Mr. Abram's argument that a State could not be both judge and party and he thought that the measures of implementation proposed by Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321) should be included in the draft convention.

As Mr. Bouquin (E/CN.4/Sub.2/SR.427) and Mr. Cuevas Cancino had suggested, there were of course points of detail in the convention which might be improved. The Sub-Commission should bear in mind, however, that it was not expected to produce a definitive text. The main thing was to adopt a text and submit it to the Commission on Human Rights.

/...

(Mr. Calvocoressi)

There was one other course, which he thought was rather "escapist", and that would be to transmit Mr. Ingles' text with a resolution stating that it had been impossible to examine the document in detail owing to lack of time, but that the Sub-Commission endorsed it.

In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the members of the Sub-Commission would be able to adopt document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321 as it stood, since its provisions would in any case be examined in detail by the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly.

Mr. ABRAM, replying to Mr. Ostrovsky, said that it was true that the United States had not ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide or the Slavery Convention, but that had not been of any disadvantage to its nationals, for there had been no slavery in the United States since the nineteenth century and the crime of genocide had never been committed in his country.

With regard to the question of segregation of different sections of the population, he wished to assure Mr. Ostrovsky that his country was doing everything in its power to put an end to that situation. In conclusion, he said that he was strongly in favour of the measures of implementation proposed by Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321).

Mr. AWAD warmly congratulated Mr. Ingles on his text. He hoped that the Sub-Commission would see no objection to its adoption.

Mr. BOUQUIN pointed out to Mr. Ostrovsky that the international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination was not intended for States which were not going to ratify it. It was essential that the draft convention, like the draft covenants, should be accompanied by measures of implementation. The Convention against Discrimination in Education adopted by UNESCO had been followed, as he had already pointed out, by a Protocol instituting a Conciliation and Good Offices Commission. It would be illogical to put strong provisions into the convention and not to provide any measures of implementation. Accordingly he very much hoped that Mr. Ingles' text, with which he agreed in principle, would be put to the vote and would be adopted by the Sub-Commission.

/...

Mr. MUDAWI said that he was in favour of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321, since he too thought that, despite the well-established principle of the sovereignty of States, it would be desirable to set up a Committee, if only to encourage international co-operation.

Mr. MATSCH said that he approved of the measures of implementation in document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321, which met the wish of the General Assembly expressed in resolution 1904 (XVIII).

Mr. SAARIO thought that the system proposed by Mr. Ingles could quite well be adopted, since in its broad outlines it was similar to that prepared by the Commission on Human Rights for the draft International Covenants on Human Rights. He regretted, however, that the measures of implementation made no provision for the rights of individuals, as subjects of law, to submit petitions.

With regard to article 11, paragraph 2, and article 17, he too was sorry that the Sub-Commission had not had time to consider the problem which arose when a State had no power to report a violation of human rights to the courts because it was not an interested party. The gypsies were a case in point.

Mr. KRISHNASWAMI thought it essential that a committee, particularly a good offices committee, should be established; he was therefore in favour of the measures of implementation proposed by Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.321). In his view, the Sub-Commission would be guilty of a dereliction of duty if it did not adopt those measures.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking in his personal capacity, said that he was in favour of Mr. Ingles's draft, which should be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights as representing the Sub-Commission's views. The debate had shown that article 1 met with the general approval of the members of the Sub-Commission and that the other articles did not give rise to any fundamental objections.

He thought that a convention of that kind was essentially designed to be applied under the auspices and control of the international community; otherwise it had no more force than a declaration.

Some members, including Mr. Ostrovsky, had argued that the international community had not reached a sufficient degree of maturity to establish a good

(The Chairman)

offices committee. He himself thought that that argument was refuted by the facts. It was indeed known that the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, which had been approved by many European countries, included measures of implementation that went beyond those proposed by Mr. Ingles. The American States had established, by decision of their own organs, human rights commissions empowered to carry out investigations and to intervene in cases where there was a violation of those rights. For its part, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which was composed of representatives of Governments, i.e. members of that international community to which Mr. Ostrovsky had referred, had proposed to the General Assembly, in connexion with human rights, implementation machinery which went at least as far as that suggested by Mr. Ingles.

He agreed with Mr. Bouquin that the Sub-Commission, as a group of independent experts, should make known its views not only on the substantive articles but also on measures of implementation, the primary objective being to give concrete form to the commitment undertaken by Governments to eliminate racial discrimination within their territories. For those various reasons, he was convinced that it was the duty of the Sub-Commission to approve the document proposed by Mr. Ingles.

Speaking as Chairman, he pointed out that there were several courses open to the Sub-Commission: it could, as Mr. Cuevas Cancino had proposed, incorporate article 1 of Mr. Ingles's text in the draft Convention and transmit the other articles to the Commission on Human Rights as proposals; it could transmit to the Commission the whole of Mr. Ingles's document as a general opinion of the Sub-Commission; or it could submit the document to the Commission without comment. The Sub-Commission appeared to favour the first course.

Mr. SAARIO said that, as the Sub-Commission had only a limited amount of time at its disposal, he did not think it advisable to consider Mr. Ingles's text article by article. In his opinion, the text could be put to the vote in two sections: firstly article 1, which seemed to meet with general approval, and then the remainder of the document taken as a whole.

Mr. CALVOCORESSI supported that proposal.

/...

The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Sub-Commission to consider article 1 of the document submitted by Mr. Ingles.

Mr. INGLES said that he was prepared to replace the present name of the Committee referred to in article 2 et seq. the title "Good Offices and Conciliation Committee" if that would facilitate the adoption of the text.

Mr. AWAD said that he did not favour that change. As it stood, the text corresponded to the wishes of the majority of the members; moreover, he was convinced that a committee of that kind could not attempt any conciliation if it had not first investigated the cases submitted to it.

Mr. CAPOTORTI pointed out that it would appear from article 1 that judicial remedies were measures taken by States to give effect to the Convention, whereas of course they only derived from legislative measures adopted by States; he would therefore like that expression to be deleted from article 1, paragraph 1. In any event, the words "or other" between the words "legislative" and "measures" made any further precision unnecessary. He agreed with Mr. Matsch that it would be better to allow two years for the submission of the reports, or at least the first report. Lastly, he wondered whether it should not be made clear that the Economic and Social Council would examine the reports in question.

Mr. INGLES, replying to Mr. Capotorti's first objection, suggested that the words "including judicial remedies" should be replaced by "including judicial procedure".

With regard to the time-limit, he pointed out that a period of one year would make it possible to appraise the situation with regard to the applications of the Convention more rapidly. The first report of the States concerned would enable the Economic and Social Council to decide more quickly and in full knowledge of the facts what method should be adopted subsequently.

With regard to Mr. Capotorti's third observation, he thought that paragraphs 2 and 3 of the article showed that the reports would be submitted to the Economic and Social Council for consideration.

Mr. CAPORTORTI said he still thought that one year would not be enough to enable States to enact the necessary legislative measures to give effect to the Convention. Moreover, he favoured periodic reports, preferably every two years; he therefore suggested that the words "every two years and in addition" should be inserted in article 1, paragraph 1, after the word "thereafter".

He realized that paragraphs 2 and 3 of the article showed that the report would be considered by the Economic and Social Council, but he would like that idea to be stated explicitly and suggested that the word "for" should be replaced by the words "for consideration by". He was prepared to submit his amendments formally.

The CHAIRMAN said that although, generally speaking, he agreed with Mr. Capotorti, he considered one year sufficient, since States were not undertaking to give complete effect to the Convention in that period but to enact measures towards that end.

Mr. CALVOCORESSI observed that, in view of the limited time at its disposal, the Sub-Commission should avoid becoming involved in a prolonged debate on the proposed text. He thought that a vote should be taken immediately.

Mr. CAPOTORTI said that he was sorry to have started the discussion, but he had understood that the Sub-Commission intended to study article 1 before adopting it.

Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO said that he had been under the same impression as Mr. Capotorti. He submitted a text to be forwarded with Mr. Ingles's document. He had not proposed his text earlier because he had thought that the Sub-Commission would not take up the question of transmission until it had adopted article 1.

Mr. AWAD supported the text proposed by Mr. Cuevas Cancino. He moved the closure of the debate on article 1.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in accordance with rule 48 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions, permission to speak on the closure of the debate was to be accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure. Since no one had asked for the floor, he put the motion to the vote.

The motion for closure of the debate was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Ingles whether he accepted the amendments Mr. Capotorti had proposed to article 1.

Mr. INGLES said that he had no objection to the deletion of the words "including judicial remedies" in paragraph 1. He also agreed to the insertion of the words "every two years and in addition" after the word "thereafter" in that paragraph. Lastly, he was prepared to replace the word "for" in paragraph 2 by the words "for consideration by".

Mr. CAPOTORTI said that, since the time-limit of one year from the entry into force of the Convention seemed to have the support of most members, he would not press that point.

The CHAIRMAN put the text of article 1, as amended, to the vote.

Article 1, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Mr. BOUQUIN, speaking in explanation of his vote, said that if the Sub-Commission had been able to prolong its discussion, he would have urged that the States Parties to the Convention should be invited to transmit their periodical reports not every two years but every three years, in order to harmonize that procedure with the practice of Governments to submit reports on human rights every three years. Those triennial reports were appropriate channels through which reports dealing with the implementation of the Convention could be sent.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Mr. Bouquin. Furthermore he recalled that Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Awad had proposed that the other articles should be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights together with a resolution similar to that which had been adopted to accompany the draft Declaration on the Elimination of Religious Intolerance. If Mr. Cuevas Cancino's text was adopted, article 1 of the document proposed by Mr. Ingles would be incorporated in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Mr. CALVOCORESSI said that he would have preferred a different course but he would accept the opinion of the majority.

Mr. OSTROVSKY proposed that the Sub-Commission should postpone its vote until after Mr. Cuevas Cancino's text had been circulated.

The CHAIRMAN thought that it would be wise to adopt Mr. Ostrovsky's proposal.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.