

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.2/SR.420
7 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 TWENTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 22 January 1964, at 3.10 p.m.

CONTENTS

Draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (E/CN.4/Sub.2/234; E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.308 and Add.1/Rev.1 and Add.1/Rev.1/Corr.1, L.309-L.311, L.314, L.320, L.322, L.323, L.324/Rev.1 and Add.1, L.325-L.331) (continued)

Organization of work

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. KETRZYNSKI	(Poland)
	Mr. KRISHNASWAMI	(India)
	Mr. MATSCH	(Austria)
	Mr. MUDAWI	(Sudan)
	Mr. SAARIO	(Finland)

Also present: Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX Commission on the Status of Women

Observers from Member States:

Mr. SAJJAD	India
Mr. BARROMI	Israel
Mr. SCHAAPVELD	Netherlands
Mr. QUIAMBAO	Philippines
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

<u>Secretariat:</u>	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.2/234; E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.308 and Add.1/Rev.1 and Add.1/Rev.1/Corr.1, L.309-L.311, L.314, L.320, L.322, L.323, L.324/Rev.1 and Add.1, L.325-L.331) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN announced that working document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330 had been submitted to the Sub-Commission. The document was a new version of article III, drafted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles, obviously in the hope of finding a compromise formula.

Mr. INGLES said that Mr. Cuevas Cancino and himself had used as a starting-point the text proposed by Mr. Abram (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.308), which had been chosen as a basis for the Sub-Commission's work, bearing in mind the provisions of article 9 of the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly at its eighteenth session and also the draft submitted by Mr. Ivanov and Mr. Ketrzynski (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.314).

The authors of the new draft had taken paragraph 4 of Mr. Abram's text as the introductory paragraph for their draft, incorporating in it the ideas contained in the first paragraph of article 9 of the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly. The introductory paragraph of the new text also took account of article 9, paragraph 3 of the Declaration, which had not been done in Mr. Abram's text. Although the text of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.314 was based on that paragraph 3, the authors of the new draft had not incorporated it since they considered that it went further than that paragraph.

Sub-paragraph (a) of the new document was based on paragraph 1 of Mr. Abram's text and on article 9, paragraph 2 of the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly. Sub-paragraph (b) was closer to article 9 of the Declaration than was paragraph 2 of Mr. Abram's proposed article. As drafted, the new sub-paragraph could apply to organizations which might be formed without having to obtain a licence or authorization from the State. It would also allow for the withdrawal of licences already granted and would thus satisfy Mr. Abram.

The other sub-paragraphs of the new document followed Mr. Abram's text and laid down the measures which Governments should take to combat racial discrimination. The last sub-paragraph, providing for compensation for any individual who had suffered harm as a result of racial violence or discrimination,

(Mr. Ingles)

might perhaps form a separate article. What mattered was that that important idea should appear in the convention.

Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO pointed out that the new text took account of the objections he had made on the subject of paragraph 5 of article IX proposed by Mr. Abram; the word "also" in the new text made it clear that it was not only for individuals to make a claim.

He felt that document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330 faithfully reflected the ideas of the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly and that it did not conflict with any of the measures already adopted by the General Assembly.

Mr. ABRAM stated that, for reasons of principle, he felt obliged to submit an amendment and to request that the words "promote or" should be deleted from sub-paragraph (c) of the text, or at least that the word "or" between "promote" and "incite" should be replaced by "and". His reason for making that proposal was that he was not sure of the meaning that should be attributed to the word "promote".

As an illustration he cited the example of a group of citizens which had been organized in California to work for the abrogation of a law prohibiting discrimination in housing. It must be concluded that if that group were to succeed in its endeavours, the result would be that discrimination in housing would be reintroduced and the group was therefore promoting racial discrimination. He wondered, however, whether it would be advisable to abolish a system which, by enabling individuals to submit petitions for the abrogation of a law, allowed them to take an initiative which could also be exercised for more constructive purposes than the one he had mentioned.

In his opinion it was not always necessary to suppress a racist organization in order to put an end to its activities. In that connexion he recalled the case of the Ku Klux Klan, which in the 1950's had been very strong in the United States. At the time he had collaborated in writing a pamphlet entitled "How to Stop Violence in Your Country", and laws had been adopted in a number of states requiring the members of the organization to keep their faces uncovered during demonstrations and also to request authorization when they wished to burn

/...

(Mr. Abram)

a cross. Since then the Ku Klux Klan had lost much of its strength as an effective force. That example proved that there was no need to prohibit an organization in order to stop anti-social activities.

He feared that the prohibition of what was regarded as offensive might prove to be a double-edged weapon. Therefore, in his opinion, it would be dangerous and useless to stipulate that States should prohibit organizations on the sole ground that they promoted racial discrimination.

Mr. IVANOV, referring to article II, pointed out that the word "abstain", which he had wished to be deleted, had been maintained in the Russian text in sub-paragraph (a) of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.329.

Article III appeared to him particularly important, since it related to the struggle against racial discrimination and racist ideologies. That question was clearly dealt with in the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly, which condemned all racist propaganda and called upon States to take immediate and positive measures against organizations which promoted or incited to racial discrimination. The Declaration, which dealt in a positive and realistic manner with the question of the struggle against racial discrimination and described it as a struggle against racist ideologies and organizations, would be an effective weapon in the hands of States. The Sub-Commission should therefore adhere closely to its terms.

In particular, the convention should be based on the Declaration in regard to the struggle against racist propaganda. It had been suggested that "propaganda" was a vague and indefinite term. On the contrary, it was something extremely precise; propaganda consisted of a series of deliberate actions intended to defend ideas and doctrines in speeches, radio or television broadcasts, the Press, the cinema, etc. Propaganda as such was severely condemned by the Declaration. Nevertheless, it was important to remember that the point was not to condemn all forms of propaganda, but only propaganda based on the idea of the superiority of one race over another. In fact the definition was very limited. It was not true, as some people seemed to believe, that the suppression of that form of propaganda would be an interference with freedom of expression; on the contrary, freedom was enlarged when violations of it were put down. That was exactly the purpose of

/...

(Mr. Ivanov)

the document submitted by Mr. Ketrzynski and himself; article II, sub-paragraph 2 (b), of that text proposed that no propaganda should be admitted which asserted the superiority of one race over another; thus the document envisaged a strictly limited struggle and not an attempt to interfere with freedom of expression.

The need to combat racist propaganda and, in particular, to take preventive measures could not be over-emphasized. Action should be taken before racist organizations poisoned the minds of young people by implanting in them hatred of certain races; otherwise the situation would soon be beyond the control of the authorities. That was what had happened in the case of the racist doctrine of hitlerism. If laws had been passed soon enough to prevent the dissemination of those harmful ideas, it would perhaps have been possible to avoid the catastrophe in which the modern world had been engulfed.

In article II, sub-paragraph 2 (b), of the text which he and Mr. Ketrzynski had proposed, the need to take preventive measures was brought out. Considering the question from the legal angle, many international instruments provided for the limitation of propaganda likely to pervert the masses. For example, a Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications had been concluded at Geneva in 1923. He considered that racist propaganda was no less pernicious than the propaganda covered by that Convention.

A condemnation of fascist propaganda as such was contained, inter alia, in the Potsdam Agreement which recognized the need to prohibit such propaganda and to control education in Germany so as to ensure the extirpation of nazism.

The USSR Constitution, for its part, stipulated in article 74 that any propaganda based on the idea of racial superiority or hatred was punishable by law.

The convention to be drawn up by the Sub-Commission should not be more timid than those texts. Racism continued to prosper, depriving millions of human beings of the fundamental rights proclaimed by the United Nations. The convention should deal a severe blow to such ideologies, by placing special emphasis on the importance of trying to prevent any propaganda in their favour. In that connexion, he thought the text of the convention should use the word fascist, which was used in document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.314, because doctrines of racial superiority

/...

(Mr. Ivanov)

were specially extolled by fascists. In addition, that was a clearly defined concept which was not open to differing interpretations.

In the light of those considerations, he did not think that the text proposed by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles constituted a satisfactory basis for discussion, although it was preferable to Mr. Abram's text.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Russian text of article II adopted by the Sub-Commission would be altered to conform to the French and English texts.

He hoped that the experts would conclude the general debate as soon as possible and decide on a working text, since the Sub-Commission had very little time at its disposal.

Mr. CAPOTORTI fully endorsed the Chairman's suggestion. It was particularly desirable for the Sub-Commission to prepare and submit to the higher organs the complete text of a draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, even if the text did not entirely satisfy all the experts.

In his view, the draft of article III submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330) was a satisfactory basic text. Compared with Mr. Abram's draft of article IX (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.308/Add.1/Rev.1 and Corr.1), it had the advantage of being directly based on article 9 of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. In addition, it was a logical continuation of the articles already adopted. He would therefore confine his comments to it.

With regard to the drafting of the article, he thought that in the first line the expression "All States Parties" should be replaced by the phrase "States Parties", which had already been used in article II. The word "severely" should be deleted; article II merely condemned racial discrimination and racist propaganda could not be condemned more strongly than racial discrimination itself. Thirdly, he would like a clear definition of the organizations referred to in the second line of the text under consideration. He therefore suggested the insertion of the phrase "based on ideas or theories of the superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin" between the word "organizations" and the words "which justify". That change would make the sentence heavier and less concise but would make it easier for the experts to adopt the proposed article. Lastly, he thought that the word "initiate" might be replaced by the word "adopt".

/...

(Mr. Capotorti)

Turning to the substantive problems, he said that he entirely supported the first sentence in the text of Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles. The condemnation of racist propaganda was mentioned in it and, as Mr. Ivanov had stressed, that was an important point; that general principle was supplemented by a more strictly legal obligation - that of taking positive measures against incitement to discrimination. The authors of the text had succeeded in drawing a clear distinction between the expression of personal opinion, which could not be punished without an infringement of freedom of expression, and pernicious acts of incitement to racial discrimination. In his view, it was right to penalize a film company if it produced only films inciting to racial discrimination or a television network if all its programmes were designed to disseminate ideas of racial discrimination, as those were deliberately provocative activities. On the other hand, the showing of a single propaganda film or tendentious television programme did not call for positive measures. One had to trust in public opinion and in the intelligence of its reactions to odious propaganda. In his view, the isolated manifestation of an opinion was neither really pernicious nor condemnable; on the contrary, it could have the welcome effect of awakening the critical sense of the public and consequently serve the cause of the struggle against racial discrimination.

He had no comments to make on sub-paragraph (a), but was not entirely satisfied with sub-paragraph (b), because it covered only organizations which promoted or incited to racial discrimination, while he thought that the prohibition should also relate to incitement by persons and groups of persons. He therefore suggested that the authors should replace that sub-paragraph by the following text: "Each State Party shall prohibit all incitement to racial discrimination by persons, groups of persons and organizations and shall, if necessary, outlaw organizations engaging in such acts". Part of that text was taken from article 9, paragraph 3, of the Declaration.

Sub-paragraph (c) added little to the provisions of article II; moreover, if his suggestion concerning sub-paragraph (b) was adopted, the provision would no longer serve any useful purpose because, under the new text, all organizations inciting to racial discrimination would be prohibited, whether or not they were supported by government funds.

/...

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the article submitted by Mr. Ketrzynski, which had just been circulated in document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.331.

Mr. KETRZYNSKI apologized for submitting a new draft at that late stage and explained that the text of Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330) was a valuable compromise but did not entirely satisfy him. In particular, that text made no mention of racial hatred and sub-paragraph (b) dealt only with organizations.

The text which he now placed before the Sub-Commission was based on the principle that, in accordance with the terms of articles I and II as adopted, States Parties should undertake to recognize all incitement to racial discrimination and racial hatred as an offence punishable under law. That offence was defined in sub-paragraph 1 (b). In sub-paragraph 1 (c), he had mentioned fascist movements because, although the term had given rise to several interpretations, no one could deny that all fascist movements were also racist. The text of that sub-paragraph completed the definition of the offence punishable under law.

In his view, none of the provisions in paragraph 1 could be interpreted as inviting the State to go beyond the bounds legality; consequently, the misgivings expressed by some experts no longer had a raison d'être.

Paragraph 2 dealt with the moral action which States Parties should undertake in order to eliminate racial prejudice and on which Mr. Abram had placed great emphasis. Paragraph 3 was not very different from sub-paragraph (d) of the text submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330). Those paragraphs could be included in a separate article, if the Sub-Commission thought it advisable.

The CHAIRMAN said that the chief difference between the texts submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles and the one submitted by Mr. Ketrzynski was that in the former propaganda or incitement to racial discrimination not resulting in or likely to cause acts of violence were not considered as an offence punishable under law.

Paragraph 2 of the draft article submitted by Mr. Ketrzynski contained a provision which was rather similar to that in paragraph 1 of the article II which had already been adopted; he therefore did not consider it particularly useful.

Mr. CALVOCORESSI supported the text submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330).

Mr. SAARIO also preferred the article III submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles because it followed and even improved upon the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [A/RES/1904 (XVIII)] which, after all, had been drafted with the future convention in mind, as the choice of some of its terms showed.

With regard to sub-paragraph (b), which was by far the trickiest, he disputed, from a legal standpoint, the use of the words "shall prohibit" and "outlaw" and proposed that the sub-paragraph should be replaced by the following text: "Each State shall take appropriate judicial or administrative measures in order to prohibit the function of organizations which incite or are designed to incite racial discrimination". The use of the verb "promote" appeared to him to be questionable because it could be interpreted in too many ways, whereas the word "incite" left no room for doubt as to the organizations' activities and, therefore, as to the criterion which States might apply in taking measures against them.

Finally, he drew Mr. Capotorti's attention to the fact that whereas sub-paragraph (b) referred only to organizations, sub-paragraph (a) was concerned with individuals.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was the first paragraph of the drafts submitted respectively by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330) and by Mr. Ketrzynski (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.331) which presented the greatest difficulties; an effort should be made to reach some common ground so that the sub-commission might pass on to other paragraphs.

Mr. IVANOV felt that agreement might be reached on the article III submitted by Mr. Ketrzynski (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.331). However, he suggested that the authors of the two draft articles under consideration should be asked to get together with a view to drawing up a single text.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no common text could be prepared until members of the Sub-Commission had reached agreement on the question whether it was simply incitement to racial discrimination or incitement resulting in acts of violence that should be punishable under law.

Mr. SAARIO said that article 9, paragraph 2 of the Declaration left no room for ambiguity in that regard.

Mr. CALVOCORESSI, referring to the article III submitted by Mr. Ketrzynski (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.331), reaffirmed his opposition to the inclusion in the convention of the expression "racial hatred", which indicated only a state of mind. Furthermore, for the reasons he had already given, as well as those put forward by Mr. Saario, although all forms of incitement to racial discrimination should be condemned, only incitement resulting in acts of violence could be punished, as was stated in the article III submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330).

Mr. CAPOTORTI said that, while he had no fundamental objection to the expression "racial hatred" in the text submitted by Mr. Ketrzynski (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.331), he felt that its use tended more to weaken the text than to strengthen it; if the expression was retained it would have to be defined.

As for designating racial discrimination as a crime, he thought that it would be better to retain the wording used by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles. The important thing was that States Parties should prohibit the act of racial discrimination since it was impossible to lay down the punishment they should apply.

The reference to fascist movements in sub-paragraph (c) of Mr. Ketrzynski's text was inappropriate in his view, for some countries which, unlike Italy, did not possess very specific legislative and constitutional provisions on the subject might use that text as a reason for not acceding to the Convention. Lastly, he thought that paragraph 2 would be more appropriate in a separate article devoted to educative measures to eliminate discrimination.

He therefore preferred the article drafted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330), provided sub-paragraph (b) was amended, for if, as Mr. Saario had said, sub-paragraph (a) applied to individuals, that was true only when incitement to racial discrimination resulted in or was likely to cause acts of violence.

Mr. BOUQUIN said that he too favoured the draft article III submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330), which was a compromise

(Mr. Bouquin)

text. With reference to the reservations on legal grounds, expressed by Mr. Calvocoressi and Mr. Saario with regard to the inclusion in the text of the expression "racial hatred", he proposed, in order to reconcile the various points of view, that the words "with the aim inter alia of exciting to racial hatred" should be added in the first sentence after "promote racial discrimination".

With respect to the drafting of the text, he approved the changes suggested by Mr. Capotorti, and asked that "All" should be deleted at the beginning of the first sentence and that "initiate" should be replaced by "adopt" or "take" and "positive" by "effective".

Furthermore, it would be more appropriate in sub-paragraph (a) to say "shall prevent" instead of "shall penalize".

With regard to sub-paragraph (b), the use of both "prohibit" and "outlaw" seemed unnecessary; he also proposed that Mr. Abram's amendment (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.322) to replace the word "or" after "promote" by the word "and" should be adopted.

With regard to sub-paragraph (c), he thought that, in the French text, the word "agents" should be replaced by "fonctionnaires" and the word "ou" should be replaced by "et", since it was not a question of an alternative.

Sub-paragraph (d) required substantive amendment because it would not cover, for example, the case of a victim of racial discrimination who sought restoration of his career status. The State could not guarantee compensation for the damage, but only a means of recourse in the courts. In that respect, paragraph 5 of the text submitted by Mr. Abram (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.308/Add.1/Rev.1) appeared to be clearer and therefore preferable.

Subject to those few amendments, he supported the text of article III submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330), which marked a big step forward.

The CHAIRMAN suggested, as a compromise that might be acceptable to the majority of members, that the words "shall prohibit all incitement to racial discrimination and shall punish it in cases where it results in or is likely to cause acts of violence" should be inserted after "Each State Party" in sub-paragraph (a) of the article III submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330).

/...

That wording, which would merely prohibit racial discrimination without terming it a crime, would have the advantage of leaving the State completely free in its choice of the penalty to apply.

Mr. MATSCH proposed that the words "each State Party undertakes to:" should be added at the end of the first introductory sentence, after the words "and to this end", in order to avoid repeating the words "Each State Party" at the beginning of each sub-paragraph.

Mr. AWAD felt that the difficulties were not really great and suggested a rapid consultation between the authors of the two draft articles and of the various amendments with a view to working out a final version of the text of article III submitted by Mr. Cuevas Cancino and Mr. Ingles (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.330).

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Mr. KRISHNASWAMI said that if the Sub-Commission did not succeed in formulating drawing up the text of a draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, it should at least discuss that agenda item fairly thoroughly so as to be able to submit detailed views to the Commission on Human Rights. He therefore thought that at least three meetings should be devoted to the draft declaration.

Mr. CAPOTORTI did not feel that the Sub-Commission was in a position to decide how many meetings it should devote to the various items on its agenda. In any event, it seemed to him essential to complete the consideration of the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. However, the question of religious intolerance was a very important one and all experts who so desired should be given an opportunity to express their views, in order that the Commission on Human Rights would learn the opinion of the Sub-Commission as a whole.

Mr. KETRZYNSKI felt that the Sub-Commission should have a general discussion of the question of religious intolerance and then transmit to the Commission on Human Rights the record of that discussion together with the three draft declarations which had been submitted by experts.

The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that most of the experts were of the opinion that the Sub-Commission would not be able to complete consideration of item 5 of its agenda. In that case it would perhaps be sufficient to devote only two meetings to that item.

Mr. ABRAM said that the Sub-Commission should be able to agree on the text of a draft Declaration for submission to the higher bodies, as it had been requested to do. He was prepared to withdraw his own draft and might perhaps join with Mr. Krishnaswami in supporting a revised text, which could be used as a working document.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would have no objection to a two-day extension of the Sub-Commission's session if that was the wish of the experts. The Sub-Commission could also consider holding meetings at night or on Saturdays.

Mr. IVANOV was sure that the Sub-Commission could achieve its objective if it provided for a few additional meetings, as the Chairman had suggested. In any event, the Sub-Commission should complete its consideration of agenda item 4. However, if it was unable to complete a draft declaration, it should transmit the three drafts to the Commission on Human Rights together with its views on the question.

Mr. CALVOCORESSI said that he would be obliged to leave New York on the date scheduled for the closure of the session. He thought that if the Sub-Commission devoted only two meetings to a general discussion of agenda item 5, the debate should take place at two consecutive meetings in order to ensure continuity.

He thanked Mr. Abram for his offer, but did not think that, even in those circumstances, the Sub-Commission would be able to agree on a single text in the time available.

Mr. AWAD did not see the need for a detailed general debate on the question of religious intolerance, which the Sub-Commission had examined over a period of several years and which would certainly give rise to fewer problems than the question of racial discrimination. He therefore suggested that the Sub-Commission should adopt Mr. Krishnaswami's text as a basis for its work and

/...

consider it article by article. In two or three meetings it would probably be able to draft a final text for transmission to the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. MUDAWI said that it would be unfortunate if the Sub-Commission was able to only transmit an incomplete draft declaration or its views on the question to the Commission on Human Rights. Like Mr. Ivanov, he was prepared to take part in the additional meetings and he felt that the Chairman should close the general debate whenever it was likely to become lost in detail.

Mr. BOUQUIN said that he could not agree to Mr. Awad's suggestion. It was a strange coincidence, moreover, that the consideration of the question of religious intolerance had been postponed from session to session for several years. The question of religious intolerance was a subject with which the Sub-Commission was well acquainted but the same could be said of racial discrimination. A thorough general debate was therefore necessary and all the experts should have an opportunity to express their views, as Mr. Capotorti had said.

He was not in favour of extending the Sub-Commission's session and preferred that additional meetings should be held, if necessary, before the end of the session.

The CHAIRMAN said that, henceforth, in order to save time, morning meetings would begin at 10 a.m. and afternoon meetings at 2.30 p.m. If the Sub-Commission thought it necessary, it could hold additional meetings. The 421st meeting would be devoted to the question of religious intolerance, as planned. He considered that the Sub-Commission's most important task was to complete the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, which would be the main topic discussed by the Commission on Human Rights and by the Third Committee at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.