

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON THE PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND THE PROTECTION
OF MINORITIES

Second Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Friday, 17 June 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Consideration of Part C of Resolution 217 (III) of the General
Assembly on the Fate of Minorities (discussion continued)
(E/CN.4/Sub.2/43, E/CN.4/Sub.2/44, E/CN.4/Sub.2/45,
E/CN.4/Sub.2/46, E/CN.4/47, E/CN.4/49, E/CN.4/Sub.2/52,
E/CN.4/Sub.2/55, E/CN.4/Sub.2/57, E/CN.4/Sub.2/58,
E/CN.4/Sub.2/59)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. EKSTRAND	Sweden
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Miss MONROE	United Kingdom
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BORISOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. CHANG	China
	Mr. DANIELS	United States of America
	Mr. McNAMARA	Australia
	Mr. MASANI	India
	Mr. MENESES PALLARES	Ecuador
	Mr. NISOT	Belgium
	Mr. ROY	Haiti
	Mr. SPANLEN	France
	Mr. SHAFAGH	Iran

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in
either of the working languages (English or French), and within two
working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division,
Room F-852, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or
incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate
symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections
can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations
will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of
the record.

<u>Also present:</u>	Miss ZUNG	Commission on the Status of Women
<u>Representative of a specialized agency:</u>	Mr. STOLZ	American Federation of Labor (AF of L)
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. LAWSON	Secretary of the Sub-Commission

CONSIDERATION OF PART C OF RESOLUTION 217 (III) OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
ON THE FATE OF MINORITIES (E/CN.4/Sub.2/43, E/CN.4/Sub.2/44,
E/CN.4/Sub.2/45, E/CN.4/Sub.2/46, E/CN.4/47, E/CN.4/49, E/CN.4/Sub.2/52,
E/CN.4/Sub.2/55, E/CN.4/Sub.2/57, E/CN.4/Sub.2/58, E/CN.4/Sub.2/59)
(discussion continued)

Mr. SHAFAGH submitted his amendment (E/CN.4/Sub.2/55) to Mr. Daniels' draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.2/43). The purpose of his amendment was to provide for cases where irresponsible individuals might try to obtain certain rights for a group which they did not, in fact, represent. He added that he was leaving aside the controversial question of the definition of minorities which Miss Monroe had raised at the preceding meeting.

Mr. DANIELS agreed in principle with Mr. Shafagh's proposal.

Miss MONROE also supported Mr. Shafagh's views and suggested that the movers of the various amendments should discuss the matter with Mr. Daniels and agree on a joint text.

Mr. McNAMARA did not agree with Mr. Shafagh. To introduce the concept of spontaneity into the matter seemed entirely unnecessary. He recalled that a similar proposal had been adopted at the Sub-Commission's first session but the Commission on Human Rights had rejected it.

Mr. BORISOV said that according to Mr. Shafagh's amendment the fact that one member of a small community did not wish to learn the language of the group would be sufficient to prevent the rest of the population from exercising their right. Who was to decide whether a request expressed the spontaneous desire of a group as a whole? The purpose of Mr. Shafagh's amendment was to increase the number of restrictions and render the original proposal valueless. If the Sub-Commission continued to enter into questions of detail it would succeed in reducing the rights of minorities to a minimum.

He asked the Chairman what procedure would be followed to decide upon the proposals before the Sub-Commission.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN replied that the various draft resolutions and amendments would be considered in the order in which they had been submitted. Once the Sub-Commission reached an agreement on their substance, a small committee might be asked to prepare a joint text which would be voted upon by the Sub-Commission.

Mr. SHAFAGH said that Mr. Borisov had misunderstood what he had said, which was that a few irresponsible members of a group should not be given the chance to represent that group when in fact they did not represent it. With regard to the definition of "minorities", the question should be left for subsequent discussions, but any group should have the right to request certain minority rights if that request was spontaneous, namely, if it was the genuine desire of that group or minority.

Mr. MENESES PALLARES proposed that the second paragraph of Mr. Daniels' proposal should be replaced by the following (E/CN.4/Sub.2/58):

"CONSIDERING at the same time that rights accorded minorities entail a correlative obligation on their part towards the larger society in which they live and cannot therefore be used to threaten or undermine the unity or security of States".

Mr. DANIELS thought that the amendments submitted by Mr. Shafagh and Mr. Meneses Pallares were the same in intent and that the question was purely one of drafting.

Mr. NISOT said that neither Mr. Daniels' proposal nor the joint amendment submitted by Miss Monroe, Mr. Roy and Mr. Spanien (E/CN.4/Sub.2/57) drew a clear distinction between nationals and non-nationals of a State. That point should be made quite clear in the final text.

Mr. SPANIEN said that groups which claimed minority rights should be able to submit their claims to a body competent to determine their status and able to decide whether their request, submitted in a formal manner, was receivable and well founded. Such a body should be the Sub-Commission, at least in a consultative capacity.

Miss MONROE did not think it was necessary to include the word "nationals" each time there was a reference to minorities in the report.

/Mr. ROY

Mr. ROY shared Mr. Nisot's views. He had previously drawn the attention of Miss Monroe and Mr. Spanien to the fact that article 36, referred to in their joint draft amendment, had been the object of a special note by Mr. Nisot in the report. In Geneva the Sub-Commission had discussed whether the term "national" or "person" should be used, and the latter word had prevailed.

Mr. NISOT said that before the war a distinction had been made between different kinds of minorities. He hoped that the text under discussion would include the idea that there were no minorities which were not composed of nationals of a State.

Mr. SHAFAGH agreed that the text referred to nationals of a State.

Mr. DANIELS cited as an example the case of members of a group who, although originally nationals, had later been deprived of their citizenship by the State. Would that mean that they would no longer be considered nationals and would therefore have no claim to protection? That had been one form of persecution in the past.

Mr. SHAFAGH explained that the text under discussion dealt with nationals of a State. The question of persons who had been denied their citizenship by the State raised an entirely different problem.

Mr. McNAMARA said that members could not go back on a decision taken by the Sub-Commission. The text before it had been drawn up on the basis of the original proposal adopted in Geneva. The arguments adduced during the Sub-Commission's first session in Geneva and in the Commission on Human Rights showed conclusively that the intention was that, whether or not they were citizens or nationals, such persons should be able to claim the rights established for minority groups.

Mr. SHAFAGH said that the term "person" was used exclusively in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which dealt only with human rights as such; when the question of minorities belonging to different States was discussed, however, a totally different problem arose.

/Mr. NISOT

Mr. NISOT said that while that interpretation was correct, it was not applicable in the text under discussion.

Miss MONROE hoped that a discussion would not ensue each time the word "minorities" was mentioned in a text. The question had been settled by the Sub-Commission at its first session and she hoped that members would refer back to that decision when in doubt.

Mr. DANIELS shared the difficulties of some of the members. The United States of America faced serious questions with some of the foreign-born members of its population, some of whom were citizens and some were not. All of them, however, were interested in the question of the use of their language, the teaching of that language in schools and its use in judicial procedure. Those groups in the United States were given the limited right of the use of the language in schools.

As far as making recommendations to States which were not giving those rights to minorities was concerned, there would only be Article 36 to fall back on, and many States would not even be aware of the existence of that Article. The application of those rights should be left to the discretion of States, as the introduction of a fixed pattern by which States would give those rights to minorities would be considered a flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of those States. No legislative body would consider itself bound by a decision taken by the Sub-Commission.

Mr. McNAMARA said that Miss Monroe had appealed to the Sub-Commission to consider itself bound by a decision taken at Geneva on the definition of "minorities". While it was true that the Sub-Commission itself had adopted that text, the Commission on Human Rights had not yet done so, and the Sub-Commission could not therefore consider itself bound by it.

Mr. SHATAQ asked Mr. Daniels whether a small group of foreign-born people, residing in the United States for a limited period of time, would be entitled to ask the Federal Government to allow the teaching of their language in the State schools their children would be attending, even though they were not as yet citizens of the United States.

Mr. DANIELS said that the majority of persons belonging to such groups would be United States citizens. He agreed, however, that the point raised needed further consideration. Migratory workers, for instance, should be protected as minority groups but the text of such a provision would have to be carefully worded.

Mr. BORISOV said that the joint amendment submitted by Miss Monroe, Mr. Roy and Mr. Spanien referred to the abuse by minorities of their rights. Had those rights, however, been specified? In his opinion minorities did not enjoy sufficient rights. Had they the right to vote, to employment, to enjoy their ethnical culture? Such rights should be enumerated in the draft resolution.

The Sub-Commission's aim was to do away with discrimination and not to impose restrictions on minorities.

Mr. SPANIEN pointed out that Mr. Borisov should not confuse an amendment with a draft resolution. Obviously Mr. Daniels felt that most of the rights enjoyed by minorities were already covered by the collective freedoms granted by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international conventions and the draft Covenant on Human Rights, mentioned in his proposal. There was no question in the joint draft amendment (E/CN.4/Sub.2/57) of doing away with minority rights, but it would be a waste of time to enumerate all those rights in every amendment submitted in the Sub-Commission. The purpose of the amendment was to prevent the abuse of rights which history had shown could be used by such persons as Hitler against the interests of the people. If the rights granted to minorities were abused for the purpose of fomenting agitation which might cause an international incident, or of provoking unrest in the communities in which they lived, such action would obviously be against the principles of the United Nations Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The purpose of the amendment he had submitted jointly with Miss Monroe and Mr. Roy was to improve and strengthen the rights of minorities, which it was the Sub-Commission's task to define for their proper implementation and exercise.

The Sub-Commission decided that the authors of the various amendments should discuss the matter with Mr. Daniels and agree on a final text for submission to the Sub-Commission.

E/CN.4/Sub.2/44 and E/CN.4/Sub.2/52

The CHAIRMAN placed before the Sub-Commission the draft resolution submitted by Mr. Shafagh(E/CN.4/Sub.2/44), which was on the same lines as Mr. Meneses Pallares' proposal (E/CN.4/Sub.2/52).

Mr. DANIELS said that his own proposal would accomplish the same purpose. The Sub-Commission had previously considered whether the question should be covered by a General Assembly resolution; the advantage of such a method would be that it would follow up resolution 119 (II) of the General Assembly, which required States to submit reports on their implementation of resolutions in the economic and social fields.

Mr. MENESES PALLARES pointed out that his text was an alternative proposal to the one submitted by Mr. Shafagh. The main difference between the two texts was that whereas Mr. Shafagh's proposal provided that the information should be furnished "in the light of the provisions of the Covenant", his own proposal referred to the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That was an important point, because it would be at least a year before the Covenant was drawn up. The Sub-Commission needed the information from Governments with the least possible delay.

Mr. SHAFAGH agreed with Mr. Meneses Pallares' proposal; the text should make it clear, however, that States must pledge themselves to furnish information at the Secretary-General's request.

Mr. McNAMARA asked the Secretariat whether the Commission on Human Rights had taken any decision during its current session on article 3 of the International Covenant on Human Rights, which dealt with information to be obtained from Governments.

Mr. LAWSON replied that the Commission on Human Rights had decided to postpone the examination of article 3 until it had considered methods of implementation.

Mr. McNAMARA said that in that case the Sub-Commission was still in a position to make recommendations. He was satisfied with the resolutions submitted by Mr. Shafagh and Mr. Pallares, but favoured the latter's text because it was wider in scope and proposed that

/the Secretary-General

the Secretary-General should take action through the Commission on Human Rights. He would, of course, be gratified to see the idea introduced also in the Covenant.

Mr. NISOT asked if there were any provisions in the Charter which obliged Governments to reply to questionnaires or to communicate to the Secretary-General any information concerning their territories.

Mr. MENESES PALLARES said that the idea of furnishing information should be included in the Covenant but that in any case Governments of Member States were constantly receiving such requests, which they complied with if they deemed it advisable to do so.

Mr. NISOT said that if Governments were under no obligation to furnish information it might be advisable to make that point clear in the resolution, to avoid any misunderstanding.

Mr. SPANIEN asked Mr. Meneses Pallares whether the term "minorities" in his proposal referred to what might be called "legal minorities".

Mr. MENESES PALLARES replied that he referred to legitimate recognized minorities, as they would ultimately be defined by the Sub-Commission.

Miss MONROE suggested that at the current stage of the work it might be advisable to use the expression "recognized minority".

At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion, Mr. MENESES PALLARES replaced the words "furnish the Organization" by "furnish him".

Mr. LAWSON said that from time to time, the Secretariat sent out questionnaires to Governments. The Commission on Human Rights, for instance, had recently decided to submit a questionnaire to Governments on the question of implementation. Governments were under no obligation to reply, but generally did so if it was within their power to furnish the information requested.

From the wording of the resolution it was not clear whether the Secretary-General was expected to prepare a questionnaire and send it out to Governments, or whether the questionnaire was to be prepared for the Sub-Commission's consideration.

/Mr. SHAFAGH

Mr. SHAFAGH agreed with Mr. Lawson's suggestion but added that under the terms of the Covenant, States party to it should pledge themselves to furnish information which was required of them.

Mr. McNAMARA remarked that the questionnaire on the basis of the Covenant and that suggested by Mr. Meneses Pallares, raised two entirely different questions. The Covenant was still to be decided upon and it might be many years before it was finally drawn up, circulated to Governments and ratified. Obviously the Sub-Commission could postpone action until that time, and Mr. Meneses Pallares' proposal might set the machinery in motion.

Mr. McNamara agreed that the Secretary-General should be asked to prepare a questionnaire. He wondered whether such a questionnaire could be submitted during the Sub-Commission's current session. If that was not possible, a working group might be set up to prepare it.

Mr. LAWSON replied that it would be difficult for the Secretariat to prepare the questionnaire in such a short time and he thought that Mr. McNamara's suggestion to set up a working group might be adopted.

Miss MONROE hoped that the discussion would throw light on what should go into the questionnaire and she suggested that the words "or in reply to questionnaires" should be deleted from the resolution until a decision had been reached on the matter.

She also suggested that until a definition of minorities had been agreed upon, the term "recognized minorities" should be used, in order to indicate at what precise stage of the discussions any given document was adopted.

Mr. McNAMARA felt that the word "recognized" was too vague.

Mr. ROY thought that Miss Monroe's suggestion was merely to use the term "recognized" until the Sub-Commission had agreed on a definition of minorities.

He wondered whether the authors of the two proposals before the Sub-Commission would agree to consider them as one, merely adding to Mr. Meneses Pallares' text the third paragraph of Mr. Shafagh's proposal.

Mr. MENESES PALLARES and Mr. SHAFAGH accepted Mr. Roy's proposal.

/Mr. SPANLEN

Mr. SPANLEN and Mr. SHAFAGH did not share Miss Monroe's opinion that the term "minorities" should be qualified until such time as the Sub-Commission had agreed on its definition.

The CHAIRMAN felt that there was general agreement on that point.

Mr. BORISOV asked that a written text of the new joint proposal by Mr. Meneses Pallares and Mr. Shafagh should be circulated before it was put to the vote.

Mr. SHAFAGH presented his draft proposal (E/CN.4/Sub.2/45) concerning the publication of a year-book on minorities. The proposal being largely self-explanatory, he need only state that he was proposing that the year-book should be published once every three years, not only because of financial considerations but also in order to enable the Secretary-General to obtain fuller information. In connexion with sub-paragraph (c) of the draft proposal, he remarked that groups of experts might eventually be sent out by the Secretary-General specifically for the purpose of studying the needs and conditions of minorities.

Mr. NISOT said that the Secretary-General would be very unwise to embark upon an undertaking involving such heavy responsibilities. He stressed in particular the basic political difficulty of deciding which groups actually constituted minorities before a definition had been established.

Mr. McNAMARA proposed the deletion of sub-paragraph (c), in which the Secretary-General was requested to make certain that all materials included in the year-book were supplied by well-qualified and impartial correspondents, free of any political bias. Such a request might be taken to imply that the Secretary-General did not always act on those lines, an implication which was unwarranted and certainly unintentional. He wondered also why the proposals contained in sub-paragraph (b) should affect only the first issue of the proposed year-book.

In view of the point raised by Miss Monroe and Mr. Nisot with regard to the definition of minorities, Mr. McNamara suggested that the words "minorities" in Mr. Shafagh's proposal should be followed by the words "as defined by the Sub-Commission".

/Mr. SHAFAGH

Mr. SHAFAGH explained that he had had no intention of casting an aspersion on the Secretary-General, but had included sub-paragraph (c) only in the interests of ensuring full authenticity. He would agree to its deletion.

Mr. LAWSON (Secretary of the Sub-Commission) said that Mr. Shafagh's proposal had considerable financial implications. The printing costs of the Year-Book on Human Rights, which had 500 pages and had been printed in English and French, had amounted to \$26,000; the Commission on Human Rights had, moreover, been requested to have the Year-Book published also in Chinese, Spanish and Russian. The Year-Book on Human Rights was compiled by a special staff on the basis of material gathered by the Secretariat. Some of that material was obtained from correspondents suggested by Governments or employed on the basis of their personal qualifications.

Mr. Lawson suggested that the Sub-Commission might, for the time being, content itself with requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a study on the possibilities of publishing information on minorities. Such a study might be made before the end of the present session of the Sub-Commission, and members would then be in a better position to decide on the matter.

Mr. SHAFAGH accepted Mr. Lawson's suggestion, which was also supported by Mr. DANIELS and Mr. McNAMARA.

It was so decided.

Mr. MENESES PALLARES requested that the study to be prepared by the Secretary-General should state the estimated expenditure of including an additional section on minorities in editions of the Year-Book on Human Rights.

Miss MONROE introduced her working paper on protection of minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/46). Discussion had shown the urgent need for a classification of minorities; only on the basis of such classification could an authoritative definition be established. There were many different kinds of minorities, and if the Sub-Commission disregarded that fact it might, in making recommendations with only one class of minorities in mind, impair the rights of other minority groups.

Miss Monroe drew attention to the conclusions set forth on page 2 of her working paper, and stressed that her main concern at the present

/stage was

stage was not to pursue any definite system of classification but only to establish whether any form of classification was possible. At the present time, the term "minority" covered a very wide variety of groups, extending from such static and long-established units as the Turks in Cyprus, the Danes in Schleswig-Holstein and the Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia to small and constantly changing groups of emigrants or migratory workers, which should not be governed by the same rules as those applying to the former category. Furthermore, there were groups in which only the older members wanted protection of minority customs and characteristics, while the younger members were in favour of assimilation; in such circumstances it would be wrong to pin the whole group down to minority status.

Turning to the questions of methods whereby classification might be established, Miss Monroe remarked that the Sub-Commission might decide to work on the matter itself, in which case it would have to remain in session for several weeks; it might request the Secretary-General to prepare a paper on the subject, or employ outside experts to study the question.

Mr. NISOT agreed that classification was a pre-requisite for establishing a definition of the term "minority", but expressed skepticism concerning Miss Monroe's suggestions.

Mr. McNAMARA suggested that members should be allowed until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, 21 June, to submit their ideas on the subject of classifying the existing types of minorities.

Mr. MASANI remarked that the best course would be to request the Secretary-General to prepare a detailed study on the question, on the lines of the Secretariat's paper on the prevention of discrimination (E/CN.4/Sub.2/40). The Sub-Commission would then be in a position to use that study as a basis for further discussion at its following session.

Miss MONROE would agree to that suggestion, but stressed that the Secretariat's study should be made available well before the opening of the following session.

Mr. McNAMARA observed that Mr. Masani's proposal would mean postponing the whole matter until the following session, which might not take place for a considerable time. He appealed to members to try to solve the question of classification before the end of the present session.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was no inconsistency between the proposals advanced by Mr. Masani and Mr. McNamara.

Mr. BORISOV remarked that Miss Monroe's proposal was clearly designed to defer the Sub-Commission's basic task -- the protection of minorities -- by introducing a series of long-term academic studies. The question of classification was a purely routine matter; by concentrating upon it, the Sub-Commission would implicitly admit that it was unprepared to act on substantive issues.

In his opinion, the words "minority" and "protection" were perfectly clear; they appeared in the Charter, in a large number of official documents and in the Sub-Commission's own terms of reference. To embark upon abstract discussions on their exact meaning, discussions which might last for many years, would be to create a diversion.

Miss MONROE felt that Mr. Borisov's remarks illustrated the absence of agreement on definitions and showed the urgent need for classification.

Mr. DANIELS, while disagreeing with Mr. Borisov's appraisal of Miss Monroe's proposal, thought that the Sub-Commission should not allow the absence of a definition to prevent it from establishing a modicum of minority rights.

Mr. NISOT objected that it was impossible to do so before establishing who was to enjoy those rights.

Mr. SPANLEN felt that the Sub-Commission should do more than merely request the Secretary-General to prepare a study on a question as vital as that raised by Miss Monroe. He added that if such a study had been available for the current session, the discussion might have been more concrete and consequently more fruitful.

The Sub-Commission should not forget the substance of its task, which was to give guidance and to determine how protection might best be given to minorities; nor should it overlook the lines of action laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The General Assembly itself had realized the complexity of the question of protection of minorities, and had entrusted its study to the Sub-Commission. By relegating that task to the Secretariat instead of endeavouring to offer

/the General

the General Assembly the help it had requested, the Sub-Commission would admit its inability to discharge its functions, and would thus be failing in its duty.

Mr. DANIELS believed that any attempt at classification would merely complicate the Sub-Commission's work. It would be more advisable at the present stage to proceed on broader lines and to endeavour to establish a single set of protective measures applicable to all minorities in general.

The CHAIRMAN said that Miss Monroe and other members should elaborate their views on the subject of classification and be prepared to discuss them by 21 June, as suggested by Mr. McNamara.

It was so decided.

Mr. MENESES PALLARES presented his paper on the Sub-Commission's tasks with respect to minorities in accordance with the limitations imposed by the new functions of the Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/Sub.2/47). He recalled that, in his opinion, the new terms of reference of the Sub-Commission imposed restrictions upon its functions rather than broadening them; that was why he considered that the Sub-Commission should make the greatest possible use of the powers it still retained.

Mr. CHANG remarked that Mr. Meneses Pallares' paper, like that submitted by Miss Monroe, was very useful for the long-term plan of studies to be drawn up by the Sub-Commission. He felt that the best the Sub-Commission could hope to achieve during the current session with regard to that long-term aspect of its work was to sort out all proposals of that nature and to adopt those it wished to retain; then, with or without the help of the Secretariat, it would be able to undertake the proposed studies.

The Sub-Commission took note of the document submitted by Mr. Meneses Pallares.

Mr. SHAFaq, introducing his draft resolution on studies to be undertaken (E/CN.4/Sub.2/49), referred to the need for reconsidering the resolutions adopted at the first session of the Sub-Commission, and of widening their scope. It was, he believed, precisely because the Sub-Commission was required to carry out studies of that nature that the term of office of its members had been extended for a further three

/years.

years. The studies he was proposing would not interfere with further efforts to work out a definition of basic terms, and could be carried out parallel with those efforts. In addition, Mr. Shafagh observed that his proposal was closely related in purpose, if not in substance, to the working paper submitted by Miss Monroe.

Mr. McNAMARA did not think that Mr. Shafagh's draft resolution need be considered at length, in view of the foregoing discussion on the papers submitted by Mr. Meneses Pallares and Miss Monroe. Most of the points raised in the draft resolution had already been discussed to some extent or were adequately covered by the Secretariat's paper on discrimination. With regard to sub-paragraph (d), he recalled that the Sub-Commission had already discussed the question of spurious minorities at its first session, and that its conclusions had not proved acceptable to the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. NISOT, supported by Mr. SPANIEN, thanked Mr. Shafagh, Miss Monroe and Mr. Meneses Pallares for the useful studies they had prepared.

Mr. BORISOV criticized Mr. Shafagh's draft resolution on the same grounds as he had criticized the working paper submitted by Miss Monroe. The Sub-Commission, which was composed of international experts, could surely employ its energies more profitably than by engaging upon protracted arguments concerning definitions. He wondered whether any member of a minority, for whom the Sub-Commission was supposed to ensure protection, would consider Mr. Shafagh's proposal helpful or important.

The CHAIRMAN stated that Mr. Shafagh's draft resolution would be examined in conjunction with other proposals on definitions.

Mr. McNAMARA asked whether it would be possible for the Sub-Commission's session to continue beyond the fixed termination date of 24 June.

Mr. LAWSON (Secretary of the Sub-Commission) explained that budgetary provision had been made for a two-week session ending on 24 June. In case of need, the Sub-Commission might hold a further meeting on the following Saturday, 25 June. If it was felt, however, that two or three further days were required after that date, a request would have to be made to the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget for an additional financial allocation.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.