



Wednesday, 16 October 1957,  
 at 10.45 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 33: Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (continued)	
Article 14 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (continued) . . . . .	99

**Chairman: Mrs. Aase LIONAES (Norway).**

**AGENDA ITEM 33**

**Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (E/2573, annexes I, II and III, A/2907 and Add.1-2, A/2910 and Add.1-6, A/2929, A/3077, A/C.3/L.460, A/3525, A/3588, A/3621, A/C.3/L.617-624) (continued)**

**ARTICLE 14 OF THE DRAFT COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (E/2573, ANNEX I A) (continued)**

1. Mr. TEJERA (Uruguay) said that he had some brief observations to make on article 14 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/2573, annex I A) and on the amendments proposed by various delegations.
2. His delegation would vote in favour of the Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.624) to paragraph 1.
3. Paragraph 2(b) seemed unsatisfactory, as the exact meaning of the words "technical and professional secondary education" was not clear. In Uruguay technical education was primarily the responsibility of the university. There was also a Labour University comprising *inter alia* a School of Arts and Crafts. The Uruguayan delegation would be unable to vote in favour of paragraph 2 (b) unless the phrase relating to technical and professional secondary education was deleted. In addition, some alternative should be found for the words "made progressively free". The provision of free education should in fact be an immediate objective. While perfectly aware of the difficulties some countries faced in that respect, he considered it necessary for a principle of fundamental importance to be clearly enunciated.
4. He shared the doubts which had been expressed about the use of the word "merit" in paragraph 2(c). Governments should not be allowed to use it as a pretext for arbitrary selection. In that sub-paragraph too, the words "progressively free" should be replaced by "completely free".
5. In paragraph 3 it was of no great moment whether the word "liberty" or the word "right" of parents was used, for no basic issue was involved. He personally, however, would prefer the word "right". In his view the retention of the phrase concerning "such minimum educational standards as may be laid down or approved by the State" was essential. Education was responsible for forming the national character, inculcating a civic sense and giving

citizens an understanding of their country's institutions. The State could not allow fundamental ideas to be under-emphasized or deliberately distorted.

6. U KO KO GYI (Burma) said that provisions of article 14 were broadly in line with his country's educational policy. The Burmese Constitution proclaimed the right to education and laid down the principle that primary education should be compulsory and free. In practice, education was free up to university level, and in addition scholarships were awarded to needy or specially gifted students.

7. The Burmese Government had doubled the number of primary schools since the Second World War. Most schools were now public, though there were some private schools, a fact which showed that freedom of education was respected in Burma. Owing to the shortage of school buildings and teachers, it had not yet proved possible to make primary education compulsory throughout the country, but only in certain selected districts.

8. Burma was also continuing its efforts with regard to secondary and higher education, and was carrying out a fundamental education programme which had earned the praise of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

9. The Burmese delegation was prepared to vote for article 14 as it stood. It would support any amendments which improved on the original text or strengthened the various principles laid down in it.

10. Mr. BRATANOV (Bulgaria) said he was in complete agreement with the substance and form of article 14. After briefly reviewing the history of public education in Bulgaria, he pointed out that article 79 of the Bulgarian Constitution proclaimed the right to education—which was required to be secular and to have a democratic and progressive spirit—and the right of minorities to be educated in their vernacular and to develop their national culture. Primary education was compulsory and free. Moreover, article 79 of the Constitution did not consist solely of a declaration; it provided for the setting up of schools, educational institutions and universities and for the awarding of scholarships. Those provisions had been given specific effect in various legislative measures.

11. He quoted statistics to illustrate the progress made in his country since the Second World War. There was no longer a single locality without at least a primary school, whereas there had been 1,658 in 1943-1944. At that time 100,000 children had not been attending school. Almost all children now received a primary education.

12. In contrast, the educational situation in the world

as a whole remained disturbing, especially in the under-developed countries. Half the inhabitants of the world were illiterate; worse still, half the children were not attending any school, as the Report on the World Social Situation (E/CN.5/324/Rev.1) showed. Some countries in Latin America were particularly ill served: for example Paraguay, where 48 per cent of the children of school age had no access to education, and Chile, where 370,000 children were not attending primary school. In colonies and dependent territories the situation was even less satisfactory. Indeed, it left something to be desired even in some industrial countries: it was common knowledge that many children had to endure racial discrimination in the United States of America.

13. The Bulgarian delegation did not propose to submit any amendments to article 14. It would suggest, however, that the article should mention the right of national minorities to education in their mother tongue, which would ensure the full development of the human personality. Moreover, in order to make the article more specific, it was necessary to amplify it by including provision for some practical measures along the lines proposed by Romania (A/C.3/L.620).

14. The provision proposed in the Irish amendment (A/C.3/L.617, point 2) was not acceptable. The existing text of article 14, paragraph 3, was perfectly clear and adequately safeguarded the rights of parents. Furthermore, the Irish amendment would have the effect of putting private establishments in a privileged position and removing them from the appropriate State control. It was to be hoped, therefore, that the Irish representative would be willing to withdraw her amendment. If it was retained, it should be amended by the insertion of the phrase "subject always to the requirement that the education provided in such institutions shall be in conformity with the principles and objectives set forth in paragraph 1 of this article", after the words "educational institutions" and by the addition of the words "and that such schools shall be equally accessible to all without discrimination of any kind" to the end of the text.

15. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) said that article 14 was one of the most important articles in the draft Covenant. For Belgium, the principle that education should be accessible to all, at all levels, without discrimination of any kind, was the corner-stone of genuine human freedom. She had, however, some misgivings about article 14 in its existing form.

16. The general ideas embodied in paragraph 1 had long been applied in Belgium. But in the interests of clarity the Belgian delegation proposed a different text for the paragraph (A/C.3/L.623); it proposed the inclusion of a reference to the ideas of human dignity and respect for moral and spiritual values, of which human rights and fundamental freedoms were only one aspect.

17. The Belgian delegation considered the words "It is understood" in paragraph 2 inappropriate to an international covenant, and would therefore vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.621, point 2). Sub-paragraph (a) called for no particular comment; primary education had been compulsory and free in Belgium since 1914. On the other hand, the Belgian delegation proposed that sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) should be replaced by the text set forth in its amendment (A/C.3/L.623). In her country, fees were in principle payable for secondary, teacher-

training, technical and higher education, though the cost was low. The Belgian Government awarded many scholarships and grants to assist needy students; it was currently considering the adoption of an in-training wage system. While it was certainly desirable that secondary education should be generally available and that higher education should be made accessible to all—and in certain countries the only way to achieve that was to make education free—the provision of free education should be regarded as a means rather than an end in itself, since in higher education, for example, the same result could be achieved by instituting an in-training wage.

18. With regard to paragraph 3, freedom of education was guaranteed under the Belgian Constitution and about 50 per cent of Belgian children attended private schools. Any encroachment on parents' freedom of choice was a legal offence. Children could receive religious training even at public schools, but such training was never compulsory. For that reason the Belgian delegation wished to amend the concluding words of paragraph 3 to read: "in conformity with their religious and philosophical convictions" in order to respect the rights of agnostic parents.

19. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) said that his delegation attached special importance to the considerations that had led to the drafting of article 14. Education played an important part in training men and women who could further social progress.

20. The Romanian Constitution guaranteed the rights of all to education, which was ensured by an ever-widening network of primary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, by a system of scholarships, and by organization of free vocational training in factories and villages. Education was free for seven years and compulsory for four. Illiteracy had almost completely disappeared in Romania. In addition, the State took care to see that the influence which broadcasting, the cinema and the Press exercised on young people was characterized by respect for the same ethical principles as the school endeavoured to inculcate in the young. Considerable importance was attached to the role of the family; it was felt that there should be co-operation rather than competition between the family and the school.

21. After commenting on the unsatisfactory state of education in the world at large, he went on to say that he found the text of article 14 acceptable as it stood. Nevertheless, it was not enough to state principles; it was also necessary to specify the measures that should be taken by the State if the right to education was not to remain an empty promise. In particular, the State should provide the necessary material basis by providing buildings, establishing new schools, granting scholarships and improving the quality of teaching staff. His delegation had therefore presented an amendment (A/C.3/L.620), which he hoped would be supported by many other delegations.

22. Mr. SAMY (Egypt) considered that article 14 was one of the most important in the draft Covenant, since it embodied basic principles. Every individual, whatever his religion, colour or race, had the right to education. Educational policy must be solely designed to protect the interests of the people concerned, and could not therefore be imposed from without.

23. The Egyptian Government was engaged in attacking the serious problem of illiteracy it had inherited after forty years of foreign occupation. In 1946 only 18 per cent of the population had been able to read and write. Fundamental education centres had been established in the villages of Sirs-el-Laiyana and Al Manayil, and the authorities had carried out experimental studies aimed at eradicating adult illiteracy in co-operation with UNESCO. In rural areas community social centres provided educational facilities for both adults and children. The Institute of Popular Culture offered a wide range of courses to adults who could read and write (in commercial subjects, the arts, industries, languages, domestic economy, vocational training, and so forth). Egypt was also giving neighbouring countries any help they might need in regard to education. The role played by the ancient University of Al-Azhar in the Moslem world was well-known.

24. Most of the principles stated in article 14 were in accordance with the provisions of the Egyptian Constitution, under which primary and secondary education were free and compulsory for all. Although the article substantially reflected the desires and hopes of the peoples of the world, it was not entirely satisfactory. In particular he felt that it was out of place to refer to discrimination, racial or other, in an article dealing with freedom of education. It would be better to draft a separate article enumerating all forms of discrimination, to which reference could be made where appropriate. Moreover, the fact that religious education was mentioned only at the end of the paragraph tended to minimize the importance of that type of education. It was of such importance, socially and culturally, that it would be better to deal with it in a separate article.

25. He considered that since the various amendments proposed were not conflicting, it should be possible for their sponsors to agree on a single text acceptable to all. He hoped that that text would embody the good features of the individual amendments.

26. Mr. ALDUNATE (Chile) said that his delegation supported the existing text of article 14. It recognized however, that the text still had its weak points and would support any amendments which would improve but not weaken it.

27. Like the representatives of Guatemala and Ecuador, who had joined him in sponsoring amendments (A/C.3/L.619 and Corr. 1), he felt that the words "racial hatred" were out of place in the article, since they introduced a negative element. Nevertheless, if that amendment was not accepted, he would vote in favour of the original text.

28. He regretted that he did not have detailed information in his possession that would enable him to refute what he considered to be the erroneous statements made by the representative of Bulgaria about illiteracy in Chile. He would merely point out that in his country primary education had been compulsory for fifty years, and that Chile had sent teachers on missions to many different parts of Latin America and that their competence was highly esteemed. Relations between private and State schools were excellent, and he paid a tribute to the high quality of the instruction given in private Catholic institutions.

29. In conclusion, he stressed the need to proceed more rapidly with the examination of the draft Covenants. He thought representatives should refrain from embarking on broad philosophic discussions, and from giving unduly detailed accounts of the situation in their own countries.

30. Mr. ASIROGLU (Turkey) said that the principles expressed in article 14 were recognized in the Turkish Constitution. Primary education was compulsory for all children and, like secondary and higher education, was available free of charge to all, to aliens as well as to Turkish citizens, in the State schools. Secondary education was being introduced gradually throughout Turkey as part of a large-scale programme to develop education at all levels. Scholarships and other forms of assistance were awarded to pupils and students solely on merit. The Government's anti-illiteracy campaign had included fundamental education programmes, which had been highly successful.

31. His delegation felt that parents had the right to choose the kind of education they wished their children to have. Education should be free, but it should nevertheless meet the standards established by the State. It was also necessary that States parties to the Covenants should recognize the right of parents to give their children a religious education that accorded with their own beliefs. In Turkey all religious communities had the right to open and run their own schools, provided that their curricula were approved by the Ministry of Education.

32. His delegation would vote in favour of article 14. He felt that there would be no point in adding the paragraph proposed by Ireland (A/C.3/L.617), since none of the provisions of the existing text precluded the establishment of the schools provided for in that paragraph. He was quite prepared to agree to the replacement of the word "liberty" by the word "right", but he could not accept the phrase "means towards education" instead of "schools" in paragraph 3, and would therefore vote against that point of the Irish amendments. Parents could not be allowed to keep their children away from school altogether on the ground that they had the right to teach them at home if they so wished. The Turkish Constitution recognized and respected the rights of parents and guardians in the matter of education, but it stipulated that primary education should be given by qualified teachers in primary schools with curricula conforming to the standards laid down by the State.

33. His delegation would vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.621). The amendments proposed by Belgium (A/C.3/L.623) and by Chile, Ecuador and Guatemala (A/C.3/L.619 and Corr.1) involved changes of drafting rather than of substance. The amendment proposed by the three Latin American delegations was less satisfactory than the Belgian amendment, which had the great merit of making the text clearer and easier to understand. The Turkish delegation would therefore vote for the Belgian proposals, with the exception of the one relating to paragraph 3, and it would abstain in the vote on the amendment submitted by Chile, Ecuador and Guatemala. It would also abstain on the texts submitted by the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.618), the Philippines (A/C.3/L.622), Peru (A/C.3/L.624) and Romania (A/C.3/L.620). The Romanian proposal embodied some

useful suggestions, but he thought it better for the draft Covenant not to be unduly detailed. It would be preferable to adopt guiding principles and standards and leave it to Governments to take whatever measures they considered necessary to ensure their application.

34. Mr. HASTAD (Sweden) said that he would support the text of article 14 as it stood. However, in order to avoid referring to racial hatred twice in the same paragraph, the Committee might adopt the new text of paragraph 1 proposed by Peru (A/C.3/L.624).

35. Explaining his delegation's position with regard to paragraph 3, he said that, under the traditional Swedish system of education, religious instruction was compulsory in primary and secondary schools for all children who were members of the State Church. The only children who were exempted were those whose parents had left the Church or had never belonged to it. That practice, which had been followed for centuries, had the approval of most of the population, who did not consider it an infringement of their rights and freedoms.

36. In the Council of Europe, when Sweden had ratified the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and an additional protocol which was almost identical in content with paragraph 3 of article 14, the Swedish Government had made a reservation on that point. It might be possible to change the wording of paragraph 3 in order to take into account the existing system of religious education in Sweden and some other countries.

37. Mr. ROJAS (Venezuela) had no comments to make on the substance of article 14. The principles it set forth were recognized by the Constitution and laws of Venezuela, where primary education had been compulsory and free since 1870. Secondary education was free also and higher education had been free until four or five years ago, when the Government had introduced, as an experiment, a higher educational system on a fee-paying basis, which had proved most successful.

38. As the essential purpose of education was to encourage the full development of the human personality, it would be well to give that aim more emphasis by stating it in a separate paragraph. He did not wish to make a formal proposal but he would like to have the UNESCO representative's views on his suggestion.

39. His delegation concurred with several other delegations which had objected to the words "the suppression of all incitement to racial and other hatred" in paragraph 1 of article 14. Such a negative clause was superfluous, particularly as, later in the same paragraph, it was stated that education "shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial, ethnic and religious groups". The amendments to paragraph 2 submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.621) and Peru (A/C.3/L.624) were similar. As his delegation preferred the word "recognize" to the word "ensure", it would support the United Kingdom proposal. As the meaning of the expression "on the basis of merit" in paragraph 2(c) was not clear, it should be deleted. It would be better to leave each country free to decide what qualifications were required for access to higher education. The Irish amendments (A/C.3/L.617) to paragraph 3 were entirely acceptable to his delegation, which con-

sidered that, in the matter of education, the rights of parents took precedence over those of the State.

40. Mr. PYMAN (Australia) said that the Australian Government had no hesitation in accepting the obligations contained in article 14, as, in addition to the free State schools, Australia had private establishments which, although not financed by the State, were obliged to conform to the minimum standards laid down or approved by the State, and to which any parents who wished to do so could send their children at their own expense. Any parent or guardian in Australia was entitled and was able, if he wanted to do so, to send his child to a free primary (or secondary) school; thus, the letter and spirit of paragraph 2 (a) were fully respected.

41. However, the Australian delegation felt that some parts of paragraph 1 were out of place in the draft Covenant—for example, the definition of the objectives of education—and would prefer the paragraph to state merely that the "States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right to education". However, if the Committee felt that a definition of the aims of education should be included, he would propose the deletion of the words "the suppression of all incitement to racial and other hatred". In the Commission on Human Rights, some representatives had said they were afraid that that clause might be used to justify a system of censorship incompatible with freedom of expression and opinion. While admitting that that might be considered a rather far-fetched interpretation, he felt that the Third Committee could not be too vigilant in protecting freedom of expression and opinion.

42. The Australian delegation would support the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.621), as they improved the text.

43. He wished to point out that Australia, like Canada, could not accede to the Covenants unless they contained an adequate federal State clause. The progressive implementation clause did not solve the difficulties of federal States, as it stated that each State Party undertook to take steps with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the Covenant "by legislative as well as other means", and in Australia, for constitutional reasons, only the state governments had the right to pass education laws.

44. It was perfectly understandable that the General Assembly wished the consideration of the Covenants to be completed by December 1958. His delegation shared that objective. His delegation was equally anxious, however, that the exceedingly complex task of preparing articles which met, as far as possible, all the legitimate points of view and varied circumstances of States should be carried out with as much care as time permitted. Adequate time should be allowed for the preparation of amendments and for careful assessment by each delegation of the full implications of every proposal for revision.

45. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that it was unnecessary to emphasize the importance of article 14 and the responsibility of the Third Committee with regard to it in view of the fact that it had heard, in connexion with the report of the Economic and Social Council, that the proportion of illiterates was over 80 per cent in nearly seventy countries and territories.

46. The USSR, where more than 75 per cent of the population had been illiterate in 1917 and four-fifths of the children had been unable to attend school, had made up for lost time. There were now 200,000 elementary and secondary schools attended by more than 30 million children. There had been comparable progress in higher education: whereas there had been only about 100,000 students in 1917, there were now more than 760 universities and institutes attended by nearly 2 million students. Not only was tuition free but the Government granted scholarships to students whose work was satisfactory. The USSR did not neglect any means of raising the standard of education, and correspondence and evening courses were well attended.

47. She was aware that some countries were in a less privileged position but she felt it was essential to impose minimum obligations on States and not to include provisions in the Covenants which would be narrower in scope than the corresponding provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. She would therefore be obliged to vote against the amendments submitted by the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.618) and by Chile, Ecuador and Guatemala (A/C.3/L.619 and Corr. 1), which, in her view, weakened the text.

48. She regretted that some representatives had proposed the deletion from paragraph 1 of the words "the suppression of all incitement to racial and other hatred". Discrimination in education was unfortunately not a myth and it was not a matter of chance that the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had proposed that a special convention on discrimination in education should be prepared. The clause she had mentioned and the passage concerning understanding, tolerance and the maintenance of peace were in their right place in the Covenants and were fully in harmony with the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

49. The USSR delegation would vote against the Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.624) to paragraph 1, which greatly weakened the text.

50. It would vote for the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.620), which proposed positive measures and provided a valuable conclusion to the article.

51. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) reiterated the view, already expressed by her delegation and others, that the best way of hastening the completion of the Covenants would be to entrust the drafting of the final text to an international conference of plenipotentiaries, as had been done in the case of the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery and the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. If the Committee preferred to adhere to the procedure it had followed in the past, she suggested that it would be wise to wait until at least half the representatives who intended to speak on a particular article had expressed their views before setting a time limit for the submission of amendments to that article. It might also be advisable for the Third Committee to set up a drafting committee—in conformity with annex II, part 2, paragraph 29, of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly—which would, *inter alia*, examine amendments before they were submitted to the Committee.

52. Article 14 was in conformity with the legislation

and practice of Israel. One of the first laws enacted in Israel had been the Compulsory Education Law of 1949, which provided that education should be made available free of charge and without any distinction for all children between the ages of five and thirteen years and for young people between the ages of fourteen and seventeen who had not previously received a primary education. The question of curricula and school standards was dealt with in the State Education Act of 1953. In Israel, parents were free to place their children in private schools, religious or others, provided that the schools conformed to the minimum standards prescribed by the State. There was a system of scholarships for secondary and higher education, but it was unfortunately limited. The Israel delegation could therefore accept article 14, although it regretted the lack of balance between its very detailed text and the very concise text of other articles, which might lead to misconceptions regarding their relative importance.

53. She objected to the phrase "encourage... the suppression of all incitement" in paragraph 1, which was negative in nature and seemed to be superfluous in view of the subsequent positive statement that education should promote tolerance.

54. She fully supported the drafting amendments proposed by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.621).

55. The words "generally available" in paragraph 2 (b) seemed to be ambiguous and she thought that the word "accessible" used in paragraph 2 (c) might be more appropriate. The word "equally" in paragraph 2(c) seemed to be redundant when applied to "merit" and was superfluous if the Indian delegation's extremely broad interpretation was accepted. While understanding the motives for the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.618), she considered that free education at all levels was an ideal towards which all should strive and suggested that both elements be retained in the Covenant. It was also advisable to mention fundamental education, for the fact must be faced that the abolition of illiteracy would be a very slow process. In that connexion she quoted information from the latest UNESCO survey of illiteracy in the world.<sup>1/</sup>

56. She had no objection to the replacement of the word "liberty" by the word "right" in paragraph 3, as was suggested in the Irish amendment (A/C.3/L.617), but she was not in favour of deleting the word "schools" as she considered schools to be the normal and preferable means of education. She would be able to vote in favour of the amendment if the Irish representative would agree to retain the word, and simply to add the phrase "means towards education" to the sentence.

57. With regard to the text proposed in the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.620), she considered the ideas of "the development of a system of schools" and "an adequate fellowship system" were implicit in the existing text and that the "continuous improvement of the material conditions of the teaching staff", despite its importance, was related to the general

<sup>1/</sup> United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *World Illiteracy at Mid-Century: a statistical study*, Monographs on fundamental education, No. XI (UNESCO, 1957).

frame of working conditions and was out of place in article 14.

58. Mr. EFFENDI NUR (Indonesia) said that the principles on which article 14 was based were in full conformity with the corresponding articles of the Indonesian Provisional Constitution. Law No.4 concerning the basis of school education, enacted in 1950, stressed the need for character formation and the development of self-reliance and civic responsibility.

59. While the Indonesian delegation understood the reasons that had prompted the Irish representative to submit the second point of her amendments (A/C.3/L.617), it believed that the text she proposed was likely to raise certain practical difficulties, in view of the variety of systems in force in different countries. Article 30 of the Indonesian Provisional Constitution recognized the freedom to teach and to be taught, but provided for supervision by the public authorities in the interests of the community as a whole. Indonesia also recognized the right to set up educational establishments, but only under the control of the public authorities. He was afraid that the Irish amendment in its existing form was incompatible with the purposes of the Constitution and legislation of his country and he would abstain from voting on it.

60. He would support the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.621).

61. He would also vote in favour of the Netherlands amendments (A/C.3/L.618) to paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c). In his opinion, the purpose of article 14 was to ensure that no one should be deprived of primary, secondary or higher education for financial reasons only and it was advisable to leave the contracting States some latitude with regard to the methods to be used to achieve that goal. In Indonesia, for example, care was taken to ensure that school fees for secondary and higher education were adjusted to the parents' financial means. The Government had enacted a special scholarship regulation, under which scholarships were granted to students who were without means or who had only limited financial resources.

62. The Indonesian delegation was glad that the Committee had set up a Working Party and would be able to vote in favour of any amendment which would improve the form or substance of the article.

63. Mrs. HAIKAL (Jordan) said that her delegation was in favour of the existing text of article 14 and had no objection in principle to any amendments

which improved it or made the wording more precise. Nevertheless, she doubted the practical value of the second point of the Irish amendments (A/C.3/L.617), which was ambiguous, and she could not therefore support it.

64. The right of everyone to education was embodied in the Jordanian Constitution. Jordan was endeavouring to make universal and free primary education a reality and had made great progress towards that goal, despite the serious problem created by the influx into Jordan of a large proportion of the Palestine Arabs whom Israel had turned into refugees. For ten years, Jordan had tried to meet the needs of those refugees, including their educational needs, and owed a great debt of gratitude to the United Nations, and, particularly to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and UNESCO, which had helped it to give the Arab children living in camps a minimum of education and technical training. Illiteracy was on the wane and would be abolished as soon as educational services were adequately developed. The extension of the school system, the training and recruitment of teachers and the financing of projects were now the principal problems with regard to education. She was glad to be able to state, with reference to paragraph 3, that the right of parents to place their children in schools of their choice had never been questioned in Jordan. Public schools were free and open to all, without any discrimination whatsoever. The number of those schools was sufficient in the towns, but was not yet, unfortunately, sufficient in rural areas. There were also a certain number of foreign schools in Jordan, to which parents who had the means could send their children and to which the Jordanian Government granted all the necessary facilities.

65. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) objected to the Jordanian representative's uncalled-for remark concerning Israel. It was not Israel which had turned the Palestine Arabs into refugees—that had resulted from the act of aggression which had been directed against Israel.

66. The CHAIRMAN recalled the Committee's decision to set up a Working Party and stated that the Vice-Chairman had agreed to preside over it. She suggested that all the delegations which had submitted amendments should be members of the Working Party.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.