



Wednesday, 16 October 1957,
at 3. 10 p. 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)	105

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. MESSADI (Tunisia) pointed out that the substance of article 14 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/2573, annex I A) was identical with that of article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that the two articles differed only in form. A comparison of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 26 of the Universal Declaration and paragraph 1 of article 14 of the draft Covenant illustrated that fact; the latter paragraph contained only one phrase which did not have a parallel in article 26. Obviously, the Commission on Human Rights, in drawing up article 14 of the draft Covenant, had wished to preserve the spirit and the letter of article 26 of the Universal Declaration, and that desire was justified. The Commission had formulated the right to education in such a way as to admit practical application. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 14 were elaborations of paragraphs 1 and 3, respectively, of article 26.

2. The text of article 14 was the result of a unified effort for compromise among different points of view and should give rise to no suggestion for a major change either in substance or in form. The delegation of Tunisia was prepared to vote in favour of article 14 as it stood and would support only the United Kingdom amendment, which would improve the drafting. But since a Working Party was to re-draft the article, the Tunisian delegation reserved the right to choose between the old text and the new one to be prepared by the Working Party.

3. Some of the amendments, for example, those submitted by Belgium (A/C.3/L.623) and by Chile, Ecuador and Guatemala (A/C.3/L.619 and Corr.1), did not, in the opinion of the Tunisian delegation, embody improvements; other amendments introduced new elements with which the Tunisian delegation could not agree. Moreover, the amendment suggested by the Netherlands was less precise than the basic text of article 14, paragraph 2, and would imply that Governments were under an obligation to supply financial support for secondary

or higher education to any person lacking sufficient personal means for such education. The wording of article 14, paragraph 2, of the basic text did not in any way prevent Governments from supplying more than primary education, if they so wished, and within the limits of their financial resources, but it would be going too far to make it an enforceable obligation.

4. The Tunisian delegation could not support the amendments submitted by Ireland (A/C.3/L.617), the first point of which carried a serious modification of substance. The replacement of the word "liberty" by the word "right" would imply that families had the right to request subsidies for the private "means towards education" which they would choose for their children. The new text would also imply that families could educate their children entirely at home. The organization and administration of means of education were, however, chiefly, although not exclusively, functions of the State; the text of article 14 as it stood provided an ample number of checks on the power of the State in that connexion. The State's main responsibility was to guarantee that children would receive an education in accordance with the principles contained in paragraph 1 of article 14, and in order to do so, the State must have the right, as provided in paragraph 3 of that article, to lay down the minimum educational standards for both public and private institutions. Since the amendment submitted by Ireland was opposed to those principles, it was unacceptable to the Tunisian delegation.

5. The Tunisian delegation agreed in principle with the amendment submitted by Romania (A/C.3/L.620), particularly in regard to the improvement of the material conditions of teaching staff.

6. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) extended his delegation's greetings to Mrs. de Figueres, the wife of the President of Costa Rica.

7. Education in Spain had suffered dire effects from wars and disturbances, and reconstruction was necessarily slow. It would be desirable for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to make a comparative study of the stages of education in various countries at the time a progressive policy was initiated and while it was being carried out. The information would be helpful to other States when providing educational facilities for both children and adults.

8. The illiteracy rate in Spain was 10 per cent, not 17 per cent, as had been incorrectly reported. Considerable progress had been made during the past thirty years in reducing illiteracy, and only by such comparisons could a true idea of progress be obtained.

9. With regard to the third point of the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.621), it should be noted that the Spanish text should in any case remain unaltered.

10. The Spanish delegation would vote for article 14.

11. Mrs. de FIGUERES (Costa Rica) thanked the representative of Spain for his welcome and expressed her satisfaction at having the opportunity to participate actively in the work of the Third Committee.

12. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) supported the principles underlying article 14 and all its paragraphs, which reflected those already embodied in the Philippine constitution.

13. The Committee should bear in mind that fact that the text of article 14 was the result of a lengthy discussion in the Commission on Human Rights and should therefore resist the temptation to make extensive revisions.

14. The Philippine delegation did not agree with the statement by the representative of Israel that the final text of the Covenants should be drafted by an international conference of plenipotentiaries so that only those Governments which were willing to subscribe to the principles contained in the Covenants would have a voice in the drafting of Covenants. The Philippine delegation wished to see the Covenants completed as soon as possible; a conference of States with similar views would not bring about the result desired, namely the recognition of human rights in countries where they were not recognized or only partially recognized. The draft Covenants should therefore be submitted to every Member State.

15. Statistics of education in the Philippines were contained in some publications issued by UNESCO. The standard was high, but the Philippine Government would welcome the inclusion of an article on education in the Covenant as a spur to the further development of education in the Philippines.

16. Mr. MASSOUD-ANSARE (Iran) said that his delegation had no objection to the substance of article 14 as drafted by the Commission on Human Rights (E/2573, annex I A), because that text was in conformity with his country's legislation on education. A law prescribing free and compulsory primary education had been enacted in 1943 and, although lack of funds had prevented its full application, the number of pupils attending school had nearly trebled by 1955. Secondary and higher education, for which only nominal fees were charged, had also progressed.

17. His delegation was in favour of retaining paragraph 2 (d), on fundamental education, as that method had yielded excellent results in Iran. The great advantage of that type of education was that it covered isolated groups in rural areas and helped them to adapt themselves to modern conditions and to raise their standard of living. By introducing sanitary improvements, new agricultural methods and instruction in domestic and social welfare, it met a real need among people who had had no normal education. He paid tribute to UNESCO for its assistance.

18. He welcomed the reference to "such minimum educational standards as may be laid down or approved by the State" in paragraph 3, for it was essential to mention such standards in the interests of countries where fundamental freedoms were not always respected and the aims set forth in paragraph 1 were hampered.

19. His delegation was in favour of all the amendments which would improve the wording of the article, but

hoped that the authors of substantive amendments would not press their proposals in the Working Party.

20. Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) hoped that the Working Party would be able to provide a solid basis for a brief and effective discussion of the final text. The essential purpose of the article was to set forth the aims of education and the duties, rights and guarantees arising therefrom; the Committee's goal should be the greatest possible precision of definition, though absolute precision was impossible. The article should therefore leave Governments a sufficient margin for fulfilling their obligations, with due respect for the conditions peculiar to their countries. Some of the proposed amendments, however, did not comply with those purposes and were even contrary to them.

21. For example, the Irish proposal (A/C.3/L.617) to replace the word "schools" by "means towards education" was presumably intended to cover children who were for some reason, such as health, unable to attend school. He did not consider that that warranted a generalization, since it was a generally accepted theory that only through school education could the human personality achieve its full development. If the Irish amendment were accepted, it would be essential to make that theory clear. In Poland, for example, there was a certain amount of education outside State schools but the system might not be applicable in other countries. It would therefore be undesirable to specify some methods and not others.

22. He thought that the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.618) was dangerous, since the phrase "no one shall be deprived of...education for financial reasons only" might imply that students could be debarred from education for other reasons and would open the door to all kinds of discrimination, contrary to the provisions of article 2 of the draft Covenants.

23. He suggested that the phrase "on the basis of merit" in paragraph 2 (c) might be altered to refer to the aptitudes and capacities of the student.

24. The Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.620) seemed a useful extension of the provisions of paragraph 2 and would be more acceptable in that form than as a separate paragraph.

25. With reference to the third point of the Belgian amendments (A/C.3/L.623), he stated that, although the right to religious education was guaranteed and fully applied in Poland, where violations of religious tolerance were punishable by a law applicable equally to believers and non-believers, his delegation could not regard it as a duty of the State to provide purely religious schools.

26. Mrs. SYSOEVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stressed the importance of article 14 in view of the impressive illiteracy figures given by UNESCO in its recent brochure entitled *World Illiteracy at Mid-Century*¹ and of the statement by the Director-General of UNESCO that too little progress was being made in combating illiteracy. The Byelorussian delegation considered that the article drafted by the Commission on Human Rights was generally acceptable, since it was in conformity with the letter and spirit of the United

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

Nations Charter and set forth minimum obligations for promoting the right to education. It would not therefore support any amendments which would directly or indirectly weaken the text through the insertion of unnecessary enumerations. The Committee should ensure that none of the provisions of the article were weaker than Human Rights; any other solution would represent a retrograde step from what had already been achieved by the United Nations.

27. In the Byelorussian SSR, the right to free and compulsory primary education for seven years was guaranteed by the Constitution, and secondary education was also free for all. Government scholarships were granted for higher, technical and vocational education. She cited a few figures to illustrate the excellent results that system had yielded; in a country where over 80 per cent of the population had been illiterate forty years previously, there were now about 170,000 persons who had completed higher education and secondary technical education.

28. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said he could vote for article 14 as it stood, as it was compatible with his Government's educational policy and was satisfactorily worded.

29. He would abstain from voting on the Irish Amendment replacing the word "liberty" by the word "right" (A/C.3/L.617, point 1), as he did not consider the change necessary or desirable. He would vote against the amendment replacing the word "schools" by the words "means towards education" (A/C.3/L.617, point 1), because he agreed with the Turkish representative that schools were "means towards education". He would also vote against the new paragraph proposed in the amendments (A/C.3/L.617, point 2), because he thought it was prejudicial to the application of the minimum standards referred to in paragraph 3.

30. The Syrian delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.618).

31. With regard to the three-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.619 and Corr.1), he would abstain from voting on the amendment to paragraph 1, but would vote in favour of the new text proposed for paragraph 2. He would abstain on paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c) in their combined form, but would vote in favour of the amended paragraph 2 (c). He also considered that the amendment to paragraph 3 clarified the text.

32. His delegation would vote in favour of the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.620), which was a useful addition, but would abstain from voting on the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.621), because they related only to the English text, which the Syrian delegation did not regard as a basic working document. He would vote in favour of the Philippine amendments (A/C.3/L.622) replacing the word "recognize" by the word "agree" and the word "It" by the word "Education", and against the Belgian amendments (A/C.3/L.623), and would abstain from voting on the Peruvian amendments (A/C.3/L.624).

33. He hoped that the Working Party would give expression to all the views that had been expressed in the Committee; he stated his objection to working methods which prevented all issues from being discussed in the plenary Committee.

34. Mr. Francisco LIMA (El Salvador) said he would try to analyse the article from a legal point of view. The signatories of the Covenants would undertake

solemn commitments towards other states and must therefore be fully aware of the scope of their responsibilities. Article 14 recognized the individual's right to education and the people must therefore be aware of their rights, in order to ensure the States's recognition.

35. It might be said that in article 14 the right to education was recognized conditionally. In order to ascertain the obligations entailed, certain questions must be answered. The first was how the aims enumerated in paragraph 1 were to be achieved and whether they had any legal validity or were merely declaratory, as were the provisions of article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Secondly, it was generally known that in some countries education was administered by private, as well as by State, institutions. It must be decided, then, what the obligations of the State were towards private educational institutions. It might be inferred that the State had the right to interfere with private education and the obligation to guide private institutions towards implementation of the Covenant. If the aims had legal validity, the State was obliged to fulfil them in respect of all its citizens; if not, two separate types of education could coexist in one country.

36. In the light of those considerations, the obligation set forth in paragraph 2 (a) was somewhat obscure. Both the State and those attending school had certain obligations, but the question was whether that applied to private education also. He could not agree with the statement in paragraph 41 of the commentary on article 14 (A/2929, chap. VIII) concerning the intention of the wording of paragraph 2 (a) and thought that the proposed new paragraph in the Irish amendment (A/C.3/L.617) somewhat clarified the issue.

37. He considered that it would be undesirable to replace the word "liberty" by "right". In legal terms, if a right was granted to one party, another party incurred a corresponding obligation. Accordingly, if parents had the right to ensure the religious education of their children in conformity with their own convictions, the State by implication incurred the obligation of providing such education on request. The real intention of the provision, however, was to leave parents free to ensure religious education outside State schools.

38. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that the right to education was an inalienable human right and it was therefore deplorable that there should be discrimination against women in that field, as was clear from the study on discrimination in education carried out by the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/181/Rev.1).^{2/} That report showed that in some countries where primary education was not compulsory, boys were favoured at the expense of girls and in others deep-rooted customs and prejudices prevented women from enjoying the right to education. It was therefore important that the word "everyone", in article 14, should be clearly understood to mean both men and women, as in the other articles of the draft Covenant.

39. Paragraph 2 (b) was particularly significant, as secondary education was a factor in the formation of personality, and was therefore important not only to individual men and women but to the family and the community as a whole. Technical and professional

^{2/} United Nations publication, Sales No.:1957.XIV.3.

secondary education must be available on equal terms to men and women, as lack of training restricted women's access to employment. She would vote for article 14, on the understanding that it applied equally to both sexes, and for any amendments which would improve the text.

40. In the Dominican Republic, primary education was compulsory and available, free to all. The Constitution provided that all persons were obliged to attend State schools and the State was bound to provide the necessary facilities. The State was also under the obligation to eliminate illiteracy and great progress has been made. Secondary education, including technical and professional training, was available, free to both sexes, and a very large percentage of women had availed themselves of the opportunity to train for the liberal professions. The budget appropriation for education had increased steadily from year to year.

41. Mr. COX (Peru) strongly supported the text of article 14 with the amendment to paragraph 1 proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.624) and the amendments to paragraph 2 proposed by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.621) and by the Canadian representative at the 779th meeting. His delegation had submitted its amendment to paragraph 1 (A/C.3/L.624) in order to bring the wording of the article into line with the analogous provisions of the Peruvian Constitution, which laid down that primary education should be compulsory and free, and made provision for secondary schools, where education should be dispensed free when possible, for vocational and technical schools and for teacher training. The Constitution also set a minimum for the education budget, which was not less than 19 per cent of the total budget. It had seemed advisable to replace the negative wording "the suppression of all incitement to racial and other hatred" and avoid the repetitiousness of the basic text by stating merely that education "shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups". By adopting article 14 with the amendments he supported, the Committee would be reaffirming the solidarity of mankind. The best service it could render to generations to come would be to ensure a satisfactory draft of the Covenants.

42. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that the Constitution of Iraq recognized the right of everyone to education and the obligation of the State to provide education for everyone without discrimination. Primary education was compulsory and free in principle; unfortunately, the law was not yet enforced throughout the country, owing to a lack of facilities and funds. All education above the level of the primary school was free but not compulsory.

43. The basic text of article 14 was satisfactory for it recognized the right to education as a fundamental human right and the State's obligation to ensure full exercise of that right. She could not support the amendments proposed by the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.618) and Belgium (A/C.3/L.623) to paragraphs 1 and 2, as they would restrict the scope of the article.

44. Turning to paragraph 2, she said that the word "merit", in sub-paragraph (c), should be construed to mean strictly academic merit. The elimination of illiteracy must be one of the primary objectives of all States which had an illiteracy problem, as the increasing mechanization of all fields of activity made literacy a necessity for all workers. It was question-

able whether fundamental education could be adapted to educate large numbers of people rapidly and cheaply. The Iraqi Government had established a special section in the Ministry of Education and special centres for the training of teachers for their exacting role and the application of the methods of teaching. It must nevertheless be recognized that the system was only in the experimental stage and the notion itself was changing. It had originally been intended for adults who had received no primary education but it was now being extended to children also. In the latter case, it had disadvantages. First, it was more expensive than the usual primary school methods and, secondly, the stress it laid on practical subjects meant that the children did not learn subjects which they would require if they were to enter secondary schools.

45. Referring to the Irish amendments (A/C.3/L.617), she said that if the State was responsible for providing education, it must obviously be responsible for the standard of that education also. Iraq allowed religious groups of all kinds to establish their own schools, provided they maintained certain standards, and thus effectively recognized the right of parents to choose what schools they wished for their children. That was nothing more than the recognition of the freedom of conscience of the individual. However "bodies" could not be allowed to exercise such freedom of conscience without supervision. She agreed, incidentally, with the Belgian representative that such freedom should apply not only to religious but to other convictions (A/C.3/L.623, point 3). She could not recognize the unrestricted right of parents to select the education of their children without supervision from the State. She was therefore unable to vote for the Irish amendment.

46. Although she sympathized with the Romanian delegation's concern for the material conditions of the teaching staff, she could not vote for the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.620), as the addition of a new paragraph would make article 14, already detailed, much too long.

47. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was in favour of the existing text of article 14, with the slight drafting changes it had proposed (A/C.3/L.621). For that reason he thought it unnecessary for his delegation to be included in the proposed Working Party. He agreed with the Philippine representative's statement about the method of work on the Covenants and he would only add that the aim of the Committee's current work was to ensure that the draft Covenants should be as widely acceptable as possible while marking a genuine step forward on the path of respect for human rights. It would be useless to get amendments adopted by a majority in the Committee if the resulting text was unacceptable to many Governments. The amendments should be considered in that light.

48. As regards paragraph 1 of the article, he agreed with the criticisms levelled at it by the representative of El Salvador, but he felt that the definition of the aims of education could only be regarded as of a declaratory character, and could not be made an enforceable obligation. As there were many amendments to paragraph 1, the Working Party would be well advised to take as a guide to that paragraph article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That at least had been agreed upon by all Member States. The word "encourage", in paragraph 1, seemed to be merely a mis-

translation, as the UNESCO representative had pointed out at the 781st meeting, and the best solution, there again, would be to adopt the word used in the Declaration (article 26, para. 2), namely "promote". He agreed with the view expressed by the representatives of Venezuela and Israel (782nd meeting) that it was undesirable to include such a negative aim as the suppression of racial hatred, and the point was covered by the positive aim of encouraging friendly relations among States.

49. The replacement of the word "liberty", in paragraph 3, by the word "right", as proposed by the Irish representative (A/C.3/L.617), could be accepted by his delegation, but the legal implications mentioned by the Salvadorian representative should be borne in mind. The second point of the Irish amendments was perhaps perfectionist; in any case, he felt that the words "such minimum educational standards as may be laid down", in the original text, were preferable to the words "minimum of education".

50. Turning to the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.618), he said that it was acceptable in principle, although it was not clear from the text as it stood that the measures mentioned therein were to be taken progressively. The Working Party might make that clear. The Netherlands amendment provided an example of what he had said as to the acceptability of the Covenants; he did not feel that the Committee should adopt a wording which would compel the Netherlands to introduce free secondary education if the same purpose was being achieved in another way.

51. He disagreed with the Polish representative's statement that the Netherlands amendment, while precluding discrimination on financial grounds, would permit it on grounds enumerated in paragraph 2 of article 2 of the draft Covenant. That paragraph would apply to article 14 and the Netherlands amendment merely added a requirement that there would not be discrimination on purely financial grounds.

52. There were serious objections to the Romanian amendment (A/C.3/L.620). First, it added another paragraph to an already lengthy article. Secondly, it laid down an immediate obligation instead of prescribing progressive measures. Thirdly, the specification of measures was unnecessary. Fourthly, the question of improving the material conditions of the teaching staff, however desirable an object in itself, was out of place in article 14.

53. Finally, he agreed with the Iraqi representative that the real purpose of paragraph 2 (d) of the article was to deal with adult illiteracy, and that that should be made clear.

54. Mr. DEVASAR (Federation of Malaya) said that article 14 was a succinct formulation of unimpeachable principles. They were being applied in the educational policy of the Federation of Malaya, which aimed at the full development of the human personality. Teaching was given in Malay, the national language, but the language and culture of other groups were not neglected. Although the educational policy had not yet borne all its fruits, the results so far achieved were encouraging and primary education was being extended to an increasing number of children. Over 870,000 students were attending technical training courses and courses in arts, science and law. There were 650 adult education classes, attended by 15,000 pupils,

5,000 of whom were women. The programme, initiated in 1955, aimed at providing schooling for all children.

55. Referring to the Irish amendments (A/C.3/L.617), he welcomed the replacement of the word "liberty" by the word "right" in paragraph 3 of article 14, but preferred the word "schools", in the original text, to the expression "means towards education", as the word "schools" was wider in scope. He supported the addition of the new paragraph proposed by Ireland.

56. He also supported the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.618), as it provided an assurance that States would not excuse themselves on financial grounds for not providing free education.

57. He supported the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.621), the second of which was particularly important. The words "It is understood", at the beginning of paragraph 2 in the original text, had no binding force, whereas the words "The States Parties to the Covenant recognize", proposed by the United Kingdom representative, constituted a formal commitment. On the other hand, the word "agree" seemed preferable to the word "recognize" in paragraph 1, and he therefore supported the Philippine amendment (A/C.3/L.622).

58. His delegation could support article 14 with the changes he had mentioned, and any drafting changes which did not affect the substance.

59. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that, in regard to the task of the Working Party, his delegation would take into consideration the suggestion of the United Kingdom with regard to the amendment submitted by the Netherlands.

60. Miss MacENTEE (Ireland) wished to comment on a number of points raised during the meeting.

61. She believed that the procedure of holding a general debate followed by an *ad hoc* discussion leading to the formulation of a final text in the case of each article was a good one; the best procedure, however, was that suggested by the representative of Israel (782nd meeting), namely to assign the task of drawing up the final texts of the Covenants to an international conference of plenipotentiaries.

62. The delegation of Ireland would support the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.621). It also agreed to change the word "right" to "liberty" in paragraph 2 of its own amendment (A/C.3/L.617, point 2), and wished to state that it had not intended that that paragraph should imply any obligation on the part of States to subsidize private education. It agreed to take into consideration the suggestion that a clause on the provision of minimum educational standards should be included in the amendment.

63. The delegation of Ireland believed that each State must find its own legal solution to the question of reconciling the rights of the individual with the common good.

64. The delegation of Ireland shared the misgivings of the representative of Iraq about the inclusion in article 14 of a paragraph on fundamental education. That was a technical term which had not been clearly defined and which should not be taken as a substitute for education.

65. The delegation of Ireland considered that the

amendment submitted by Romania (A/C.3/L.620) was too detailed for a covenant containing general principles; it would not vote against that amendment, but could not regard it as a substitute for the amendment submitted by Ireland.

66. Mr. MAHEU (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), in response to a query made by the representative of Venezuela (782nd meeting) regarding the relative importance which UNESCO attached to the three objectives stated in paragraph 1 of article 14, said that UNESCO regarded the first aim, the full development of the human personality, as essential. The second, the strengthening of respect for human rights, was equally important, for it introduced a notion of responsibility which

would eliminate the possibility of the first objective's being interpreted as forced individualism. The third aim, the suppression of all incitement to racial hatred, was also of great importance. The wording of that aim, however, had given rise to the objection that it stated in a negative way what appeared to be expressed in a positive way in the following sentence.

67. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) requested that the representative of UNESCO should attend the meeting of the Working Party and suggested that only representatives of delegations which had submitted amendments to article 14 or which had important recommendations to make in that respect should attend.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.