



Dual Distribution

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Ninth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDREDTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Monday, 25 May 1953, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

pages

Reports of the fourth and fifth sessions of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (item 4 of the agenda) (continued):

Draft resolutions annexed to the report on the fourth session (E/CN.4/641, E/CN.4/641/Corr.1) (continued):

Draft resolutions II and III - Definition of minorities for purposes of protection by the United Nations, and interim measures to be taken for the protection of minorities respectively; and Chilean, United Kingdom, Uruguayan and Yugoslav amendments thereto (continued)

4 - 6

Draft resolutions annexed to the report on the fifth session (E/CN.4/670) (resumed from the 397th meeting):

Draft resolution C - Protection of newly-created minorities

6 - 7

Draft resolution D - Collection of provisions on protection of minorities

7 - 9

Draft resolution M - Reports of the relevant work of UNESCO

9 - 13

(Taken together with)

Draft resolution IV- Activities of UNESCO in the field of prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities (Annexed to the report on the fourth session)

Draft resolution K - Technical assistance in the fields of prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities

13 - 18

Present:

Chairman: Mr. AZMI (Egypt)  
Rapporteur: Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium)

Members:

Mr. WHITLAM	Australia
Mr. DIAZ-CASANUEVA	Chile
Mr. CHENG PAONAN	China
Mr. ABDEL-GHANI	Egypt
Mr. CASSIN	France
Mrs. CHATTOPADHYAY	India
Mr. INGLÉS	Philippines
Mr. DRUTO	Poland
Mrs. RÖSSEL	Sweden
Mr. KRIVEN	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Mr. MOROSOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mrs. LORD	United States of America
Mr. PEROTTI	Uruguay
Mr. JEVREMOVIĆ	Yugoslavia

Also present:

Mr. ROY	Chairman of the Sub- Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities
---------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Representatives of a specialized agency:

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. METRAUX Mr. BMMATE
------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

World Federation of United Nations  
Associations

Mrs. SALMON

Category B and Register

Catholic International Union for Social  
Service

Miss de ROMER

Women's International League for Peace  
and Freedom

Mrs. BAER

World Jewish Congress

Mr. RIEGNER

World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations

Miss de ROMER

Secretariat:

Mr. Humphrey

Representative of the  
Secretary-General

Mr. Das )

Mrs. Bruce )

Secretaries to the  
Commission

REPORTS OF THE FOURTH AND FIFTH SESSIONS OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES (item 4 of the agenda) (continued)

Draft resolutions annexed to the report on the fourth session (E/CN.4/641, E/CN.4/641/Corr.1) (continued):

Draft resolutions II and III: Definition of minorities for purposes of protection by the United Nations, and interim measures to be taken for the protection of minorities respectively; and Chilean, United Kingdom, Uruguayan and Yugoslav amendments thereto (continued)

Mr. PEROTTI (Uruguay), introducing his amendment to draft resolution II on definition of minorities<sup>(1)</sup>, requested that the word "undesirability" be substituted for the word "inadmissibility" in the first line.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium), reminding the Commission that he had a particular personal interest in the subject of minorities, said that the discussion at the previous meeting had not really satisfied him. The Belgian delegation had abstained from voting on the Polish proposal<sup>(2)</sup> because it considered that to refer the whole question back to the Sub-Commission would make it impossible for the latter to make any progress. He thought that if it wished the Sub-Commission to advance, the Commission must take a decision on the principles embodied in draft resolution II and on the definition of minorities submitted therein.

Knowing from experience how complex minority questions were, and how difficult it was to avoid ambiguity in the relevant texts, he thought that the Commission should approve the draft resolution on the definition of minorities, but only in general terms.

---

(1) The Uruguayan amendment read:

"Insert, in the third considerandum, as sub-paragraph (1), after the words 'complex situations such as', the following passage:

'(1) The inadmissibility of considering as minorities groups established or becoming established within a State by virtue of its immigration laws or its settlement or industrialization plans and works, whether spontaneously or under international agreements;'

(2) See summary record of the 399th meeting (E/CN.4/SR.399), page 16.

For instance, the Commission might adopt a resolution stating that, having examined the Sub-Commission's work on the subject, it noted with approval the principles and definition which had resulted therefrom.

Draft resolution III was a provisional text, since the Sub-Commission did not know whether the principles and the definition it had drafted would meet with the Commission's approval. If, however, they did, the Sub-Commission intended to undertake a series of studies on the protection of the rights of minorities.

In his opinion, rather than consider provisional proposals, it would be better for the Commission to authorize the Sub-Commission to proceed to study the interim measures it recommended for the protection of minorities, on the basis of the principles and the definition which it had prepared and which the Commission was about to approve.

That procedure would save the Commission considerable time, since it could not need to go into draft resolutions II and III in detail, or to consider the amendments submitted to them. Nor would it be bound by the terms of the definition, some of which might raise difficulties. Moreover, the Sub-Commission would have the satisfaction of seeing its principles approved and recognized, and of knowing the lines on which it should continue to work.

Mr. CASSIN (France) thought it a pity that the discussion should have strayed a little from the point at the morning meeting. Like the Belgian representative, he saw no reason why the Commission should not accept the principles and definition drafted by the Sub-Commission, without taking a stand on each separate measure recommended by that body. He also saw no point in holding up the Sub-Commission's work by withholding authorization for it to take as the basis for its work, at least temporarily, the drafts it had prepared and its past studies on measures to be taken by the United Nations for the protection of minorities. If that accurately described the Belgian representative's intentions, the French delegation would support them.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) said that, although the Belgian delegation had as yet taken no definite stand on the issue, he saw no objection to the Sub-Commission taking as a provisional basis for its work the principles set forth in draft resolution II, if they met with the Commission's approval. Indeed, the Sub-Commission might well go further and extend the scope of its work.

Mr. DIAZ-CASANUEVA (Chile) thought it important that the Commission's approval of the principles and definition should be qualified by a reference to the points raised during the discussion, and that the draft resolution adumbrated by the Belgian representative should state clearly that, in carrying out its further studies, the Sub-Commission should take into full account the observations made, and amendments submitted, during the discussions in the Commission.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) accepted the Chilean representative's suggestions, and submitted the following draft resolution:

"The Commission on Human Rights,

Having studied the Sub-Commission's work on the principles and definition of minorities,

Notes the results with approval, and

Requests the Sub-Commission to proceed with its work on the protection of minorities on the basis of the approved definition, bearing in mind the discussions which have taken place in the Commission during its ninth session"

At the request of Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), it was decided that the vote on the Belgian draft resolution should be deferred until it had been circulated in writing.

Draft resolutions annexed to the report on the fifth session (E/CN.4/670) (resumed from the 397th meeting):

Draft resolution C: Protection of newly-created minorities

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said that the draft resolution on protection of newly-created minorities called for no comment, and asked the Commission to adopt the single recommendation it contained.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) supported the draft resolution. Experience showed that the establishment of new States, or the modification of frontiers, often resulted in a majority being transformed into a minority under the sovereignty of another State. Such changes of sovereignty entailed certain dangers and hardships for the persons affected. In such cases it was essential, although often very difficult, to protect the rights both of individuals and of groups. He felt, therefore, that, in the general interest, the Commission should approve the principle embodied in the draft resolution.

Mr. CASSIN (France) thought that the draft resolution, which made provision for dealing with problems created by the establishment of new States or the delimitation of new frontiers, was a wise measure, and should accordingly be approved.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the definition of minorities in draft resolution II, consideration of which had just been deferred, would, if adopted, vitiate draft resolution C. He was, however, prepared to regard the resolutions as unrelated, and on that understanding would vote for resolution C.

The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution C to the vote.

Draft resolution C was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution D: Collection of provisions on protection of minorities

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, drew attention to the parallel between resolution B, adopted at the Commission's 396th meeting, and the resolution under consideration: the first related to provisions on the prevention of discriminatory practices, and the other to provisions on the protection of minorities. In adopting resolution B, the Commission had decided to delete the words "particularly in the case of new States" from the end of the final sentence, and he imagined that, in order to bring the two resolutions into line, the Commission would wish to delete the final clause of resolution D, from the word "notably" onwards.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) suggested that, following the precedent set by the action taken on resolution B, draft resolution D might be couched, not in the form of a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council, but in that of a direct request from the Commission to the Secretary-General. He also agreed with Mr. Roy's suggestion, and further thought that, as a matter of drafting, the words "protection of minorities" should be substituted for the word "subject" in the preamble.

It was agreed that the draft resolution should be addressed to the Secretary-General direct.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) thought that the deletion of the final clause from resolution B had been of little significance. In draft resolution D, however,

the two final clauses reproduced the idea underlying resolution C on the protection of newly-created minorities, just adopted unanimously.

Mr. DIAZ-CASANEJVA (Chile) considered that the proposed collection of provisions ought to cover not only international instruments such as conventions, but also national constitutions and legislation. He therefore proposed that the words "and national" be inserted between the words "international" and "instruments" in the operative part of the resolution.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that the last two clauses of the draft resolution might be deleted, especially as the question of minorities created by frontier changes was covered by resolution C; he therefore proposed that a separate vote be taken on them. With regard to the phrase "to serve as a body of suitable precedents", he had already emphasized, with reference to the identical phrase used in resolution B, that it would be impossible for States to undertake to use as a guide each and every provision dealing with the protection of minorities that might be collected. His vote on the draft resolution would depend on whether or not those words were retained.

Mr. CASSIN (France) proposed that the words "on occasion" be inserted in the phrase quoted by the Soviet Union representative. He was by no means sure that it would be possible to use the proposed collection of provisions as a body of precedents. There was a great deal of difference between the expressions used in the French text, namely, "pourrait être consulté" and "servir de guide". Possibly more members of the Commission would be disposed to accept the text were the addition he proposed made.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although he was not opposed to the French amendment, it would not remove his difficulty. He therefore requested that a separate vote be taken on the words "to serve as a body of suitable precedents".

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that in the preamble the words "protection of minorities" be substituted for the word "subject".

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French proposal that the words "on occasion" be inserted before the words "as a body of suitable precedents".

The French proposal was adopted by 8 votes to none with 8 abstentions.



The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "to serve on occasion as a body of suitable precedents".

The Commission decided by 6 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions, to delete those words.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Chilean proposal that the words "and national" be inserted between the words "international" and "instruments".

The Chilean proposal was adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the passage "notably in cases when minority rights are to be safeguarded in newly established States, but also in cases when minorities are to be protected following upon the establishment of new boundary lines between States".

The Commission decided by 7 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions, to retain those words.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution D as a whole and as amended.

Draft resolution D, as a whole and as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution M:	Reports of the relevant work of UNESCO
(Taken together with)	Activities of UNESCO in the field of prevention
Draft resolution IV	of discrimination and protection of minorities
(annexed to the report	
of the fourth session):	

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, explaining draft resolution M, said that the Sub-Commission was of the opinion that the co-operation of the specialized agencies, and in particular that of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), was essential to the satisfactory performance of its task. It would accordingly be glad if UNESCO could be requested, as a matter of high priority, to continue its studies on educational methods designed to eradicate prejudice and discrimination.

With regard to draft resolution IV, he referred the Commission to the third paragraph thereof, in which the attention of the Economic and Social Council was invited to UNESCO's activities in the fields of prevention of discrimination and

protection of minorities, especially to its on-the-spot investigations, such as those it had conducted in Brazil.

Mr. METRAUX (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said that UNESCO's activities in the field of the prevention of discrimination were of two kinds: the diffusion of scientific data of use in the struggle against discrimination; and the carrying-out of specific investigations within its programme and on the basis of resolutions adopted by its appropriate organs. The latter was the more difficult task for the problems of racial prejudice were of a scope that far exceeded the Organization's limited material resources. It had accordingly concentrated on a single aspect of prevention of racial discrimination, and had made it its task since 1951 to conduct investigations into situations presenting positive features. In Brazil, for instance, where racial relations were good, it had made a large-scale survey, seeking to discover the factors conducive to harmonious racial relations. In 1952, it had conducted enquiries into the problem of integration and relations between different ethnic groups, and between minority and majority groups. Those studies were on the point of completion, and it was hoped that it would be possible to draw useful conclusions from them. He felt that UNESCO was thus making a positive contribution to the solution of the problems with which countries wishing to prevent discrimination were concerned.

Starting in 1953, UNESCO proposed to intensify its activity in the educational field with a view not only to reaching the upper crust but to penetrating into the schools. For that purpose it was preparing guides for primary school and secondary-school teachers to provide them with a theoretical basis which would help them to overcome prejudices entertained by their pupils.

Mr. DIAZ-CASANUEVA (Chile) alluded to the weighty and important studies made by UNESCO in biology and genetics, both of which sciences had been contaminated by racial theories that had led to the introduction of discriminatory measures. The draft resolutions before the Commission were intended as recognition of that work, but a very important factor was the work being done by various countries to reform their educational systems and curricula with the object of eradicating discrimination from them. Calling to mind the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Commission should initiate a report on the relation between education and the

promotion of human rights, he would urge the Commission to show interest not only in UNESCO's work, but also in the results obtained in the various countries, and accordingly suggested the addition of the following words to the last paragraph of draft resolution M:

"and the manner in which the various countries have applied the educational methods advocated by UNESCO".

Mrs. LORD (United States of America) said that UNESCO already rendered a comprehensive annual report to the Economic and Social Council. In view of the resolution adopted by the Council in 1952 calling for a report by UNESCO in 1953 on studies and work on educational methods and projects best designed to overcome prejudice and discriminatory attitudes and measures (resolution 443 (XIV)), she doubted whether there was any need to discuss draft resolution M before UNESCO's survey appeared.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) agreed with the United States representative. The Commission did not need to adopt resolutions to encourage UNESCO in its work. It would be sufficient if it congratulated UNESCO on its achievements in the fields of prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities, and then expressed the hope that the good work would be pursued. It could then dispense with draft resolutions M and IV.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that draft resolutions M and IV had been overtaken by events; however, he wished to bring two points to the Commission's notice.

First, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights - which, incidentally, neither draft resolution mentioned - the measures to be taken to make the Universal Declaration a reality were divided into two main categories: national and international measures; and educational measures. The Commission might therefore formally note that progress, although rather slow in respect of national and international measures, had been more substantial in the educational field. Such a finding was within the Commission's competence, and would in no sense be at variance with the views of the United States and Belgian delegations.

Secondly, since the responsibilities of the Sub-Commission and UNESCO in respect of the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities were identical, the Commission should request the Sub-Commission to co-operate with UNESCO and to pay due regard to the latter's relevant programmes. In view of the

shortage of funds, which cropped up only too regularly, all overlapping should be avoided.

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, said that the Sub-Commission had discussed the issue now before the Commission both when it had been considering draft resolution IV, and later when it had come to draft resolution M.

Some members of the Sub-Commission had considered that it would be pointless to invite the Commission on Human Rights to congratulate UNESCO, since the Economic and Social Council expressed twice a year its appreciation of that agency's work. In that connexion, he called attention to paragraph 62 of the Sub-Commission's report on its fifth session (E/CN.4/670).

He thought that the Commission on Human Rights might still adopt draft resolution M, which dealt with reports on the relevant work of UNESCO.

He would point out that it was precisely because the Economic and Social Council had, by its resolution 443 (XIV), invited UNESCO to report to it on its work, that the Sub-Commission had deemed it expedient, after hearing a statement by a UNESCO representative, to invite the Organization to provide a brief review of its activities designed to eradicate prejudice and discrimination and to protect minorities.

Mr. METRAUX (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that, according to his information, UNESCO would be devoting a special chapter of its general report to the Economic and Social Council to its work in the field of prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities. Copies of that chapter could be made available to members of the Sub-Commission. That ought to solve the problem to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) felt that the Commission ought to take formal note of the UNESCO representative's statement.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that UNESCO's work in the struggle against prejudice and discrimination had made substantial progress. Its value was generally recognized. There seemed little to warrant the transmission of a formal resolution to the Council, particularly in view of UNESCO's offer to include a special chapter in its general report and to abstract the relevant information for the Sub-Commission's use. He proposed that no action be taken on draft resolutions IV and M, and that the Commission proceed to the next draft resolution.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN,  
the Commission took note of the statement made by the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Draft resolution K: Technical assistance in the fields of prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, was glad to note that the proposals submitted by the United States delegation in its draft resolution on advisory services<sup>(1)</sup> under item 7 of the agenda, which had not yet been discussed, coincided in several respects with those of the Sub-Commission, and dealt with the same subject as draft resolution K but in much greater detail. The United States delegation had naturally viewed the problem from the level of the Commission on Human Rights, whereas the Sub-Commission had considered it in the context of its own more limited terms of reference. It had felt that it should be possible for the organizations participating in the technical assistance programmes to give sympathetic consideration to the requests which governments might submit in connexion with measures aimed at the abolition of racial discrimination and at the protection of minorities.

Mrs. LORD (United States of America) pointed out that her delegation's draft resolution on advisory services contained a reference to draft resolution K. The United States proposal, however, embraced a much broader field, and went into details of technical and advisory services that were relevant to all aspects of human rights. She suggested that the Commission might decide to defer its consideration of draft resolution K until the whole relation of technical assistance to human rights could be discussed in connexion with the United States draft resolution.

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, ventured to disagree with the United States representative. There was, in his opinion, no incompatibility between the United States proposals and the Sub-Commission's draft resolution which, he would repeat,

---

(1) For text of the United States draft resolution, see the Commission's report on its ninth session (E/2447), paragraph 271.

related only to the latter's activities in its own field. There would be nothing to prevent the Commission, if it adopted draft resolution K, from subsequently taking action on a wider scale, as envisaged in the United States proposals.

At the time when the United States delegation had introduced its draft resolution, it had not been known whether the Sub-Commission would remain in existence. That was no doubt the reason why there was no reference to the Sub-Commission in Part C of that proposal. In view of the Commission's decision that the Sub-Commission should continue, the United States representative might perhaps consider amending her text.

In reply to an enquiry by Mr. CASSIN (France), he said that there was no objection to combining sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of draft resolution K, seeing that both dealt with technical advice and other services which the Secretary-General might render to States desirous of eradicating prejudice or discrimination or of protecting minorities.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) considered that the recommendation in sub-paragraph (a), namely, that sympathetic consideration should be given to applications for technical assistance, was superfluous. It was the function of the organizations concerned to give sympathetic consideration to all such requests, provided there was evidence of the need for the services asked for, and that those services could be rendered within the limits laid down by the relevant General Assembly resolutions, and within the prevailing system of priorities. Sub-paragraph (b) introduced a new suggestion: that the General Assembly or the technical assistance administration should create another service to furnish technical advice designed to eradicate prejudice or discrimination. The question arose whether the Commission should ask the General Assembly to deal with the matter by creating a new fund or enlarging the existing one, or whether, as the United States representative had suggested, that question should be considered as part of a more general approach to the question of technical assistance in the field of human rights as a whole. It would appear that the examples mentioned in sub-paragraph (c) could, subject to the availability of funds, be provided for under the existing programmes of technical assistance. The drafting of legislation and the establishment of administrative and judicial machinery fell under the heading of "public administration"; expert advice on educational programmes to combat prejudice and discrimination could be furnished

from the technical assistance programme administered by UNESCO; and it was difficult to see any substantial additional need for technical assistance that would justify asking the General Assembly to revise its complicated resolutions on the matter, particularly as the demands for technical assistance of other kinds already far exceeded the available funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) referred to paragraph 59 of the Sub-Commission's report on its fifth session (E/CN.4/670), in which it was recorded that a representative of the Legal Department of the United Nations had stated that the situations in which expert advice could be given were limited, and that a resolution would have to be adopted by the General Assembly if it were desired to increase the range of situations in which requests for such advice could be met. The consideration underlying that opinion was that the only social activities for which technical assistance could be granted without the express authority of the General Assembly were those which had an economic background, or were in some way related to economic development.

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China) suggested that, in view of the short time at the Commission's disposal, it would be wiser merely to take note of draft resolution K and of the draft resolution on advisory services proposed by the United States delegation, and to refer both to the Economic and Social Council. The Council might consider it possible to extend the technical assistance programmes into the field of human rights, and make a recommendation to that effect to the General Assembly; or, alternatively, it might recommend that a certain percentage of technical assistance funds, or of some other funds, be devoted to work in the human rights field. In any event, the Commission was not competent to take a final decision.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Chinese representative that the General Assembly had approved a recommendation that technical assistance be provided for developing means of securing freedom of information, a project which fell within the domain of human rights.<sup>(1)</sup>

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) pointed out that while it was perfectly true that technical assistance could be granted for undertakings connected with human rights, a specific resolution of the General Assembly was required in each case.

---

(1) See General Assembly resolution 633 (VII).

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) felt some doubt about the exact margin between what could be done under the existing limitations of the technical assistance programmes, and what was contemplated in draft resolution K. He recalled that the original technical assistance fund, which formed part of the regular budget of the United Nations, was earmarked for social welfare advisory services, including public administration. There was no question of that fund being tied to economic development. The expanded programme of technical assistance, contributions to which were voluntary, could also be used to finance social projects provided they had a bearing on economic development. In his opinion, the drafting of legislation relating to human rights would come within the scope of the original technical assistance programme, although, if matters other than those covered by the concept of public administration were envisaged, the scope and the funds of that programme would have to be augmented. He was not satisfied that it was necessary to go farther than was possible under existing arrangements. Moreover, there was no clear definition of the additional ground it was proposed to cover: the examples given in draft resolution K were in his view already covered.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether it had formally been decided to defer consideration of technical assistance in the field of human rights until the United States draft resolution was taken up. If so, he would speak later.

Mrs. LORD (United States of America), while maintaining that it would be better to discuss the subject within the broader framework of her delegation's proposal, said that she would be quite ready to accept the Chairman's ruling that consideration of draft resolution K should continue.

Mr. CASSIN (France) expressed surprise at the Secretariat's assertion that certain requests for technical assistance were inadmissible, not for lack of funds, but for legal reasons. In his view, the Commission ought to be able to ensure that questions falling within its competence enjoyed equality of treatment in respect of technical assistance with any other problem. He had no doubt that a world survey of discriminatory measures would be extremely difficult to carry out and would give rise to a host of problems, particularly in its relation to public administration. He was equally certain that no one expert could possibly hope to



familiarize himself with all discriminatory provisions in all their various forms in every State. The Commission should, accordingly, eschew all theoretical considerations and consider the problem from a practical standpoint; it should concentrate on removing any obstacles to the admissibility of requests for technical assistance in connexion with measures aimed at the eradication of discrimination and the protection of minorities.

The French delegation accordingly proposed that the Commission adopt draft resolution K.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the extension of the provision of technical assistance from the economic field to that of human rights, were it feasible, which seemed questionable, would be an important departure; but draft resolution K seemed to him somewhat artificial. In his view, such forms of technical assistance as were mentioned in it could legitimately be regarded as serious interference in the domestic affairs of small nations, which were none the less sovereign States, and therefore conflicted with the terms of the Charter. Accordingly, he was unable to support the draft resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) referred the Commission to the report by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council on the future work of the United Nations in the field of prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities (E/2229), in which the question in paragraphs 64 to 68, of the provision of expert advice to governments aiming at the eradication of prejudice or discrimination or the protection of minorities was dealt with at some length, and substantially the same action was suggested as in draft resolution K.

The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution K to the vote, sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) being combined, as proposed by the French representative and agreed to by the Chairman of the Sub-Commission.

Draft resolution K, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China), explaining his vote, said that he had abstained not because he was opposed to the principle underlying the resolution, but because he was doubtful whether the resolution, even if adopted by the Council, could be implemented. He reserved the right to take the matter up again in the Council.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) explained that he had voted against the resolution because he was doubtful of the propriety of recommending to the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly an extension of technical assistance commitments and the creation of a new fund without providing a clear explanation as to what, if any, possibilities of action were not covered under existing relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the resolution should not be regarded as prejudging the future treatment of the question of technical assistance in the field of human rights as a whole. The French delegation's intention had been simply to ensure that requests for technical assistance in the Sub-Commission's special field should be admissible and given sympathetic consideration.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.