

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.397
5 October 1953

ENGLISH
Original : ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Dual distribution

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Ninth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 22 May 1953, at 10 a.m.

CONTENTS:

pages

1. 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 fifth session (E/CN.4/670) (continued):
 - Draft resolution E - Abolition of discriminatory measures; and United Kingdom amendments thereto (continued) 4 - 6
 - Draft resolution J - Studies of erroneous views concerning religion 6 - 10
2. Welcome to the Secretary-General 10 - 11
3. Item 1 above resumed:
 - Draft resolution J (continued) 11 - 14
 - Draft resolution L - Co-operation of non-governmental organizations 14 - 21

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. INGLES	Philippines
Mr. DEUTO	Poland
Mrs. ROSSEL	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. JEVREMOVIC	Yugoslavia

Also present:

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

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. BLAMONT
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. METTRAUX Mr. BAMBATE

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

World Federation of United Nations Associations	Mrs. SALMON
--	-------------

Category B and Register

Commission of the Churches on International Affairs	Mr. REES
Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations	Mr. WARBURG
International Federation of Business and Professional Women	Mrs. SCHRADER-RIVOLIET
International Federation of University Women	Miss BOWIE
Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations	Miss BOWIE
Pax Romana	Miss ARCHINARD
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom	Mrs. BAER
World Jewish Congress	Mr. RIEGNER
World Union for Progressive Judaism	Mr. RONALDS

Secretariat:

Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld	Secretary-General
Mr. Humphrey	Director, Division of Human Rights
Mr. Das)	Secretaries to the
Mrs. Bruce)	Commission

1. 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 fifth session (E/CN.4/670) (continued):

Draft resolution E: Abolition of discriminatory measures; and United Kingdom amendments thereto (continued)

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), referring to the Soviet Union representative's comments at the previous meeting on the United Kingdom amendments,⁽¹⁾ assured the Commission that his delegation by no means considered that, simply by adopting its proposal that a reference to General Assembly resolution 644 (VII), on the problem of racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories, be inserted in the first paragraph of the Sub-Commission's draft resolution on the abolition of discriminatory measures, the Commission would have discharged all its obligations in respect of the General Assembly resolution under item 10 of its (the Commission's) agenda; it would still have to decide what action to take on that resolution. But, whatever it might thus decide, it was appropriate, as the General Assembly itself had called the Commission's attention to the resolution in paragraph 7 thereof, to refer to it in draft resolution E.

His second argument also followed logically from the fact that, since the Sub-Commission had adopted its draft resolution, the General Assembly has passed a third resolution dealing with discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The point raised by the Philippine representative at the previous meeting concerning the words "or territories" in the third paragraph seemed to him to be valid, and he therefore withdrew his amendment to that paragraph.

With regard to the final paragraph, the distinction made by the Soviet Union representative between "all measures of discrimination" and "all measures of discrimination that may exist" must be a very subtle one, and he could only say that in English the two expressions had exactly the same meaning, and that the injunction to abolish all measures of discrimination was as comprehensive according to the

(1) For text of the United Kingdom amendments, see Annex to the summary record of the 396th meeting (E/CN.4/SR.396).

United Kingdom amendment as it was in the original text. There was, however, some advantage in retaining the words "if any" which appeared in the original text, but could not - without extensive redrafting - be included in the United Kingdom alternative. There were certain countries not having - or not admitting to having - a minority problem, which objected to a general injunction to States Members to take effective measures for the protection of minorities. In order to avoid unnecessary discussion, therefore, he was prepared to withdraw his amendments to the last paragraph, with the exception of the proposal to replace "of taking" by "to taking" in the English text. Hence, only the first two of his amendments were left.

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, observed that the Sub-Commission's proposal met the Philippine representative's points. As he had pointed out at the previous meeting, the first and second United Kingdom amendments referred to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the question of non-discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

But the Sub-Commission had in fact wished to make it clear in the third preambular paragraph, dealing with minorities, that both countries and territories were in question, and had stressed that point since resolution 127 (VI) of the Trusteeship Council did not touch on the protection of minorities. He was therefore glad that the United Kingdom representative had withdrawn his amendment to the third paragraph, for he could not have accepted it.

On behalf of the Sub-Commission, he accepted the first two United Kingdom amendments, which were in keeping with the spirit of the Sub-Commission's resolution.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), too, was glad that the last two United Kingdom amendments had been withdrawn. He was not convinced by the arguments put forward in favour of the second amendment, and would vote against it; but he could accept the amendment to the first paragraph, concerning the insertion of a reference to General Assembly resolution 644 (VII).

The CHAIRMAN put the United Kingdom amendments to the first and second paragraphs of draft resolution E to the vote.

The first United Kingdom proposal, to add at the end of the paragraph beginning "Having noted" the words "and resolution 644 (VII) of the General Assembly on racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories", was adopted unanimously.

The second United Kingdom proposal, to delete from the paragraph beginning "Considering" the words "and in Non-Self-Governing Territories other than those encompassed by the trusteeship system", was adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The third United Kingdom proposal, to insert in the same paragraph between the word "Trust" and the word "Territories" the words "and other Non-Self-Governing" was adopted unanimously.

The last United Kingdom proposal, that the words "of taking" in the last paragraph be replaced by the words "to taking", was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution E, as a whole and as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution J: Studies of erroneous views concerning religion

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, introducing draft resolution J, said that not all of the twelve experts who made up the Sub-Commission had a profound knowledge of theological and religious problems, but one, who was particularly well versed in the matters, had advocated that the Commission adopt a proposal on the lines of draft resolution J. The Sub-Commission had come round to his point of view, and had adopted by a large majority the text now before the Commission.

The expert responsible was convinced, and had succeeded in convincing his colleagues, that superstition and ignorance were at the root of certain erroneous views which had contributed to the discriminatory and hostile treatment of certain religious groups, and also to inter-religious hostility and tension.

By the terms of the draft resolution, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), as the competent specialized agency, was requested to take up the question, but was, he believed, finding difficulty in accepting the task which the Sub-Commission wished to assign to it.

Mr. METTRAUX (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, confirmed that the Sub-Commission's draft resolution was causing UNESCO some concern. His organization knew from its previous experience of such matters that the study which it had been asked to carry out would give rise to bitter discussion and even greater tensions than then existed. Again, such a study would prove very difficult, and would raise some very delicate questions, which might well provoke unfavourable reactions to the cause it was desired to serve; it would almost certainly lead to futile disputation on points of dogma. It would, moreover, be extremely hard to find persons qualified to make the necessary investigations.

UNESCO had already dealt with the question of religious prejudices in its studies and publications; it had, for instance, requested eminent spokesmen for various denominations to define their Church's position on the racial question.

UNESCO did not in fact wish to undertake the study suggested in the draft resolution, first, because of the difficulties involved, and secondly, because it was convinced that it had already achieved the draft resolution's main object through its published studies on the position taken by the various Churches on the racial question.

Mrs. CHATTOPADHYAY (India) said that her country had had considerable experience of studies of communal and religious tensions; it had been found that superficial and inadequate inquiries aroused much bitterness without leading to any useful solution. Religious differences and tensions were deep-seated, and often rooted in age-old traditions. Only those who were intimately acquainted with the life of the different religious communities were qualified to make any useful contribution to the solution of such problems. She would be exceedingly reluctant to encourage the undertaking of any such studies without the fullest examination and understanding of all their implications.

Mrs. LORD (United States of America) strongly supported the two previous speakers. It would be a great mistake to take up only one aspect of a very complex and difficult problem, but she hoped that at a later date the Commission, giving effect to the recommendations made in her delegation's draft resolution on specific

aspects of human rights, ⁽¹⁾ might see its way to including in its programme a comprehensive study under an expert adviser, using all available resources of UNESCO and other United Nations agencies, as well as of non-governmental organizations and groups.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) said that, deplorable though antagonisms due to religious prejudices might be, the evil could not be remedied by means such as those proposed in the draft resolution. The views expressed by the representatives of India and of UNESCO were those of his delegation, and he hoped that the Sub-Commission would withdraw its proposal. The question was one for those versed in ethics - theologians and philosophers - who could seek out and point up the fundamental unities to be found in all religions; thus, superstition and ignorance could gradually be overcome. He earnestly hoped that the Commission would accept that view.

Mr. CASSIN (France) thought that the principle underlying the draft resolution was fundamentally sound, and that its only fault lay in the manner in which it was presented. Undoubtedly, religious differences were all too often at the root of discriminatory measures, and the Sub-Commission was therefore duly discharging its responsibilities in seeking not only to combat existing measures of discrimination, but also to forestall new ones.

However, in common with other members, he thought that the Sub-Commission had approached the problem on somewhat too narrow lines, and he could therefore appreciate UNESCO's reluctance to accept the task assigned to it.

That being so, it would be better to send the draft resolution back to the Sub-Commission with a request that it be reviewed, taking into account the part that could be played in that field not only by international organizations but also by religious groups.

He recalled in that connexion the conference held four years previously at Seelisberg between representatives of the Christian and Jewish faiths with the

(1) This draft resolution was submitted under item 7 of the agenda (development of the work of the United Nations for wider observance of, and respect for, human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world); its consideration was deferred until the Commission's tenth session.

object of eliminating from instruction in the catechism anything capable of fomenting anti-Semitism or of weakening resistance to Nazi propaganda. The conference had yielded substantial practical results, and others on the same lines were being organized in France and elsewhere.

From the practical point of view, the essential thing was to find the best means of achieving the desired end. The Sub-Commission was competent to do that itself, and the Commission's part should be limited to giving it guidance and moral encouragement. The Sub-Commission should collaborate with UNESCO, the non-governmental organizations and the many faiths concerned in order to dispel as far as possible the prejudices which the adherents of those faiths might harbour against each other, taking "faith" in its broadest sense, to include also philosophical, deistic or materialistic doctrines.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that every sincere adherent of a religion believed that its distinctive tenets were right and that, ipso facto, those of other religions were wrong. Superstition and ignorance were difficult to eradicate because they were so often based on deep convictions. It had taken centuries for humanity to achieve such religious tolerance as now existed; a thorough study of the existence and background of erroneous views as envisaged in the draft resolution would therefore be a programme of such formidable proportions that he could sympathize with UNESCO's action in declining the assignment. On the other hand, it was to be expected that the publication of studies describing the various misrepresentations, misinterpretations and misunderstandings of different religions would merely give wider currency to precisely those erroneous views it was desired to combat. Moreover, in order to clarify misunderstandings about a particular religion, it would be essential to present a clear and authoritative statement of the true doctrines of that religion, and it was clearly not for a body like UNESCO to attempt such a task, which should be left to the leaders and thinkers of those religions. Joint conferences between representatives of various religions such as the French representative had mentioned were an admirable method of dealing with the problem, but they must be left to the initiative of the leaders of those groups.

His own view was, first, that it was only by such means that erroneous views could be combated, and secondly, that activities to that end lay outside the scope of United Nations organs. He could not, therefore, accept the suggestion that the draft resolution be sent back to the Sub-Commission for further consideration; it was not for either the Sub-Commission or the Commission itself to make recommendations or take action in that particular field.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the French representative's interesting suggestion would more appropriately be examined under item 6 of the agenda (review of programme and establishment of priorities). So far as draft resolution J was concerned, he did not believe that to send it back to the Sub-Commission would be the right course, since such action would imply tacit acceptance of its principles. Accordingly, if that proposal were put to the vote, he would abstain.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) thought that the concordant statements made by the UNESCO representative and other speakers in the discussion had clarified the matter sufficiently for the Commission to come to a decision forthwith. He therefore moved that the debate be closed and the draft resolution put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN, having quoted rule 48 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, asked whether any representative wished to oppose the motion for the closure of the debate.

Mr. CASSIN (France), although not opposed to the motion, hoped that the Commission would also be able to express itself on his suggestion that the draft resolution be sent back to the Sub-Commission.

The Belgian representative's motion was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

2. WELCOME TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The CHAIRMAN, speaking on behalf of all members of the Commission, welcomed Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, the new Secretary-General of the United Nations, and wished him every success in his new appointment.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that as a private individual he had always followed with great interest the activities of the Commission on Human Rights, and had noted with special satisfaction the adoption by the General Assembly in 1948 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Commission occupied a special place within the United Nations, since the realization of human rights and fundamental

freedoms was specifically referred to in the Charter. He was aware of the very difficult and delicate nature of many of the problems with which the Commission had to deal, and would follow with the closest attention its work, and, indeed, all efforts on the international plane, for the promotion of human rights.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Secretary-General for his remarks.

3. ITEM 1 ABOVE RESUMED:

Draft resolution J (continued)

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no formal amendment had been submitted to draft resolution J, but that certain suggestions had been made, especially by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as to the course the Commission might follow.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), agreeing that he had made no formal proposal, repeated that if the French representative's suggestion were put to the vote, he would abstain, as he would also on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. CASSIN (France) thought that the Commission could reach agreement on his proposal, deciding on the precise instructions to be given to the Sub-Commission when it came to discuss the latter's programme of work.

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, supported the French representative's proposal, for which there were precedents. In his view, the Commission could ask the Sub-Commission to bear in mind, when reviewing the draft resolution, the opinions expressed during the discussion of the draft resolution as reported in the summary records.

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China) thought it might be preferable for the Sub-Commission merely to take note of the draft resolution, leaving to the Sub-Commission responsibility for deciding whether or not to consider the question further. He therefore submitted the following draft resolution:

"The Commission on Human Rights

"Takes note of the Sub-Commission's draft resolution on studies of erroneous views concerning religion."

Mr. CASSIN (France) pointed out that if it adopted the Chinese proposal, the Commission would be taking an entirely neutral attitude to the Sub-Commission's draft resolution. His own proposal would leave the Sub-Commission free to decide whether or not it wished to go further into the matter.

He therefore, in the light of the response of the Chairman of the Sub-Commission to his suggestion, formally proposed that the draft resolution be sent back to the Sub-Commission for review in the light of the discussions in the Commission.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), clarifying his previous remarks, explained that he did not regard the question of religious tolerance and discrimination as in itself lying outside the scope of the United Nations, but thought that the specific aspects of misinterpretation and misunderstanding to which the draft resolution referred were unsuitable for action by international organizations, and should be left to the groups and persons qualified to deal with them. He agreed with the Chinese representative's approach to the question. To send the draft resolution back to the Sub-Commission without qualification would be ambiguous, since it could be interpreted as a directive to the Sub-Commission to go further into the whole question; and to send it back for reconsideration in the light of the discussion in the Commission would be tantamount to a directive not to reconsider the question at all. The United Kingdom delegation was not in favour of the subject being pursued further in the way suggested in the draft resolution, and he would accordingly be unable to vote for the French proposal.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium), although in general agreement with the United Kingdom representative, felt the Commission should not merely take note of the draft resolution, but should take a definite decision on it. If the Commission wished the Sub-Commission to make a further, more comprehensive study of the problem, the procedure proposed by the Soviet Union representative should be followed, and the subject dealt with under item 6 of the agenda.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) also supported the Soviet Union representative's suggestion. The view of the Australian delegation was that the draft resolution should not be reconsidered by the Sub-Commission.

Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he would support the French proposal, because he considered, first, that important questions were at stake, and secondly, that the Commission could not ignore the existing situation. The Sub-Commission should therefore be instructed to re-examine the problems dealt with in draft resolution J.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to vote first on the French, and then on the Chinese proposals.

The French proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

The Chinese draft resolution was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put the draft resolution itself to the vote.

Draft resolution J was rejected by 8 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China) emphasized that his intention in submitting his draft resolution had been to avoid making it mandatory on the Sub-Commission to reconsider its draft resolution, and to leave the question to its discretion.

Mrs. LORD (United States of America), explaining her vote, said that she felt that the Commission itself ought first to study the broader issue of freedom of religion in all its aspects. The Sub-Commission would have an important part to play in such a study.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) explained that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because the terms in which it defined the problem were much too narrow.

His delegation had also voted against the French proposal. To send the resolution back to the Sub-Commission would be justifiable only if that body were simultaneously given instructions that would enable it to consider the issues involved from an entirely different standpoint. The Commission should study those directives when it came to discuss the Sub-Commission's programme of work, until which time the matter should be left open.

Mrs. CHATTOPADHYAY (India) explained that she had supported the French proposal, hoping that, as a result of its adoption, the Sub-Commission would have been encouraged to adopt a different approach to the subject of religious discrimination. It might, however, be better to deal with the matter, as the Soviet Union representative had suggested, when the Commission came to discuss its programme of work.

Mr. CASSIN (France) hoped that even though his proposal had been rejected, the Sub-Commission would re-examine the problem from a new angle and in a much wider context than hitherto.

The French delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it was not satisfied with the way in which it was worded.

Draft resolution L: Co-operation of non-governmental organizations

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, introducing draft resolution L, said that the Sub-Commission considered that there were two distinct aspects to its work: general studies on the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities; and studies on specific questions and suggestions for the prevention of discrimination in particular cases and the effective protection of minorities.

The draft resolution on the co-operation of non-governmental organizations related to the first aspect of the Sub-Commission's work. The latter had felt it necessary, to help it in carrying out its task, to assemble as much material as possible on the measures taken by governments, whether Members of the United Nations or not, and on the suggestions and achievements of United Nations bodies and the specialized agencies.

As early as its fourth session the Sub-Commission had already received replies from thirty-eight governments, and now possessed a large amount of material on the activities of United Nations bodies and the specialized agencies in the fields of prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities.

The Sub-Commission, moreover, had thought that the interested non-governmental organizations should also be able to express their views - an opinion which, he was pleased to note, the French representative seemed to share - and had been greatly helped by their collaboration.

As, however, it considered that the suggestions of those organizations would carry more weight if submitted jointly, it had adopted the draft resolution on the co-operation of non-governmental organizations for submission to the Commission. Since provision had been made for the calling of conferences of non-governmental organizations, the Sub-Commission recommended that the Secretary-General be requested to consult them on the advisability of convening them in periodic conferences in accordance with the rules laid down in General Assembly resolution 479 (V).

Mrs. LORD (United States of America) asked whether the question could not be placed on the agenda of the next Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council, to be held in Geneva in June 1953, immediately before the Council's sixteenth session.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) explained that the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations was a purely private meeting, and that the United Nations merely put premises at its disposal; it had nothing to do with drawing up the Conference's agenda.

Mr. REES (Commission of the Churches on International Affairs), speaking, at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, as Chairman of the Bureau of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council, said that the Conference had always eschewed the consideration of substantive issues; it would therefore be difficult for it to comply with the requests made in draft resolution L. He believed, none the less, that all non-governmental organizations interested in the Commission's work would welcome its adoption. The Commission should not look to the Conference to give a collective

answer to substantive questions and he would cite, as an example of a better means of securing the necessary co-operation, the International Conferences of Non-Governmental Organizations interested in Migration, which had been convened jointly by the Department of Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat and the International Labour Organisation. Such an ad hoc conference would be necessary to provide the assistance asked for by the Sub-Commission, but he had no doubt that the idea of such a conference would find enthusiastic support if broached at the forthcoming Conference mentioned by the United States representative.

Mrs. SALMON (World Federation of United Nations Associations), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, expressed her Federation's appreciation of the work done by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, and was gratified to see that the collaboration of non-governmental organizations was considered so helpful. The World Federation would warmly welcome the adoption of draft resolution L.

Mr. RIEGNER (World Jewish Congress), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said that he would like to take the opportunity to express his organization's gratitude to the Sub-Commission for the work it was doing. The World Jewish Congress was particularly glad to note that the Sub-Commission had taken some of its suggestions into account when drawing up its work programme, and he would like also to emphasize that his Organization considered that the programme envisaged marked any important step forward in the Sub-Commission's endeavours, notably in the case of part A (prevention of discrimination).

It would give his organization much pleasure if the Commission could see its way to adopt draft resolution L, as it would thereby encourage some of the non-governmental organizations to show greater interest than they had done hitherto in the questions being dealt with by the Sub-Commission. The resolution should also lead to fuller collaboration between them and the United Nations. Although the non-governmental organizations in consultative status were determined to maintain their independence and fully to preserve their individual right of direct access to the bodies of the United Nations - a determination that was fully shared by the World Jewish Congress - the conferences contemplated in the draft resolution would enable the organizations to get together for the profitable study of the problems with which the Sub-Commission had to deal, while the latter, in its turn, would benefit from their effort to co-ordinate their thinking on the subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat), replying to Mr. WHITLAM (Australia), said that, if the draft resolution were adopted, the Secretary-General before convening a conference, would consult with the non-governmental organizations to ascertain their wishes in the matter. That could be done at the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations to be held the following month, but as the organizations concerned did not usually speak with a collective voice, it might be preferable to approach each one individually. Mr. Rees had mentioned the International Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations interested in migration; but draft resolution L did not go so far. It merely envisaged, as a first step, consultations to establish the desirability of convening a conference.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) asked whether the cost of such a conference, if convened under the rules laid down in General Assembly resolution 479 (V), would fall on the United Nations budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said that he did not think that there would be any financial implications. The United Nations would merely make premises, and possibly technical staff, available if they were not being used for other meetings. He pointed out that General Assembly resolution 479 (V) laid down rules for the calling of non-governmental conferences by the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) noted that that resolution authorized the Council to "make recommendations for financing" (rule 2, Section 1 (d)). Was it the accepted procedure for the non-governmental organizations to defray the costs involved? Or would United Nations funds be used?

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said that the question of how such conferences should be financed was within the jurisdiction of the Economic and Social Council, with whom the final decision lay. The Secretary-General, however, who was responsible for estimating the financial implications of proposals, had not considered that such conferences as were envisaged in draft resolution L would constitute a charge on United Nations funds.

Miss BOWIE (International Federation of University Women), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, welcomed the draft resolution and the approval it implied of the efforts of the non-governmental organizations. The non-governmental

organizations in consultative status with the Council were directly or indirectly concerned in the prevention of discrimination, and she cited occasions when the International Federation of University Women had maintained its opposition, albeit at the cost of membership and income, to discrimination on racial, religious or political grounds. Those organizations, which invariably had difficulty in raising sufficient funds to achieve their principal aims, would view with some alarm a call for periodic conferences. For the same reason, it was not realistic to ask them to devote a larger proportion of their existing resources to any fresh cause. The forthcoming Conference would help, but she was in favour of only one conference, and not a series, being held.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) associated himself with the cogent arguments put forward by the previous speaker, and was opposed to the inclusion in the draft resolution of gratuitous advice to organizations which, by definition, were active in the prevention of discrimination on how they should dispose of their resources. He therefore proposed that sub-paragraph (1) be deleted from the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution, and that the word "periodic" be deleted from the second operative paragraph.

The preamble mentioned organizations actively engaged in activities designed to eradicate prejudice and discrimination, whereas the operative part proposed that all non-governmental organizations in consultative relationship with the Economic and Social Council or the specialized agencies should be consulted. While it was not necessary to limit consultation to those organizations already active, it would be well to give the Secretary-General latitude to convoke meetings of organizations which he found to have a definite concern in the prevention of discrimination. He would therefore propose that the second operative paragraph be amended to read "... to consult interested non-governmental organizations in consultative relationship ...", and that the third paragraph of the preamble be deleted. It was not for the Commission to give gratuitous financial directives to organizations whose association with the United Nations both attested their interest in combating discrimination and enabled them to discern the directions in which their resources should be applied.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) observed that practical difficulties would arise if it were not possible to approach all non-governmental organizations in consultative status, as only by such means could the Secretary-General ascertain their interests. It would therefore be preferable to leave the second line in the second operative paragraph unchanged.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that in that event he would propose that the fifth line of the second operative paragraph be amended to read "advisable to convene the interested non-governmental organizations in conferences in order that they may ..."

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, said that the Sub-Commission itself had considered deleting sub-paragraph (i) of the first operative paragraph, but had decided by a small majority to retain it.

He was afraid that he could not support the United Kingdom proposal that the word "periodic" be deleted. The non-governmental organizations which had made statements in the course of the discussion in the Sub-Commission had, with but one exception, supported the idea of periodic conferences. They should accordingly be given the opportunity of making known their views on the matter, as provided for in the draft resolution, which requested the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the competent specialized agencies, to consult them on the advisability of convening periodic conferences.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) supported the United Kingdom proposal that sub-paragraph (i) of the first operative paragraph be deleted, but considered that a desirable idea would be lost if the third paragraph of the preamble was deleted as well. The preamble established a link between organizations having as their objective the promotion of social progress generally and those actively engaged in specific activities designed to eradicate prejudice and discrimination. The draft resolution accordingly referred to two distinct categories of organization, and he would suggest that the United Kingdom representative's intention would be better achieved by replacing the words "a larger proportion of their resources" by "particular attention" than by deleting the third paragraph of the preamble.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) accepted that suggestion. As it was unlikely that there would be any difficulty in convening future conferences if the first proved successful, the word "periodic" was unnecessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) emphasized that the resolution merely requested the Secretary-General to consult the non-governmental organizations on the subject; it did not instruct him to convene a conference. Action by the Economic and Social Council would be needed before a conference could be convened, and the Council would naturally take only such action as it saw fit.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that in that case his proposals should be completed by amending the penultimate line of the draft resolution to read "the advisability of convening such a conference". The resolution was of an exploratory nature, and if the Council deemed it advisable the question of convening ~~future~~ conferences could be raised again subsequently.

Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) concurred. The matter lay entirely within the Council's discretion.

The CHAIRMAN said that the latest amendment put forward by the United Kingdom representative added a new element. The original proposal to delete the word "periodic", while removing the idea of regularity, had left the door open for the holding of several conferences. Now it was suggested that only one conference should be envisaged.

Mr. ROY, Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, wondered whether the United Kingdom representative could agree to a suggestion just made to him (Mr. Roy) by the representative of a non-governmental organization, namely, that the phrase "periodic conferences" in the second operative paragraph be replaced by the words "one or more conferences". The words "such conferences" in the last paragraph would have to be consequentially amended to read "one or more such conferences". It would then be for the non-governmental organizations concerned to indicate in due course whether they thought it advisable to convene one conference or more.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that Mr. Roy's proposal was acceptable to him.

The CHAIRMAN put the United Kingdom amendments, as themselves amended, to the vote one by one.

The proposal that the words "a larger proportion of their resources" in the third paragraph of the preamble be replaced by the words "particular attention" was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The proposal that sub-paragraph (1) of the first operative paragraph be deleted was adopted by 6 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

The proposal that the words "advisable to convene them" in the second operative paragraph be replaced by the words "advisable to convene the interested non-governmental organizations" was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The proposal that the words "periodic conferences" in the second operative paragraph be replaced by the words "one or more conferences" was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The proposal that, in the last operative paragraph, the words "convening one or more such conferences" be substituted for the words "convening such conferences", was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution L, as a whole and as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.