

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.768  
3 March 1964

ENGLISH  
Original: ENGLISH/FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Nineteenth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 2 April 1963, at 3.25 p.m.

CONTENTS

Draft declaration and draft convention on the elimination  
of all forms of religious intolerance (item 13 of the agenda)

Communication from the Chairman of the Commission

Present:

Chairman:

Rapporteur:

Mr. RESIOH (Poland)

Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy)

Members:

Canada

Chile

China

Denmark

Ecuador

France

India

Lebanon

Liberia

Netherlands

Panama

Philippines

Poland

Turkey

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

United Kingdom of Great Britain  
and Northern Ireland

United States of America

Miss AITKEN

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA

( Mr. CHENG Paonan

( Mr. TAO

Mr. MADSEN

Mr. PONCE y CARBO

Mr. CASSIN

Mr. CHAKRAVARTY

Mr. HAKIM

Mr. DOE

Mr. BEAUFORT

Mr. JIMENEZ

Mr. BRILLANTES

Mr. WIECZOREK

Mr. LÜTEM

Mr. NEDBALLO

Mr. NASSINOVSKY

Sir Samuel HOARE

Mrs. TREE

Observers for Member States:

Argentina

Cuba

Iraq

Israel

Spain

Yugoslavia

Mr. GARCIA PINEIRO

Mr. GONZALEZ-PINEIRO

Mrs. AFNAN

Mr. BARTUR

Mr. ARROYO AZNAR

Mr. SOC

Representative of another United Nations organ:

Commission on the Status of Women

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX

Representative of a specialized agency:

International Labour Organisation

Mr. METALL

Secretariat:

Mr. HUMPHREY

Director, Division of Human  
Rights

Mr. TARDU

Secretary of the Commission

DRAFT DECLARATION AND DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE (item 13 of the agenda) (E/CN.4/842 and Add.1, 846)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider item 13 of its agenda.

Mrs. TREE (United States of America) said that the terms of Articles 1 and 55 of the Charter of the United Nations and Articles 2 and 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights showed that the United Nations had been concerned ever since the Charter had come into force with the problem of religious discrimination and that concern had been reflected in fairly precise terms in the Universal Declaration. While the Universal Declaration could not be considered as binding on States, it had nevertheless been considered, and justly so, as an expression of views commonly and universally held by all Members of the United Nations. In a sense, therefore, all States were committed to guaranteeing and defending the right of everyone to freedom of religion, including the freedom to change his religion or belief, and the freedom, either alone or with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

In spite of those provisions, manifestations of discrimination based on differences of race, colour and religion were still in evidence throughout the world, and it was the recognition of that fact that had led the General Assembly to adopt resolution 1781 (XVII). The United States delegation had voted for that resolution in the General Assembly because much evidence still existed throughout the world of discrimination based on religion or belief.

Many forms of discrimination existed. At previous sessions the Commission had dealt with some of them, and at the current session, by approving the draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, it had attempted to deal with such forms of racial discrimination as still existed in the world. The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had also occupied itself for many years with discrimination in various forms and guises. Discrimination on religious grounds was only part of a more general and difficult problem and should be tackled by the Commission in the context of all its work on discrimination. By adopting two separate resolutions, one on racial discrimination and the other on religious discrimination, the General Assembly

had obviously intended that the two problems should be dealt with separately. They were the two most important problems with which the Commission had to deal.

Under Article 18 of the Universal Declaration, everyone had not only the right to freedom of religion but also the right to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship or observance. Unfortunately, there were many places where individuals did not enjoy those rights. In some places that was so in spite of constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of religion and freedom to practice religion. There persons were denied the possibility of propagating their faith and were also persecuted under the guise of legitimate prosecution for crimes against the security and social stability of the community of which they formed part. In other places, religious minorities were subjected to systematic political, religious and cultural deprivation; they were denied the right to organize their religion on a national basis, theological students were debarred from returning to theological schools on extraneous grounds, members of religious minorities found it impossible to publish holy books which they needed for worship, the teaching of their religious language was prohibited, they were denied facilities for producing religious vestments and sacramental food for worship, and, in certain instances, they were refused permission to leave the country for religious conferences and were even denied the right to have any contact with their fellow-religionists elsewhere. Furthermore, where a religious minority was considered as a nationality, its members were in some cases denied the cultural and social privileges of other nationalities; they were prevented from having a cultural life in their own language, their own newspapers, publishing houses, literary journals, professional theatre, dramatic schools, literary and cultural research institutions; their schools had been closed and they were subjected to a constant and virulent press campaign. Those practices were deeply disturbing, and everything possible should be done to put an end to them.

Obviously, a declaration could merely record the collective view that there should be no form of religious discrimination whatever. The force of such a declaration would depend on the extent to which Member States were prepared to act in accordance with its terms. If they did, the draft declaration which the Commission had been asked to prepare for the General Assembly might be helpful in reducing, and finally eliminating, those prejudices which lay at the root of the problem.

Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) remarked that religious intolerance had never been a problem in China. During the past 5,000 years the Chinese people had not invented or created a religion, nor had they waged war to impose a religion, nor had they suppressed a religion. For 2,000 years Jews had been allowed to settle in China and to practise their religious beliefs, as had peoples of other faiths. There were no problems about the separation of church and State. Since freedom of choice of religion, one of the most fundamental of human rights, was the practice in China, the Chinese Government would welcome any declaration and convention which might lead to the recognition of that right throughout the world.

Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that since time did not permit of a full debate on and a thorough examination of the problem of religious intolerance, he would confine himself to a few brief remarks. Religious intolerance was the most odious form of intolerance, because it offended against the most sacred rights of man. Religion, by its very nature, pervaded the whole thinking and all the endeavours of man, it was the basis of his philosophy of life, it was the central element in the existence of the human person. Religious intolerance sometimes compelled believers to disregard the commands of their conscience and to violate the laws of God, the laws which they considered the most fundamental and most sacred.

There were two aspects of religious intolerance. The first entailed an encroachment upon the religious freedom of an individual or a group of individuals, and meant that people could not enjoy fully the right proclaimed in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration and those other rights which were indispensable to the full exercise of freedom of religion, such as the right to freedom of assembly and association, the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to own property. The second appeared where individuals or groups of individuals were subject to discrimination for the very reason that they adhered to a certain religion. That was why the word "religion" had been included in the general non-discrimination formula in Article 2(1) of the Universal Declaration, together with such other grounds for discrimination as race, colour, sex, language, political or other opinion. The word "religion" was also found in many other international instruments, notably Articles 1, 55 and 76 of the Charter. How serious the problem of religious

intolerance was could be appreciated from the fact that discrimination on grounds of religion could have a bearing on practically all the rights mentioned in the Universal Declaration and on many other rights not mentioned in it.

In the draft declaration to be prepared by the Commission it should first of all be stated, in the clearest possible way and without any ambiguity, that everyone had a sacred right to freedom of religion in the full sense of the word freedom. Furthermore, it should be stated that no one should be subject to any discrimination on the grounds of his religion. The best formulation might be a reference to Article 18 and other relevant articles of the Universal Declaration. In that way, and perhaps by other means too, freedom of religion in its individual, collective and social aspects should be guaranteed to the fullest possible extent.

It should also be made quite clear in the proposed draft declaration that the rights mentioned in it were not the only rights involved; it should not be possible to invoke the draft declaration to exclude other rights. A statement should also be included in it to the effect that any limitation of or detracting from the rights laid down in the declaration should be forbidden. Any declaration not containing such provisions, safeguarding the freedom of religion to the fullest possible extent, would not be acceptable to the Netherlands delegation.

Referring to the alleged violations of the freedom of religion in various parts of the world, he stated that the Netherlands Government and people detested all forms of religious intolerance and of discrimination on religious grounds wherever they might occur and under whatever pretext they might be practised. If, however, religious discrimination did exist in some countries, for example against the Jewish people, to the extent that even the necessary means for their religious rites were denied, or prohibitive measures were taken against Christian missionaries, whether Protestant or Catholic, or if small dissenting groups were physically threatened because of their religion and were spiritually hampered in the exercise of their religious rights, he sincerely hoped that each member of the Commission would use his influence to try and stop any religious discrimination being carried out in his country, so that each individual and each group of individuals could enjoy the right to freedom of religion.

Mr. JIMENEZ (Panama) said he shared the view expressed in paragraph 218 of the Sub-Commission's report (E/CN.4/846) that equal importance should be attached to the elimination of religious intolerance and the elimination of racial discrimination. It was appropriate that, having just approved a draft declaration condemning racial discrimination, the Commission at once should turn to condemning religious discrimination. All acts of religious discrimination violated the provisions of Article 18 of the Universal Declaration.

The Panamanian Constitution guaranteed freedom of religious observance and practice, subject to the requirements of public morality and the maintenance of the peace. Panamanian civilization was a Christian civilization, the majority of the people were of the Catholic faith, but those who professed other faiths were free to practise them and were not compelled to observe any Catholic rites.

It was a matter of great regret that fifteen years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration, religious intolerance and persecution still existed. Every effort should be made to remedy the situation. No improvement in the granting of human rights and fundamental freedoms would be possible until all forms of religious intolerance had been eradicated. Since the Commission would unfortunately not have time to deal with the matter at its current session, it must ensure that it dealt with it at the next session. The draft declaration should be based on the Universal Declaration, should be brief and solemn, and should not go into details.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that the basis for the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance derived from the United Nations Charter, which not only recognized the equality of all human beings but also proclaimed their equality from the point of view of conscience and religion. Religious intolerance had many aspects in common with racial discrimination, but since the General Assembly had requested a separate draft declaration on each of those subjects, the Commission must comply with its wishes.

The atmosphere had become favourable to the idea of religious tolerance, on which a number of statements had recently been made by eminent authorities on religion and morals. The Commission could not remain aloof from a current of opinion that was so noble and so closely in keeping with the spirit of the Charter.



Although the Commission did not have time at its current session to prepare a declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, it could nevertheless sketch its broad outlines. The preamble, in his opinion, could not differ greatly from that of the draft declaration on racial discrimination, based as it was on the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But the operative part would raise the greatest difficulties, since it would be more complex than that of the draft declaration on racial discrimination. There were three specific aspects of religious intolerance to be condemned.

Religious intolerance could give rise to discrimination against an individual on account of his beliefs. There, any action that might be taken against an individual who, of his own free will, might wish to change his religion or to adopt a religion, if he had none, must be condemned. The matter at issue in that case was the social consequences of a spiritual fact, and not a physical fact such as race or colour.

Secondly, individuals of a given religious persuasion should be protected as a group. No group should be allowed to tyrannize over others and to engage in forced conversions or reprisals against any of its members who withdrew from it. The Commission should concern itself with freedom in the relations between groups of individuals sharing the same beliefs in different countries. That concerned freedom of information as much as freedom of belief and religion. Philosophical or religious beliefs certainly deserved as much consideration as scientific knowledge.

A third form of intolerance was that directed against such external manifestations of a faith as rites, teaching and charitable works. That was related to the problem of the maintenance of the peace, and the Commission's stated principles should be sufficiently comprehensive. It should condemn intolerance towards certain groups, provided that their beliefs and activities were not directed against the freedom or lives of other members of society, and where necessary, it should protect society against the cruelty and intolerance which certain rites might entail. It might, indeed, be better to speak of mutual respect than of tolerance in that connexion.

Mr. DOE (Liberia) regretted that time would not permit of a full discussion of a problem which all Liberians had at heart. He recalled that the Liberian delegation had said, during the debate on the subject in the Third Committee, that it believed that there was only one race, the human race.

Liberia had been founded on Christian principles, and small though it was, its behaviour with regard to religious tolerance had been exemplary. As was well known, the Liberian people had at one time been discriminated against on grounds of colour and because they had formed a minority group, but, in spite of the odds against them, they had been in the vanguard in the recognition of principles of religious freedom and had tried to safeguard that freedom wherever humanity had been plagued by intolerance. The Liberian Constitution clearly laid down that no individual or group of individuals might be discriminated against on religious grounds. Religious groups of all kinds lived together in Liberia and had equal rights. A Minister of Religious Guidance had been appointed with Cabinet rank, and was drawn from the various religious groups in the country in rotation. No man could be debarred from election to public office on account of his religious beliefs.

The Liberian delegation had strongly advocated in the Third Committee that the question of religious intolerance should be accorded as much importance as that of racial discrimination and that it should be treated as a separate item. The General Assembly had agreed. Unfortunately, what he had feared had happened; the important question of racial discrimination had taken up so much of the Commission's time that there was none left for proper attention to the question of religious intolerance. Any resolution the Commission might adopt on the item should include a decision that the preparation of a draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance should be given priority at the Commission's next session.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) said that, as was well known, religious tolerance was an essential element of political and social life in Lebanon; it had in fact become a way of life. Lebanon had learnt from experience that religious tolerance was an essential foundation for society and that religious intolerance was incompatible

with social and political stability. There were many religious communities in Lebanon, and had they not lived in harmony, Lebanon could not have survived as a State respecting religious freedom and providing a refuge for persons seeking religious freedom. The Constitution guaranteed religious freedom for individuals and for communities. Moreover, it was recognized, although not written into the Constitution, that religious freedom was the right of all, irrespective of sect. The Lebanese delegation considered that it was of greatest importance that the United Nations should prepare and adopt a draft declaration and draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, which could set a standard for all countries to aim at.

Since the Commission could not deal with the subject at the current session, it should give it highest priority at the next. The Commission had been unable to deal with it not only for lack of time, but also because no suitable text had been prepared by the Sub-Commission. The principles drafted by the Sub-Commission covered a field wider than would be covered by a draft declaration, and although they contained elements which could be used in such an instrument, they could not serve as a substitute for one. The draft declaration would have to define general principles of non-discrimination in religious practices and rites and would also have to take into account the provisions of Article 18 of the Universal Declaration.

Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) remarked that he did not think it would be possible even to conclude the general discussion in the time available. Brief statements did not do justice to the importance of the question, nor would they serve any useful purpose, as a full debate would have to take place at the next session. For that reason, he did not propose to make any statement on the substance at that stage, but reserved the right to do so at the appropriate time.

India was a secular State, and its Constitution provided for complete religious freedom and belief, subject to public order, morality and health.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the previous speaker that it would not serve any useful purpose for the Commission to discuss the substance at the current session. There was no reason why the draft declaration should not be based on Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights. The USSR had no difficulties in implementing the relevant articles of the Universal Declaration, since its Constitution provided for freedom of religious observance, and no discrimination was practised against anyone on grounds of religion. A considerable majority of the people in the USSR were convinced atheists, and only a minority professed a religion, but that did not diminish their rights. The church was separate from the State, and the schools were secular.

In his delegation's opinion, the draft declaration should contain provisions condemning discrimination either against those professing a faith or against those without a faith. It should also contain a provision recognizing the freedom to engage in anti-religious propaganda as well as the freedom to celebrate religious rites and the freedom of conscience in the widest sense. He would speak on specific aspects of the draft declaration at the following session.

Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy) stressed the importance which the United Nations ascribed to the problem of religious intolerance. The General Assembly, in its resolution 1781 (XVII), had instructed the Commission to prepare a draft international convention as well as a draft declaration on that problem. He regretted that the Commission had not time to prepare the complete text of a draft declaration. Its provisions should be such as to ensure the implementation of the principle proclaimed in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration, which implicitly condemned any action or policy directed against freedom of conscience and religion. The draft declaration should also be inspired by other provisions of the Universal Declaration, such as Articles 20(1), 26(3) and 30. The relationship to be established between the principles proclaimed in Articles 18 and 30 would have to be studied carefully at the proper time.

Mr. MADSEN (Denmark) said that religious tolerance was protected in his country by the Constitution and the law. In the second preambular paragraph of resolution 1781 (XVII) the General Assembly had stated that it was "deeply disturbed by the manifestations of discrimination based on differences of race, colour and religion still in evidence throughout the world". Denmark continued to be thus disturbed. As the United States and Netherlands representatives had already said, discrimination based on religious grounds still prevented people in some countries

from enjoying the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion and the freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest their religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance, as specified in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration; and that included, for example, the right to bake and roll unleavened bread. In other cases, people were denied freedom of movement and the right to leave a country or the right in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an impartial tribunal stipulated in Articles 13 and 10 respectively. The Danish Government condemned all such discrimination and intolerance wherever it occurred.

Article 2 of the Universal Declaration entitled all people alike to the rights and freedoms set forth in the Declaration without discrimination of any kind, including discrimination on religious grounds. The Commission had to prepare a draft declaration to combat religious intolerance. The fourth preambular paragraph of General Assembly Resolution 1781 (XVII) emphasized that each State ought to take all the necessary action to put an end to violations which infringed human dignity; the draft declaration should state clearly and concisely what measures States should adopt to implement that recommendation.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said it was natural and right that the General Assembly should have directed the Commission to take action on religious as well as on racial discrimination. Antagonisms due to people's innate dislike of anyone different from them in race, colour or religion were deep-rooted and always difficult to overcome, but the question of discrimination on religious grounds had certain peculiar features. Discrimination based on ethnic differences was much publicized and opposition to it was well organized; there was no corresponding weight of opinion or publicity against religious discrimination, the existence and effects of which were therefore far less widely known.

In western Europe religious discrimination had been largely eliminated; in the rest of the world the situation was less encouraging. A special type of discrimination consisted in depriving believers of essential elements for the observance of their cults. While a minimum of toleration was grudgingly allowed, minor obstacles were placed in their way and believers were treated as second-class citizens.

The Sub-Commission's report had drawn attention to the need for upholding the essential rights to freedom of worship individually and in groups as stated in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration. It would, however, be a mistake to assume, as the Sub-Commission, no doubt for lack of time to go into the matter, appeared to have assumed, that the declaration to be drafted by the Commission would deal only with that aspect. Discrimination on the ground of religion occurred in the exercise of many rights unconnected with religious observances. The draft declaration ought also to deal with those forms of discrimination, perhaps specifying some of them, as had been done in the instrument on racial discrimination. The task would be a difficult one, particularly because of the delicate questions that arose in connexion with the rights proclaimed under Article 18, and he hoped that when the Commission came to embark on it, it would have at its disposal full information concerning the comments and proposals of Member States in response to the invitation expressed in General Assembly resolution 1781 (XVII). He also hoped that at the next session priority and ample time would be allowed for the elaboration of a satisfactory declaration.

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said he shared the general feeling that a declaration on the elimination of religious intolerance was needed. Although most Chileans were Catholics, the maximum toleration prevailed in Chile for persons professing other beliefs, or none. That toleration was established by the Constitution and the law and also by social custom.

Religious intolerance was more difficult to deal with than racial discrimination. It spread over many aspects of life, including education and relations between different religions and between church and State. He supported the suggestion made by the representative of France that the question should be considered as it affected individuals on the one hand and groups on the other. Liberty of conscience had also to cover external manifestations of belief, where it was related with the right of peaceful assembly and association. States and social groups should take the necessary steps to promote the progressive disappearance of intolerance on religious grounds and at the same time to guarantee religious freedom.

The question was referred to in various other United Nations agreements such as the Convention on Genocide and in Article 18 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The right to freedom of thought, belief and religion was also laid down in the American Declaration of Rights and Duties of Man adopted by the ninth Inter-American Conference at Bogota in 1948.

It might be better to use the word "intolerance" rather than "discrimination" in a United Nations draft declaration. Intolerance was the more philosophical term and related more directly to the human conscience, but it was rather too vague a term to be used for the obligations of States. The second preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 1781 (XVII) used "discrimination", despite the resolution's title.

It was to be hoped that before the Commission's next session, Member States would have found time to submit their comments and proposals as invited by the General Assembly resolution, and would do so as fully as possible in order to help the Commission to draft a declaration which would be as valuable as that on racial discrimination.

Mr. LÜTEM (Turkey) said he regretted that the Commission had not had time to discuss item 13 of its agenda in detail and to comply with the General Assembly's request to prepare a draft declaration on all forms of religious intolerance. He had had occasion to state his delegation's point of view on that problem at the Commission's eighteenth session. Turkey, which was a secular State, granted equal rights to all religious sects.

His delegation wholeheartedly endorsed the views expressed by the French representative regarding intolerance and the lines to be followed by the future declaration.

Mr. WIECZOREK (Poland) said that the Polish Constitution recognized the equality of all religions, and during the Second World War the Polish People's Government had settled the question of religious freedom by allowing all individuals to choose their religion.

He wished to make a few observations to guide the Commission at its next session. Citizens should be guaranteed equality without distinction on the grounds of religious belief or membership of any church, and there should be no penalties for

refusing to subscribe to any religion. Every endeavour should be made to suppress the violent forms of hatred provoked by certain religions. He agreed with the representative of France on the importance of establishing freedom of worship for both individuals and groups. No one should be obliged to adopt any form of religion; the civil rights of the citizen must not be made dependent on the religious belief of the individual, and freedom of expression must be allowed to persons professing a religion and to anti-religious propaganda alike. The Commission's aim should be to produce a genuinely balanced document which would promote absolute equality for all.

Miss AITKEN (Canada) said that the same care would have to be taken in preparing the draft declaration on eliminating religious intolerance as had been given to that on the elimination of racial discrimination. If all representatives showed as much wisdom and understanding as the representative of France, the Commission could look forward to the successful completion of its task.

Canada was a secular State and contained representatives of most religions and sects. Freedom of religion was one of the basic rights enjoyed by all Canadian citizens. The draft declaration to be prepared by the Commission would serve a most useful purpose in securing the same freedom everywhere.

Mr. PONCE y CARBO (Ecuador) said that the declaration on religious intolerance concerned one of the most sacred rights of the human person and should be drafted in a correspondingly dignified form. It should be as generally and simply worded as possible and should avoid any reference to factual situations and any claim to be exhaustive.

The General Assembly had directed the Commission to take up the question of religious intolerance owing to the existence of manifestations of religious discrimination which had created concern in the international community of nations. Discrimination on religious grounds existed in certain places against groups of Jews who, as the Danish representative had pointed out, were denied the necessary means for performing their rites. Discrimination was also directed against certain groups by violent press campaigns and sometimes created family divisions which called urgently for solution. As the Netherlands representative had said, in some



countries both Catholic and Protestant missionaries suffered discrimination and religious minorities were terrorized and reduced to extremes of hardship. In other areas, religious communities could only pray for an end of the silence deliberately imposed on their churches. Positive intolerance of that kind made it essential to draft a declaration to end discrimination and re-establish religious freedom.

To avoid weakening the declaration in any way, questions of religious discrimination as such should not be combined with others concerned more directly with such related freedoms as those of expression and opinion, which were covered by other conventions. The Commission should also make a point of hearing observers and representatives of non-governmental organizations who had communications to make to it.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) recalled that it was the practice of the Commission only to discuss general principles. Speakers, especially representatives of non-governmental organizations, should not refer in their communications to particular governments or events with which they might be concerned.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that the Philippines was generally considered the most Christian country in the Far East, but it had never practised any form of religious intolerance. The elimination of religious intolerance was exactly equivalent to the promotion of religious freedom.

Since the discussion on the substance of the question had been postponed till the following session, the immediate question was to decide what could be done in the meantime. The General Assembly had asked the Commission to draft its declaration taking into account the views of the Sub-Commission. The Sub-Commission, in turn, considered that the study on discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices prepared by its Special Rapporteur contained elements that might be included in the draft declaration. He proposed that the Commission should ask the Sub-Commission to place the question of religious discrimination on the agenda of its next session and prepare a draft text for the Commission's consideration and that the Secretary-General should be asked to communicate with the governments of Member States and obtain their comments and proposals concerning the draft declaration.

The Commission would also have to adopt a resolution informing the Economic and Social Council of the progress it had made with item 13 of its agenda.

Mr. NEDEBALLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed that the representative of the Philippines should be asked to draft an appropriate resolution.

It was so agreed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Secretariat had received a telegram from the Chairman of the Commission stating that he was unable to attend the remainder of the session.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) proposed that the Commission convey its regrets to the Chairman.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.