

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.2/SR.185
10 February 1956
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH



COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Eighth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 12 January 1956, at 10.50 a.m.

CONTENTS

Study of discrimination in education: draft report drawn up by the
Special Rapporteur (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.92 and Add.1-28, E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.93,
E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.94, E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.95)(continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SORENSEN	(Denmark)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. INGLES	(Philippines)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. AMMOUN	(Lebanon)
	Mr. AWAD	(Egypt)
	Mr. CHATENET	(France)
	Mr. CZARKOWSKI	(Poland)
	Mr. FOMIN	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. HALPERN	(United States of America)
	Mr. HISCOCKS	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
	Mr. KRISHNASWAMI	(India)
	Mr. ROY	(Haiti)
	Mr. SANTA CRUZ	(Chile)
<u>Also present:</u>	Miss BERNARDINO	Commission on the Status of Women
<u>Representatives of specialized agencies:</u>		
	Mr. SEIERSEN	International Labour Organisation
	Mr. MAHEU	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
<u>Representatives of non-governmental organizations:</u>		
<u>Category A:</u>	Miss KAHN	World Federation of Trade Unions
	Mrs. FOX	World Federation of United Nations Associations

PRESENT (continued):

Representatives of non-governmental organizations (continued):

Category B and Register:

Mr. LEWIN	Agudas Israel World Organization
Mrs. GIROUX	Catholic International Union for Social Service
Mr. FRASER	Friends World Committee for Consultation
Mrs. MEDLOCK	International Federation of Women Lawyers
Mrs. ROITBURD	International League for the Rights of Man
Mrs. KAUFMANN- FRANKENSTEIN	International Union for Child Welfare
Miss GYARMATI	International Union of Socialist Youth
Mrs. WALSER	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Mr. PERLZWEIG	World Assembly of Youth
Mr. JACOBY	World Jewish Congress
Mr. PENCE	World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations
Mrs. POLSTEIN	World Union for Progressive Judaism
Miss GARTLAN	World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations
<u>Secretariat:</u>	
Mr. HUMPHREY	Director, Division of Human Rights
Mr. LAWSON	Secretary of the Sub-Commission

STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION: DRAFT REPORT DRAWN UP BY THE SPECIAL
RAPPOREUR (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.92 and Add.1-28, E/CN.4/Sub.2/93, E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.94,
E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.95)(continued)

Paragraphs 380-453 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Sub-Commission to resume its consideration of part II, chapter III, of the draft report. Although it was subdivided into three sections the chapter could be considered as a whole for the purposes of discussion.

Mr. HALPERN felt that, while the chapter dealt primarily with the duty of the Government to provide for the teaching of minority languages, it would be desirable to include a paragraph pointing out the connexion between the language problem and the problem of discrimination discussed elsewhere in the report. On the one hand it was an act of discrimination to prevent children of a minority group from learning the language of their cultural heritage; on the other hand, it was also an act of discrimination to prevent them from learning the majority language, a knowledge of which would be required for access to higher education. The chapter should also mention other forms of discrimination affecting minorities, for example that arising from a disparity between the quality of instruction given at minority schools and at general education schools. Again, discrimination might take the form of refusing admission to the ordinary school to members of minorities who wished to receive general instruction, or that of failing to have the majority language adequately taught at a school attended by the children of a minority group, particularly in cases where, as in most countries, a perfect knowledge of the majority language was essential for access to higher education. All those forms of discrimination should be referred to in the chapter under consideration. Reference should also be made to certain Governments which in recent years had taken over schools formerly maintained by a minority group and which had imposed an official curriculum, in effect terminating the teaching in the minority language.

Mr. HISCOCKS said in connexion with paragraph 434 that in New Zealand the Maoris attended European schools in areas where the majority of the population were of European origin, but that in other areas, where the Maoris were more numerous than New Zealanders of European origin, the latter attended Maori schools.

Four years ago as many as 9 per cent of the pupils at Maori schools had been New Zealanders of European origin. In his view that method of solving the problem of the co-existence of indigenous groups speaking languages and possessing cultures different from those of the socially dominant groups merited the Special Rapporteur's particular attention; in revising his report the Rapporteur might find the UNESCO study of compulsory education in New Zealand a useful source.

Mr. FOMIN said that the report rightly drew attention to the fact that in areas of New Zealand where the Maori population were in the minority they were taught in English, whereas they should be taught in their own language.

Mr. HISCOCKS explained that he did not question the truth of the statements made by the Special Rapporteur in paragraph 434.

The CHAIRMAN stated that he had received from a member of the Israel delegation a letter which was addressed to him personally, but which also concerned the Chairman of the Sub-Commission and had in it information relating to paragraphs 411 to 414; he would communicate it to the Special Rapporteur.

Paragraphs 454-478 and 479-508

Mr. HISCOCKS pointed out an error in the English translation of paragraph 470.

Mr. FOMIN pointed out in connexion with paragraphs 495, 502 and 508 that the Sub-Commission had decided to leave the report in the Special Rapporteur's name. The presentation of the suggestions made in those paragraphs should be reworded accordingly.

Mr. CHATENET said that he had felt reassured on reading the last few pages of Mr. Ammoun's report. At the outset of a discussion of possible conclusions and recommendations it was worth recalling that Mr. Ammoun, in presenting his report at the beginning of the debate, had mentioned having received from several Governments letters stating that they had already anticipated some possible criticisms and had corrected some forms of discrimination or endeavoured to improve situations which were regarded as being discriminatory in fact.

(Mr. Chatenet)

That showed that the efforts of the United Nations, UNESCO and the Sub-Commission were not as fruitless as was sometimes claimed. There was certainly no room for complacency, and the study and work to be undertaken by the Sub-Commission in order to improve the situation must be pursued and intensified. At a time when there existed a certain amount of scepticism, some of it tinged with bitterness, about the use of international bodies such as the United Nations, organs like the Sub-Commission and specialized agencies like UNESCO, it did not seem inappropriate to point out that some progress, however incomplete, had been made, which showed the Sub-Commission that its efforts were on the right lines.

Paragraphs 509-518 and Mr. Awad's draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.95)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Sub-Commission to consider the proposals themselves, which were set forth in paragraphs 509 to 518 and which he suggested it should study at the same time as Mr. Awad's draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.95). If the Sub-Commission was prepared to adopt Mr. Awad's draft resolution in its existing form or with some amendments it would not need to examine in detail the proposals made in the report. In the circumstances the Sub-Commission might wish to consider Mr. Awad's draft resolutions first.

Mr. HISCOCKS said that if the Sub-Commission adopted Mr. Awad's draft resolution it would have to bear in mind that it must not undertake a further detailed study of Mr. Ammoun's report. Members of the Sub-Commission had already made their observations on that report. Next year, at the Sub-Commission's next session, they would have to show some restraint. If that was accepted, the Sub-Commission must decide whether it should make recommendations this year or not and, if not, whether it should nevertheless examine the Special Rapporteur's proposed recommendations provisionally in order to assist him in revising his draft report. He himself favoured the latter solution, for it would be desirable to have a preliminary exchange of views on the recommendations set forth in the draft report even before considering Mr. Awad's draft resolution.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ said he had asked for the floor in order to make a proposal similar to that just made by Mr. Hiscocks.

Mr. HALPERN also supported Mr. Hiscocks' proposal; he thought the Special Rapporteur might find it useful to take into account the exchange of views to which his draft recommendations had given rise, when he revised his

draft report. There were no grounds for differentiating between the treatment of the recommendations and of the body of the report on which the recommendations were based.

Mr. FOMIN said that he would prefer the Sub-Commission first to give its views on Mr. Awad's draft resolution. If the Sub-Commission were to adopt the procedure proposed by Mr. Hiscocks, it would hold a preliminary exchange of views on the recommendations and, if it were to reject Mr. Awad's draft resolution and to decide to prepare recommendations immediately, it would have to reconsider the recommendations in Mr. Ammoun's report. Such repetition should be avoided.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the debate might be hampered by the fact that the Sub-Commission would be unaware of the preliminary or final nature of the recommendations that it would have before it if it adopted the procedure proposed by Mr. Hiscocks. He therefore suggested that the Sub-Commission should follow the procedure outlined by Mr. Fomin and should first consider Mr. Awad's draft resolution. He invited Mr. Awad to introduce his draft resolution.

Mr. AWAD introducing his draft resolution, thought that no member of the Sub-Commission would wish to alter operative paragraph 1, in which the Sub-Commission expressed its appreciation of Mr. Ammoun's work. He also did not think that there would be any objection to the thanks expressed in paragraph 2 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, particularly for the help that the Division of Human Rights had given the Special Rapporteur, and to UNESCO for the assistance it had provided. Paragraph 3 restated in a slightly different form the suggestion made by the Special Rapporteur himself in paragraph 517 of his report and instructed him to revise his draft report in the light of any fresh information from Governments, the Secretary-General, the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations as well as the observations and suggestions of the members of the Sub-Commission in the course of their discussion of the report. In his interpretation, that paragraph referred to Governments which had not yet supplied information. Paragraph 4 merely recognized the competence of UNESCO, to which a copy of the report must be sent to enable it to comment on the report and to lend the Sub-Commission any additional assistance that it felt able to provide. Paragraph 5 stressed the fact that, under Economic and Social Council resolution 545 E (XVIII), direct contact was henceforth authorized between the Sub-Commission and the specialized agencies.

Mr. FOMIN admitted that the draft resolution that had just been introduced was useful, but believed that it left unsolved many questions which were important to the Sub-Commission. For eight sessions, the Sub-Commission had submitted no recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights on the substance of the problems submitted to it, with the possible exception of some recommendations on less important questions. The Sub-Commission was now fortunate enough to have before it a report which, despite some imperfections, described the many forms of discrimination in the world and contained proposals which might serve as a basis for recommendations. It was of course possible to improve the information contained in the report, to include data about countries which had not been mentioned, revise its presentation and change many details, but that was not the main purpose of the Sub-Commission's work. The Sub-Commission's fundamental task was to prepare recommendations for measures to promote the elimination of discrimination.

He reminded the Sub-Commission that the General Assembly had concerned itself with the elimination of discriminatory measures, in its resolutions 103 (I) and 532 B (VI). The Sub-Commission should avoid any further delay. The Sub-Commission might decide to transmit Mr. Ammoun's report immediately to the Commission on Human Rights, noting that the report was that of the Special Rapporteur, and not of the Sub-Commission, and at the same time state its recommendations. Otherwise, the Commission would not have the necessary documentation to judge the importance of the recommendations. In its present form, the report did not bring the study of the problem to an end and new studies and recommendations might prove necessary in the future; nevertheless, the recommendations that the Sub-Commission was already in a position to make would provide the Commission on Human Rights with a substantial body of work, which the Commission could deal with at its next session, especially since its agenda was light.

On the other hand, if the Sub-Commission were to adopt Mr. Awad's draft resolution in its present form, it would conclude its eighth session without having made a single recommendation. It had just devoted over a week to the consideration of Mr. Ammoun's report. If the report were revised within a year, which was by no means certain, the Sub-Commission would have to consider the new report at its next session. That report was bound to be longer so that the

Sub-Commission would have to devote at least ten days to it and would have only a few days in which to consider other problems. However, the questions which remained to be studied were very important, for example the ILO study of discrimination in the field of employment and occupation and political or religious discrimination. Even if the Sub-Commission could hold a four-week instead of a three-week session, it would not have enough time.

Finally, even without mentioning the budgetary implications, it must be admitted that, whatever revision the Special Rapporteur might make, the report would not be fundamentally changed. Even if it were three times its present length, its general tendency would remain the same. The Sub-Commission might therefore begin at once to study the recommendations it would make and submit a report, even if provisional, to the Commission. He could recall no case in United Nations practice in which a report had been referred back to the Rapporteur, whereas provisional reports had frequently been submitted to higher instances. As regards the time needed to complete the study, he would agree to a period of two or three years, or even more, since a fairly long lapse of time would make it easier to observe the progress achieved since the first draft of the report. Other organs of the United Nations periodically resumed consideration of the same questions. The fact that a procedure was in conformity with usual United Nations practice represented an argument which, while not decisive, was none the less weighty. Furthermore, if the Sub-Commission were to postpone its decision until the next year, it would certainly produce an unfavourable impression. He could not, therefore, accept Mr. Awad's draft resolution. He also drew attention to what seemed to be a drafting error in that text. Operative paragraph 5 referred to direct contact with all United Nations organs, in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 545 E (XVIII), but to the best of his recollection that resolution referred only to relations with specialized agencies.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ shared Mr. Fomin's views on one point, namely, that the United Nations had not completely fulfilled the obligations with respect to discrimination incumbent upon it under the Charter. There had undoubtedly been some delay, but it could not be ascribed solely to the Sub-Commission. The Sub-Commission's existence had been threatened for years and it had been authorized to continue its work by a majority of only one vote in the Economic and Social Council. The financial organs, especially the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, had also made its existence difficult. Its responsibility was therefore not very great, but it should nevertheless try to make up for lost time.

The study under consideration had the twofold purpose of serving as a basis for the Sub-Commission's recommendations and enlightening world public opinion. Thus the first comprehensive study of discrimination in education would be sent to all the scientific centres in the world and must be as complete as possible. Although Mr. Ammoun's work was outstanding, he himself would admit that it could be further improved, especially in the light of suggestions made during the Sub-Commission's debates. Thus, in spite of its goodwill, the Sub-Commission could hardly transmit the report to superior bodies in its present form. In any case, whether the report was transmitted in the name of the Special Rapporteur or in that of the Sub-Commission, it would have to be accompanied by as comprehensive a resolution as possible in support of the conclusions of the report.

With reference to Mr. Fomin's argument that the Sub-Commission could adopt recommendations even if it considered that the draft report was incomplete, he thought that it could with advantage discuss the recommendations in the last part of the draft report and adopt some of them. They need not necessarily be based on the report but could refer to the Sub-Commission's discussions. Mr. Fomin's idea was worth discussing, especially as it paid due regard to the prestige of the Sub-Commission.

He supported Mr. Awad's draft resolution, subject to certain amendments. For example, the draft resolution referred to Mr. Ammoun's report, which was in fact a draft report, for Mr. Ammoun had faithfully fulfilled the task entrusted to him. With regard to paragraph 5, Mr. Fomin's interpretation of Economic and Social Council resolution 545 was correct. In that connexion, it would be well

for the Sub-Commission, adding to Mr. Awad's draft resolution if necessary, to send the necessary invitations to the specialized agencies. Lastly, he hoped that Mr. Awad would mention in his draft resolution the transmission to the Commission on the Status of Women of the section of the report which concerned it.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed Mr. Fomin's interpretation of Economic and Social Council resolution 545 E (XVIII).

Mr. AMMOUN, Special Rapporteur, explained that his report was not complete, nor could it be for another ten years. It was the first study on discrimination in education to be made in the whole world; hence its merits and its shortcomings. From the scientific point of view, in particular, the study had suffered from the fact that the Sub-Commission had not yet defined discrimination. He could not introduce innovations and had consequently had to follow a pragmatic method. Moreover, for political reasons the Sub-Commission had not yet defined what it understood by minorities.

However that might be, he felt that his draft report could be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights, either forthwith just as it stood or at the next session after it had been revised. He thanked the members of the Sub-Commission for their valuable suggestions and wished to point out, in support of his report, that not once had he been taken to task for any factual mistakes, nor had any member drawn attention to any serious omission.

He agreed with Mr. Fomin and Mr. Santa Cruz that the Sub-Commission should transmit its recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights forthwith. Its prestige was at stake. It could, of course, reject some of the recommendations which appeared in the third part of the report but it was its duty to act quickly, both in order to make up for the inertia of other bodies and because it would take a long time for the recommendations to go into effect. It would be all to the good to gain one year. Although progress had been made in some countries while the report had been in preparation, the Sub-Commission must not remain idle. It should remember that it was not dealing with an academic subject and it was essential that the effects of its decisions should be felt as rapidly as possible in the schools of certain countries.

Mr. HISCOCKS hoped that the draft resolution would be shortened and would not repeat the decisions already taken by the Sub-Commission. With regard to paragraph 3, he agreed with Mr. Santa Cruz that it would be better to speak of a draft report. As far as the substance of the discussion was concerned, he could not accept Mr. Fomin's opinion. To transmit the report immediately without giving Mr. Ammoun time to take into account the suggestions made at the present session would be tantamount to throwing overboard the discussion which had been going on for a week. Moreover, the studies made country by country were not yet complete. He did not share Mr. Fomin's pessimism about the past work of the Sub-Commission, which was not responsible for the shortcomings for which it had been blamed. He was satisfied with the work done at the present session. The mere fact that the Sub-Commission was dealing with discrimination in education was important, for it prompted Governments to give up discriminatory practices. Mr. Fomin was not correct in saying that the Sub-Commission had not made any recommendations during its eight sessions. He would remind him of the conference of non-governmental organizations that had been convened and the study on discrimination in the field of employment and occupation that had been undertaken by the ILO at the Sub-Commission's instigation.

Replying to Mr. Santa Cruz, he said that he felt it would be illogical to submit recommendations while the report was still unfinished. The Sub-Commission could not ask the higher organs to take a decision on the basis of incomplete work. If the study was successfully completed, as was to be hoped, it would be infinitely more valuable for the study of the other aspects of discrimination. There was therefore no need to fear any adverse judgement and he thought that the Sub-Commission would, the following year, be able to transmit a thoroughly satisfactory study to the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. HALPERN thought that the Sub-Commission should not worry about its reputation with the higher organs but should endeavour to accomplish a conscientious piece of work which could not but enhance its prestige. Moreover, the Commission on Human Rights had already commented favourably on the way in which the Sub-Commission had proceeded with its work. It would be a mistake for the Sub-Commission to make recommendations without allowing the Special Rapporteur time to finish his study, to complete the publication of the country-by-country studies and to take into account the comments made during

(Mr. Halpern)

the discussion. While not wishing to criticize the recommendations in Mr. Ammoun's report, some of which were excellent, he did feel that some of them were controversial. The Commission on Human Rights should have all the necessary information at its disposal in order to take decisions. He therefore hoped that Mr. Santa Cruz would withdraw his suggestion. In view of the fact that all the members of the Sub-Commission appeared to agree that the study must be completed, it would be better to defer any recommendations. That could not but give the work of the Sub-Commission more importance in the eyes of the public. In conclusion, he urged the Sub-Commission to adopt Mr. Awad's draft resolution.

Mr. FOMIN thanked Mr. Santa Cruz and Mr. Ammoun and other members of the Sub-Commission who had understood his comments. Mr. Hiscocks and Mr. Halpern, on the other hand, had misunderstood them. He was fully aware that the Sub-Commission had submitted procedural resolutions in connexion with the studies to be made - a resolution, for example, on how the study on discrimination in the field of employment and occupation should be carried out. Such resolutions were very useful but they were insufficient, since they did not relate to the substance of the problem of discrimination, but were procedural. As Mr. Santa Cruz had said, the Sub-Commission did not bear the chief responsibility for the delay in its work. The fact remained, however, that it had spent some years considering the question of discrimination in education but after eight sessions had still not submitted a single recommendation on the substance of the matter.

Mr. Hiscocks was afraid that the Sub-Commission's prestige might suffer if it were to present an incomplete report; Mr. Halpern had adopted the same attitude. Not one member of the Sub-Commission, however, had said that the report was unsatisfactory. The Sub-Commission thus had a basis upon which to formulate recommendations, which was its main task.

The Commission on Human Rights would understand the Sub-Commission's attitude if it were to submit the study as a preliminary, and not a draft report, stating that the work was not yet finished and that the study was to be

(Mr. Fomin)

elaborated and improved but that, in view of the importance of the problem, the Sub-Commission thought it necessary to submit some specific recommendations forthwith, on the basis of the work already done. It was essential that the Commission on Human Rights should be informed of the views of the Sub-Commission and that the latter should know the views of the Commission. He did not really think that the Sub-Commission could be accused of irresponsibility. It had happened more than once that draft reports far less complete than the present one had been presented to United Nations organs and had been examined by them. Furthermore, it was by no means certain that the Sub-Commission would be in a better position to make recommendations the following year than at present. The recommendations proposed by Mr. Ammoun did not, of course, exhaust the subject. It was important, however, to know which was more urgent: to have perfectly drafted paragraphs and phrases or to submit recommendations which could be adopted at once.

He could not agree with Mr. Hiscocks that the whole of the Sub-Commission's discussion at the present session would have been in vain if Mr. Ammoun's work were sent to the Commission on Human Rights as it stood. The summary records of the meetings would acquaint the Commission with the course of the discussion. He therefore considered that the Sub-Commission should submit recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights at its 1956 session.

Mr. KRISHNASWAMI agreed with Mr. Santa Cruz and Mr. Fomin that the Sub-Commission was not responsible for the delay in the completion of its work, because it had not always had the necessary means at its disposal. The Special Rapporteur, for instance, had been appointed only two years earlier.

He supported Mr. Awad's draft resolution. As had often been emphasized, the first study on discrimination in education must be global in scope. The draft report was at present very incomplete but there was every reason to hope that Mr. Ammoun would be able to fill in the gaps, between the present and the next session, especially as the statement made by the Secretary-General's representative at the 179th meeting (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.94) would enable him to complete his work on one essential point.

(Mr. Krishnaswami)

He did not think that the Sub-Commission should make recommendations forthwith without at the same time submitting its report to the Commission on Human Rights for the recommendations should be based on the report. To do otherwise would be to act like a doctor who prescribed remedies without first making a diagnosis. The Commission on Human Rights needed the report in order to understand the full significance of the recommendations.

He proposed that paragraph 3 of Mr. Awad's draft resolution should be amended in such a way as to permit the Special Rapporteur to take account of fresh information, not only from Governments, the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies, but also from the other sources of material mentioned in resolution B.

He was sure that the Commission on Human Rights would understand the Sub-Commission's difficulties and that postponing the submission of the report would make it possible to put some very useful finishing touches to it.

Mr. INGLES stated that Mr. Ammoun's study was an official document which would be available to the members of the Commission on Human Rights when they took up the report on the eighth session of the Sub-Commission. He saw no reason therefore why the Sub-Commission should not submit the study to the Commission on Human Rights in its draft form. The latter would then be able to give its opinion of the draft while the Sub-Commission and the Special Rapporteur would in turn be able to make use of the Commission's observations when they came to revise the report. Moreover, it was the Sub-Commission's duty to give the Commission an account of its work. The ILO had been criticized by some for not submitting its report on discrimination in the field of employment and occupation to the Sub-Commission. The ILO had refrained from doing so because its report had been provisional; the Sub-Commission should avoid inviting the same criticism. It had enough material to be able to make recommendations forthwith.

He saw no inconsistency between the adoption of Mr. Awad's draft resolution and the Sub-Commission's proceeding thereafter to formulate recommendations on the basis of Mr. Ammoun's conclusions and proposals. He did not believe that the revisions suggested by members of the Sub-Commission, even if incorporated by Mr. Ammoun in his final report, would in any way alter the latter's conclusions and proposals.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ had found Mr. Fomin's remarks interesting but did not entirely agree with him. Unlike Mr. Halpern, he did not think that the Sub-Commission would risk criticism from the Commission on Human Rights if it were to submit the recommendations appearing in paragraph 509 et seq. of the draft report. In so doing it would merely be fulfilling its primary obligations.

Miss BERNARDINO (Commission on the Status of Women) said that she would like Mr. Awad's draft resolution to mention the Commission on the Status of Women. Her Commission would be very glad to receive the draft report at its next session, which was to be held at Geneva in March.

Mr. ROY raised the question whether the report should be transmitted to the Commission on the Status of Women in its present form or only after it had been revised by Mr. Ammoun. It must be borne in mind that both the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Human Rights would be holding their next sessions in March.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ recalled that he had already asked the Sub-Commission to send the Commission on the Status of Women that part of the report which dealt with the discrimination based on sex; it should be sent in its present form, purely for information, and he had understood that the Sub-Commission had already so decided.

Mr. HISCOCKS agreed with Mr. Santa Cruz; there was no need to reiterate in a draft resolution something which had already been decided.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Sub-Commission whether it wished to send the whole report to the Commission on the Status of Women or only that part which dealt with discrimination based on sex.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ saw no reason why that section alone should not be transmitted to it.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.