

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.810
15 May 1964

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Twentieth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND TENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York
on Friday, 13 March 1964, at 3.25 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tribute to the memory of Mrs. M.H. Lefauchaux (continued)

Periodic reports on human rights (E/CN.4/860 and Add.1, 861 and Add.1 and 2, 872; E/CN.4/L.714/Rev.1 and Add.1, L.716) (continued)

Designation of 1968 as international year for human rights (E/CN.4/867; E/CN.4/L.717) (continued)

Draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (A/5035, 5603; E/CN.4/865, 873; E/CN.4/L.679, L.693 and Corr.1 and Add.1-3, L.709 and Add.1, L.719; E/CN.4/Sub.2/234 and Add.1-3) (continued)

Draft declaration and draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance (E/3743; E/CN.4/846, 852 and Add.1, 866, 873; E/CN.4/Sub.2/235 and Add.1-4; E/CN.4/L.713/Rev.1, L.720)

PRESENT:

Chairman:

Rapporteur:

Members:

Mr. PONCE y CARBO	(Ecuador)
Mr. IGNACIO-PINTO	Dahomey
Mr. ERMACORA	Austria
Miss AITKEN	Canada
Miss KRACHT	Chile
Mr. VOLIO	Costa Rica
Mr. GRAULUND HANSEN	Denmark
Mr. BENITES	Ecuador
Mr. VEGA GOMEZ	El Salvador
Mr. BOUQUIN	France
Mr. S.K. SINGH	India
Mr. SPERDUTI	Italy
Miss TAEBARA	Lebanon
Mr. DOE	Liberia
Mr. BEAUFORT	Netherlands
Mr. BORJA)	Philippines
Mr. BRILLANTES)	
Mr. QUILAMBAO)	
Mr. RESICH	Poland
Mr. PANUCCI	Turkey
Mr. NEDEALLO	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Mr. MOROZOV)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. OSTROVSKY)	
Sir Samuel HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mrs. TREE	United States of America
Mrs. TILLET	Commission on the Status of Women

Also present:

Observers from Member States:

Mr. BELTPAMINO	Argentina
Mr. BARROMI	Israel
Mrs. WILLIAMS	Jamaica
Mr. KISOSONKOLE	Uganda

/...

PRESENT (continued):

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. FARMAN-FARMAIAN International Labour
Organisation

Mr. BEHRSTOCK United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural
Organization

Secretariat:

Mr. HUMPHREY Director, Division of Human
Rights

Mr. LANDAU Secretary of the Commission

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MRS. M.H. LEFAUCHEUX (continued)

Mrs. TILLET (Commission on the Status of Women), speaking on behalf of her Commission and of its Chairman, Mrs. Lavallo-Urbina, associated herself with the tributes paid to the memory of Mrs. M.H. Lefauchaux by the Commission on Human Rights at its 785rd meeting. Mrs. Lefauchaux had represented France on the Commission on the Status of Women for nearly eighteen years and the fact that during that period she had been elected Chairman no less than six times indicated the esteem in which she had been held by her colleagues. A staunch believer in the goal of equal rights for men and women, Mrs. Lefauchaux had been one of the most active members of that Commission. Her death was a personal loss to all the members of the Commission on the Status of Women, who wished to express their sincere sympathy to the French delegation.

Mr. BOUQUIN (France) thanked the representative of the Commission on the Status of Women for her expression of sympathy. He would transmit that message to his Government and to Mrs. Lefauchaux' family.

PERIODIC REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS (E/CN.4/860 and Add.1, 861 and Add.1 and 2, 872; E/CN.4/L.714/Rev.1 and Add.1, L.716) (continued)

Mrs. TILLET (Commission on the Status of Women) noted with particular interest the references to the Commission on the Status of Women in the two draft resolutions, E/CN.4/L.714/Rev.1 and E/CN.4/L.716, submitted on that question. The Commission on the Status of Women would greatly appreciate the invitation to be represented on the committee on periodic reports on human rights which would be set up under the draft resolution submitted by France, Lebanon and the Philippines (E/CN.4/L.714/Rev.1).

DESIGNATION OF 1968 AS INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR HUMAN RIGHTS (E/CN.4/867; E/CN.4/L.717) (continued)

Mrs. TILLET (Commission on the Status of Women) said she had read with interest the Costa Rican draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.717). She wondered whether it would not be possible to mention in that draft resolution the conventions relating to women, such as the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, and the ILO Convention on Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value.

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (A/5035, 5603; E/CN.4/865, 873; E/CN.4/L.679, L.693 and Corr.1 and Add.1-3, L.709 and Add.1, L.719; E/CN.4/Sub.2/234 and Add.1-3) (continued)

Mr. BOUQUIN (France) said that at the 809th meeting he had requested the deletion of the word "national" in article I, paragraph 1, of the draft convention because the word caused great difficulties to his delegation. The compromise suggestion made by the Danish representative at the 809th meeting, however, was very sensible and he hoped that it would be accepted by the USSR delegation.

Mr. GRAULUND HANSEN (Denmark) thought that the Commission could not hope to resolve the question raised by the French representative by the end of the session. His delegation's suggestion might enable the Commission to settle the question temporarily by common agreement. The suggestion was that the word "national" in article I should be placed in square brackets and that at the end of paragraph 1 of that article the following sentence should be added: "in this paragraph, the expression 'national origin' does not cover the status of any person as citizen of a given State", that sentence also being between square brackets.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accepted that compromise formula.

Mr. S.K. SINGH (India) said he too was prepared to accept the solution proposed by the Danish representative, subject to a clear statement given in the report that, when article I was adopted, the word "national" had been put to the vote separately and adopted, that article I had been adopted without any square brackets and without the sentence later added at the proposal of the Soviet Union, and that the Commission did not consider those additions as a reopening of the debate on article I.

Mr. BOUQUIN (France) agreed to the inclusion of all those remarks in the Commission's report, but requested that the report should also state that the vote on the word "national" had taken place before the Commission had decided to delete article VIII. The deletion of that article, in fact, considerably altered the scope of the convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that the report would faithfully reflect the Commission's debates and would take into account the wishes expressed by the representatives of India and France. He would put to the vote the compromise solution suggested by the representative of Denmark.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that there was no need for a formal vote on the Danish representative's proposal. If a vote was taken, article I would also have to be put to the vote again, a procedure which his delegation considered inadmissible. If the Danish proposal was put to the vote, he would accordingly abstain.

Mr. BOUQUIN (France) also thought that there was no need for a vote, as the Danish representative's proposal had secured the general assent of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN took note of the unanimous agreement of the Commission.

The Danish proposal was adopted.

Article X and additional measures of implementation

The CHAIRMAN reminded members that little time was left for them to complete their work. He therefore suggested that the length of speeches be limited and, if possible, the number of speeches be reduced to one each. In the circumstances, the fact that a representative did not make a statement would certainly not now be interpreted as a lack of interest in a particular question.

Mr. QUILAMBAO (Philippines) recalled that at the 805th and 808th meetings the Commission had decided not to examine article X of the draft convention but to transmit it as it stood to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, together with the preliminary draft of additional measures of implementation prepared by the Sub-Commission. In the circumstances, it only remained to the Commission to take a decision on the draft resolution submitted by Ecuador and the Philippines (E/CN.4/L.719) to complete item 3 of its agenda. Taking into account the above-mentioned decision and the wording of operative paragraph (b) of the two-Power draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.719), the adoption of article X by the Commission would mean that it did not intend to examine that article again or to take another decision on it. But article X should be examined at the same time as the other measures of implementation, and the Commission no longer had time for that.

/...

(Mr. Quiambao, Philippines)

He recalled that the proposals concerning additional measures of implementation had been drafted and introduced in the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities by Mr. Inglés, the Philippine expert serving on that Sub-Commission. In drafting the text, Mr. Inglés, had taken as a basis the relevant provisions of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights and the protocol to the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education. The original article I of Mr. Inglés' preliminary draft had been examined separately by the Sub-Commission, and had become article X of the draft convention. That article provided for the submission of reports on the legislative or other measures adopted by States parties to give effect to the provisions of the convention. The remainder of the text had been transmitted in the form of a preliminary draft to the Commission on Human Rights "as an expression of the general views of the Sub-Commission". That preliminary draft (E/CN.4/873, page 53) provided in particular for the establishment of a good offices and conciliation committee consisting of eleven members, which would be responsible for seeking the amicable settlement of disputes between States parties concerning the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the convention. A State party which considered that another State party was not giving effect to the provisions of the convention would be able to bring the matter to the attention of that State by written communication. If after six months the matter was not adjusted to the satisfaction of both States, either State would have the right to refer the matter to the committee. In the event of no solution being reached, the States would be free to appeal to the International Court of Justice.

He stressed the usefulness of that machinery. The adoption of a draft convention after the Declaration was justifiable only if the new instrument was accompanied by effective measures of implementation. During the debate in the Third Committee on the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, many representatives had emphasized the importance of implementing the Declaration. Such concern was even more valid in the case of the draft convention, and at the sixteenth session of the Sub-Commission there had been a strong trend in favour of setting up implementation machinery. Mr. Inglés' proposals should be carefully studied, since they would make the draft convention a truly effective instrument.

/...

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the adoption of the Ecuadorian-Philippine draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.719) should not be considered a precedent allowing the Commission to transmit to a higher organ on future occasions a document of which it had not examined the substance. It was only because the Commission had succeeded in completing the most important part of the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly that it was justified in resorting to what must remain an exceptional procedure. It went without saying that the transmission of documents which had been neither discussed nor adopted by the Commission did not mean that they had been approved by the Commission.

After making those preliminary observations, he stated that if article X had been put to the vote, his Delegation would have voted for it. Furthermore, favourable consideration should also be given to measures of implementation other than those mentioned in the article. For lack of time, however, that would have to be done by the Third Committee.

Certain provisions of Mr. Inglés' draft (E/CN.4/373) were open to criticism. While he was prepared to accept the establishment of a good offices and conciliation committee under conditions which could appear either in the convention itself or in separate protocol, he felt that the committee should reflect the three systems which were predominant in the world of today. Unlike the Philippine expert, the USSR delegation considered, moreover, that the composition of the committee should be limited to nationals of States parties. The committee could serve as an intermediary in the settlement of disputes and, after examining the relevant documentation, present to the States concerned recommendations for possible solutions. It would transmit for publication to the Secretary-General of the United Nations a report on the case dealt with and its recommendations.

In the light of those considerations, he wanted the provisions of the draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.719) amplified so that not only article X of the draft convention and the preliminary draft of additional measures of implementation should be transmitted but also the summary records of the discussions on those questions and, in particular, the record containing the statement his delegation had just made on the problems of implementation. He therefore proposed the addition at the end of operative paragraphs (b) and (c) of the joint draft resolution of the words "and the summary records of the discussions which the Commission devoted to this question".

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Subject to the reservations which he had formulated regarding the preliminary draft of additional measures of implementation and to his suggested amendments to the joint draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.719), he would vote for that text.

Mr. S.K. SINGH (India) supported the draft resolution submitted by Ecuador and the Philippines. With reference to operative paragraph (e), he stated that if the placing of the word "national" in square brackets in article I, paragraph 1 of the draft convention had been put to the vote, his delegation would have abstained. No rule of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions laid down the procedure to be followed when a commission wished to reopen a matter on which it had taken a decision. The problem was dealt with in rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, however, and he felt that by analogy a rule which applied to decisions of the General Assembly should also be applicable to decisions of the Commission. He considered therefore that the procedure which the Commission had chosen to follow on the present occasion was not proper.

Mr. ERMACORA (Austria) said he regretted that owing to lack of time the Commission had not been able to examine the preliminary draft of the additional measures of implementation, for it was the body best fitted to do so.

In the joint draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.719), he felt that the introductory sentence of the operative part did not reflect satisfactorily the procedure which the Commission had followed in regard to article X, and suggested that the words "as well as" at the end of the sentence should be replaced by the words "and the following documents which have not yet been voted on by the Commission".

It was admittedly difficult to draft implementation measures acceptable to all States. But if agreement could be reached on the measures proposed for the convention, the progress achieved by the United Nations in the human rights field would be tangibly demonstrated. Without implementation measures, moreover, the convention would be nothing more than a mere declaration. The system proposed by Mr. Inglés was similar to the one which the League of Nations Council had envisaged in its resolution of 27 March 1929 (League of Nations Official Journal, Supplements 2 to 91). But that was a dangerous system. For States alone to be entitled to submit disputes relating to the convention to the committee might lead to conflict between States and run counter to the objects of the convention.

/...

(Mr. Ermacora, Austria)

Consequently, it would be preferable to grant individuals a right of petition, subject to very strict rules of procedure designed to prevent abuses.

The question was a most important one which required thorough study. He would therefore prefer to keep it on the Commission's agenda rather than have it referred to the Third Committee.

Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) said that the Commission's present task was only to decide on the method of referral to the General Assembly provided for in draft resolution E/CN.4/L.719. The Commission had three oral amendments to the draft before it, one from Austria, amending the introductory sentence of the operative part of the draft, and two from the USSR, which sought to make it clear in operative sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) that the documents referred to would be accompanied by records of the discussions on them. He for his part, as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, accepted those three amendments, which improved the text.

Mr. QUIAMBAO (Philippines) also accepted the amendments.

Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Ecuador and the Philippines.

The draft resolution submitted by Ecuador and the Philippines (E/CN.4/L.719), as amended by its sponsors, was adopted unanimously.

DRAFT DECLARATION AND DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE (E/3743; E/CN.4/346, 352 and Add.1, 366, 373; E/CN.4/Sub.2/235 and Add.1-4; E/CN.4/L.713/Rev.1, L.720)

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines), submitting on behalf of Mr. Hakim, Chairman-Rapporteur, the report by the Working Group set up by the Commission on Human Rights at its 784th meeting, observed that the Group, in line with United Nations practice, had studied only the substantive articles of the declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, without examining the preamble.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) pointed out an error in the English text of article V of the Working Group's draft (E/CN.4/L.713/Rev.1): the Group had decided that in the second sentence of paragraph 1 of that article the words "the best interests of the child being the guiding principle" should come after the words "taken into account", as in the draft principles prepared by the Sub-Commission.

Mr. BORJA (Philippines) said that his delegation attached the utmost importance to the preparation of a draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance. Both the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

The Philippines, throughout its history as a nation, had consistently manifested its respect for, and belief in, religious freedom. That freedom was recognized and guaranteed by its Constitution.

At the present time, religious discrimination, although less virulent than in the past, still persisted in actual practice. Ironically, religious intolerance had caused great suffering and needless sacrifice where religious tolerance could have helped foster and cultivate the best and highest qualities of men. Hard-set prejudices and habitual discriminatory practices in matters of religion had no place in a peaceful and enlightened world, and because of the diversity of religions and beliefs of its Member States, the United Nations was better fitted than any other institution to take proper steps to put an end to religious intolerance. That was a problem which some United Nations bodies had already studied. The Commission now had before it a draft declaration prepared by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/373) and the report of the Working Group set up at the 784th meeting (E/CN.4/L.713/Rev.1). The members of the Working Group, despite the difficulties they had encountered, particularly owing to the limited time they had had, had produced a document which would be a useful guide to the Commission. They deserved congratulations for it.

The Philippine delegation had on several occasions expressed its views during the discussions of the Working Group. It was heartened to see that the Group had been successful in condensing the Sub-Commission's draft, especially article VI. However, he would like to see the last sentence in paragraph 3 of the Sub-Commission's draft, as orally amended by the Canadian delegation, retained in that article or incorporated in a separate article. The sentence would read as follows: "Education shall include the promotion of understanding, tolerance and friendship among all religions and beliefs".

(Mr. Borja, Philippines)

The Working Group had discussed very fully, and rightly so, the need to preserve the balance between the use of the words "religion" and "belief". In that connexion, articles X and XI could perhaps be expanded to include practices which came under "belief" and not only under "religion". On the other hand, the Commission must not lose sight of actual conditions as they existed in the world today; it must confine itself to examining the areas where intolerance manifested itself instead of trying to fit the matter into some kind of doctrinal consistency.

In addition, the Philippine delegation considered that paragraph 2 of article XIV could be improved by replacing the words "against any religious group of persons belonging to a religious community" by the words "against any individual or group because of their religion or belief". At the end of the English text of the same paragraph the word "it" in the phrase "or justify it" should be replaced by the words "such incitements".

Despite the very little time left, he would like the Commission to examine the Working Group's report and adopt it. He also reserved the right to make further observations on that topic.

Mr. GRAUJUND HANSEN (Denmark) said that although he had not been a member of the Working Group he was greatly interested in the draft which it had prepared with such diligence (E/CN.4/L.713/Rev.1). It was not possible at the present stage to express a final opinion about the text which had just been submitted, but a preliminary examination seemed to show that the general ideas of the draft were acceptable, although it might be necessary to modify the form in which they were presented. The Danish delegation considered in general that the declaration should protect all beliefs, irrespective of whether religious or non-religious.

He would vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Philippine delegation (E/CN.4/L.720).

Mr. VOLIO (Costa Rica) said that in operative paragraph 3 of the Spanish version of the draft Philippine resolution (E/CN.4/L.720), "20^o" should be replaced by "21^o".

Mr. MCROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Commission was faced by certain problems owing to the fact that in spite of all efforts the Working Group had not succeeded in completing its task. Actually, all

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

the Commission had some documents which might help it in its work. The text prepared by the Working Group (E/CN.4/L.713/Rev.1) did not cover all the aspects discussed, and ignored some of the suggestions that had been made by his delegation and other delegations. Many provisions on which there had been disagreements had been left undecided. Finally the text did not clearly and fairly reflect the world situation with respect to religion and atheism. Thousands of atheists nowadays refused to concede that religion could be exclusive or take precedence over any other conviction or belief. In all countries there were men who took the position that religion had played a reactionary role and that it had been used by the ruling classes in order to facilitate the enslavement of man by man. Thousands of people were convinced that religious beliefs concerning the beginning of the world and the development of human history were unscientific and irrational. However, that conviction, which was shared by a growing number of hearts and minds, was most violently combated by those who attached importance to religion and desired to persecute atheism. If, therefore, the declaration was to be a document of a universal character, it would have to be drafted in a balanced manner with due regard not only for religious believers but also for all who had atheistic convictions and who had come to the conclusion that religion was an instrument used by the leading classes to dominate the working classes.

It should not be inferred from what he had just said that the Soviet delegation wished to secure exclusive privileges for atheists. The USSR believed that if religion, which was a product of history, was to be eliminated, patience and re-education were necessary. Administrative measures could not be applied, since they would only fan the flames of religious fanaticism. As an atheist, like most of his compatriots, he felt that the small number of religious believers who remained in the USSR should have freedom of conscience, the opportunity to practise the religion of their choice and to hold the services and practise the rites of that religion. It was in order to ensure greater freedom of conscience that the Soviet State had separated the Church from the State and the School from the Church. A decree issued as early as January 1918 and reproduced in substance in the present Soviet Constitution provided that every citizen could practise the religion of his choice, or no religion at all. It would be a good thing if the same principle could be applied internationally and if the declaration could guarantee freedom of conscience to all citizens in all countries.

/...

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

The Philippine draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.720) contained a number of provisions that were entirely acceptable to the Soviet delegation. In particular, his delegation was prepared to support the whole of the preamble, with the insertion of the words "consider and" before the word "adopt" in the fifth preambular paragraph, and operative paragraphs 1, 3 and 4; but it had serious doubts concerning operative paragraph 2. That paragraph suggested that the Economic and Social Council should continue work on the draft resolution at its thirty-seventh session. However, it was unprecedented for a subsidiary body to ask a higher body to carry out a task which it had not itself been able to perform. Since the Commission on Human Rights had not been able to consider the matters in question, would it be realistic to expect the Council, which had many other items to examine, to be able to do so on the Commission's behalf, and in less time. There had also been a suggestion to transmit the documents to the General Assembly as they stood. But what applied to the Economic and Social Council applied in even greater measure to the General Assembly: the Commission could hardly pass on a text which had not been examined article by article. On the other hand, he felt that so long as no threat was raised to the principle of the separation of Church and State, the Commission would not have any difficulty in speeding up its work on the draft declaration at a later stage. The Soviet delegation was even prepared to co-operate in the drafting of a convention. However, the approach suggested in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was completely unacceptable.

Mr. S.K. SINGH (India) said that since its seventeenth session the Commission had devoted only a little time to the draft declaration and convention on religious intolerance. The Sub-Commission had decided to transmit its drafts and the summary records of its meetings to the Commission on Human Rights, and the Commission now planned to do the same with respect to the Economic and Social Council. The representative of the USSR had questioned the propriety of that procedure, and the Indian delegation understood his feelings very well. Nevertheless, the Commission had to bear in mind that it was faced with the following alternative: either to continue the work at its next session, or to refer the matter to the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly.

The Indian delegation was prepared to agree to the Soviet proposal to add the words "consider and" in the fifth preambular paragraph. It wished to congratulate the Working Group on the way it had carried out its task. The

(Mr. S.K. Singh, India)

Indian delegation had not taken part in the work of that body, and the Indian Government had not had the time to reply to the Secretary-General's questionnaire on freedom of religion in the various countries. He therefore wish to inform the Commission that the Indian Constitution prohibited discrimination for religious reasons and proclaimed freedom of conscience. India had in the past had a Hindu school of philosophy which had supported atheism, and it had always shown itself to be particularly liberal in religious matters, both towards its own citizens and towards foreigners. The activities of the missionaries and the fact that religious communities of any denomination were entitled to acquire and administer property showed the spirit of tolerance which existed in his country. India would therefore have no difficulty in adopting a declaration or even a convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.

Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that his delegation would support the Philippine draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.720).

The Netherlands delegation deeply regretted that the representative of the Soviet Union had deemed it necessary to make comments which were offensive to the deepest convictions and feelings of innumerable people all over the world, including no doubt the vast majority of the Soviet people. The Soviet representative, who thought he knew for certain that science had destroyed the foundations of religion, had said that religion had been used as a means of oppressing the working classes. He deplored those utterances, in particular out of regard for the Soviet representative himself. The representative of the Soviet Union had also referred to the future, and seemed convinced that atheism was constantly growing all over the world. He (Mr. Beaufort) held entirely opposite views, and wished to remind the Soviet representative of the beautiful French saying L'avenir est à Dieu.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) expressed surprise that the draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance had evoked such an intolerant speech on the part of the representative of the Soviet Union; the Soviet representative's remarks regarding religion and its future had been quite uncalled for.

/...

(Sir Samuel Hoare, United Kingdom)

In the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation, the Commission should transmit the draft declaration prepared by the Working Group to the General Assembly, by way of the Economic and Social Council, but it should not assume that the Council would continue work on the matter. He therefore suggested that operative paragraph 2 of the Philippine draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.720) should be replaced by the following text:

"Recommends to the Economic and Social Council that it give such further consideration as it may deem practicable to the drafting of the Declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, in the light of the comments of Governments, and that it transmit the appropriate documents to the General Assembly for consideration at its nineteenth session."

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, said he was surprised that they had been surprised at the content of the Soviet representative's statement. It seemed to him that in the United Nations freedom of belief was a matter of course. A statement like that of the Netherlands representative that L'avenir est à Dieu might make the Soviet delegation smile but did not surprise it. Differences of opinion were a fact of life, and no one should be surprised to hear convictions expressed which were different from his own. One had to be able to show tolerance towards all opinions and beliefs; and it was freedom of belief that the Soviet representative had advocated and defended in its statement.

In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) said that her delegation accepted the Soviet amendment to insert the words "consider and" in the fifth preambular paragraph of the Philippine draft resolution as well as the United Kingdom amendment to the second operative paragraph.

The Philippine draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.720), as orally amended by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, was unanimously adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.