

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.368
2 October 1953

ENGLISH
Original: ENGLISH and
FRENCH

Dual distribution

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Ninth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 30 April 1953, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

pages

Draft international covenants on human rights and
measures of implementation (item 3 of the agenda)
(resumed from the previous meeting):

Proposals for additional articles relating to the
draft covenant on civil and political rights
(E/CN.4/674) (continued):

Proposals by the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia
and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of
Discrimination and Protection of Minorities
for a new article on the rights of minorities
(E/2256, E/CN.4/L.222, E/CN.4/L.225)

4 - 17

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. AZMI (Egypt)

Rapporteur:

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium)

Members:

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

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. VALTICOS
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BAMMATE

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

World Federation of United Nations Associations Mr. de MADAY

Category B

Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations Mr. MOSKOWITZ

Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations Mr. WARBURG

International Conference of Catholic Charities Abbé BOUVIER

International Council of Women Miss GIROD

International Federation of Friends of Young Women Mrs. FIECHTER

International Federation of University Women)

Pax Romana Miss ARCHINARD

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Mrs. BAER

World Jewish Congress Mr. RIEGNER

Secretariat:

Mr. Humphrey

Mr. Das }

Mrs. Bruce }

Representative of the Secretary-General

Secretaries to the Commission

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION
(item 3 of the agenda) (resumed from the previous meeting)

Proposals for additional articles relating to the draft covenant on civil and political rights (E/CN.4/674) (continued):

Proposals by the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities for a new article on the rights of minorities (E/2256, E/CN.L.222, E/CN.4/L.225)

The CHAIRMAN invited representatives to consider the insertion in the draft covenant on civil and political rights of a new article relating to the rights of minorities. The Commission had three texts before it: the Soviet Union proposal (E/CN.4/L.222); the Yugoslav proposal (E/CN.4/L.225); and the text adopted by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/2256, page 54 - Annex II, Section A.III).

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Commission that the new article proposed by his delegation had originally formed part of the draft article on self-determination submitted by him at the eighth session, and adopted by the Commission, after amendment. In its amended form that text now formed article 1 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights. The amendment of his proposal reflected the Commission's decision that the rights of minorities should be examined apart from the right of self-determination, and it was in implementation of that decision that he was now submitting a text, the purpose of which was to spell out the rights to be ensured to national minorities.

The Soviet Union delegation maintained that the rights of minorities formed an essential part of that body of principles which must be enunciated in the covenant. It was true that two articles already provided certain safeguards for national minorities, namely paragraph 1 of article 2, on non-discrimination, and article 19, on the equality of all persons before the law. But so far there was no direct reference in the covenant to the right of national minorities to use their native tongue and develop their national culture. It was essential that that right be explicitly secured, and since national cultural development was impossible without appropriate educational institutions, his draft text proclaimed the right of national minorities to possess their national schools, libraries, museums and other cultural and educational institutions.

Ample evidence of the unsatisfactory position of national minorities in many countries and in many regions of the world could be adduced from the official publications of the United Nations. The report of the Trusteeship Council for the period 18 December 1951 to 24 July 1952 (A/2150) contained information which showed that in many territories not the slightest opportunities existed for cultural development. Thus, in 1947 a little over £3 per annum was spent on the education of an African child in a certain territory, whereas £50 a year, or seventeen times as much, was spent on the education of a European child in the same territory. Educational plans for 1951 greatly increased the disparity, expenditure for an African's education being estimated at a figure that was only one fiftieth of that foreseen for the education of a European. It was obvious that in such circumstances the indigenous population could not develop. For the time being, he would not quote any further examples, but would confine himself to those introductory remarks.

Mr. JEVREMOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) reminded the Commission that some years previously the Yugoslav delegation, which attached the greatest importance to protecting the rights of members of minority groups, had proposed that an article on those rights be inserted in the first draft international covenant (E/1992, Annex IV, Section A). They were in fact essential human rights, upon which the exercise of the other rights very largely depended. After the upheavals which had taken place in the course of history, certain peoples, or large groups of them, had been compelled to live outside their original national frontiers, and had thus found themselves in the position of a minority deprived of all rights and only too often subjected to various forms of pressure, which had even gone so far as to endanger their lives.

The Yugoslav delegation believed that if members of such minorities were granted the right freely to make known their adherence to an ethnic or linguistic group, they would have an opportunity of enjoying, without discrimination, the rights granted to the citizens of the country in which they lived, and of living freely together. Those were minimum requirements which it was the duty of a modern democratic society to satisfy.

At the eighth session there had been much discussion about the importance of granting the right of self-determination to the members of minority groups, but he considered that the question should be treated more broadly and that attention

should be given to the rights of minorities which were dispersed among the population of a country and therefore unable to establish their right of self-determination. Throughout the history of nations there had been many attempts to denationalize certain ethnic groups and they were still frequent. All such attempts had been severely condemned by world opinion, and the Commission, remaining faithful both to the spirit and to the letter of the Charter of the United Nations, should give effect to that condemnation by including in the covenant on civil and political rights an article designed to protect the rights of minority groups.

The people of his own country had endured centuries of subjugation, and had had to fight incessantly to win the minimum of rights, namely the right to exist. As a result of more recent events there were still Yugoslavs who were obliged to live in the territory of certain other countries, and to fight unceasingly for recognition of what they held to be their essential rights, namely the right to develop freely, to use their native tongue, to attend their own schools and not to be subjected to discrimination on account of their ethnic origin. In view of its own people's experience, the Yugoslav delegation strongly urged that certain essential rights should be granted to minority groups generally. It believed, moreover, that there were few peoples which, at some time in their history, had not been obliged to defend themselves against attempts to de-nationalize them by those who had been temporarily their masters. Hence it was only right that nations which had gained their liberty should take active steps to help those that were still subject to establish their right to exist.

The importance of the question of minorities was demonstrated by the fact that it had been the subject of many international agreements, both bilateral and multilateral, and that the League of Nations had dealt with it time and again. Today, it was one of the main concerns of the United Nations, which had seen fit to set up a Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

Just as the insertion in the covenant on civil and political rights of an article on the right of peoples to self-determination would contribute to the maintenance of peace throughout the world, so the insertion in that covenant of an article providing protection for minority groups would help to eliminate causes of friction liable to lead to conflict. That was why the Yugoslav delegation had submitted the text of a draft article (E/CN.4/L.225), which was a revision of that

which it had introduced at the seventh session (E/1992, Annex IV, Section A). His draft took over several points from the text adopted by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/2256, Annex II, Section A.III), and also included other points which his delegation felt vital to the precise formulation of the right in question.

The text stipulated that members of ethnic or linguistic groups were to enjoy minority rights. There was no mention of minority religious groups, as that aspect of the problem was covered by article 15. But if any delegations were anxious that religious groups should be taken into consideration, the Yugoslav delegation would have no objection to its text being amended accordingly.

With regard to the right "to use without hindrance the name of his group", the Yugoslav delegation felt that such a stipulation was essential in order to protect members of minority groups from attempts to compel them to abandon the name of their group. The right of members of minority groups to learn the language of the group and to use it, and to have their own schools or other cultural institutions, was also stated. That was essential, in view of the difficulties with which minority groups had to contend. Again, the text provided that members of minority groups should not be subjected to discrimination on the ground that as minorities they enjoyed certain special rights. In other words, all measures which tended to segregate such groups from other citizens on the pretext of safeguarding their position should be prohibited. The examples he had in mind were the ghetto, and the fact that members of certain minority groups were not allowed to send their children to the ordinary national schools. Cases of that kind unfortunately still existed, and troubled the conscience of the international community. The fact that the members of minority groups were entitled to attend their own schools did not mean that they should be prevented from attending ordinary schools; they should have freedom of choice in the matter.

The Yugoslav delegation was well aware of the difficulties involved in preparing and perfecting texts dealing with the protection of the rights of minority groups; and for that reason it was prepared to accept any suggestion capable of improving its draft. In fact, if any other delegation could produce a text which embodied all the safeguards he had mentioned, and met the desired aims more fully than his own proposal, his delegation was prepared to support it.

The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the fact that the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had adopted two resolutions relating to the protection of minorities, the texts of which were included in the report of the Commission's seventh session (E/1992, Annex IV, page 36). The action taken by the Commission itself on those two resolutions was described in paragraph 148 of its report on its eighth session (E/2256, page 23); that retained for consideration was the one reproduced in Section A.III of Annex II to that report. He would also emphasize that article 15 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights, to which the Yugoslav representative had just referred, and which enunciated the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, had been unanimously adopted by the Commission at its eighth session.

Mr. DIAZ-CASANUEVA (Chile) found it somewhat difficult to gauge the scope of the three proposals before the Commission, especially as the United Nations had made no complete and impartial study of the minorities problem. Such studies as existed had been based on a sociological approach, and it was regrettable that the Organization should not have worked out a complete picture of the distribution of minorities throughout the world. He feared that, as a result of the inadequacy of the information available, proposals relating to the problem of minorities would inevitably tend to be too general. It went without saying that the Chilean delegation had every sympathy for countries with minority problems, and that his impending criticisms were in no way due to a lack of appreciation of their position.

The first point to which he wished to draw attention was that all three proposals dealt with one specific problem, namely cultural life and the provision of institutions by means of which a minority group could preserve and develop its culture. But surely the proper place to deal with that problem was in article 14 of the draft covenant on economic, social and cultural rights, which laid on the States signatories the obligation of recognizing the right of everyone to education and of undertaking to promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial, ethnic or religious groups.

It would certainly seem logical that the covenant should contain an article on minorities, despite the fact that non-discrimination formed, so to speak, the leitmotiv of both covenants; but such an article should properly cover not only the cultural, but also the juridical, political and economic aspects of life, on the

lines, for instance, of article 3 of the draft covenant on economic, social and cultural rights, which ensured equality of status for men and women.

Assuming that the Commission accepted the definition of a minority as being a well-defined population group, possessing ethnic, religious or linguistic traditions which it was desirous of preserving and developing, the question then arose of the kind of rights which such a group might wish to enjoy. Certain minorities might seek more than non-discrimination, wishing to secure privileges which would evolve into a different type of rights from those enjoyed by the national community as a whole. The recognition by the State of what he would describe as "super" rights would imply the provision of special services and special institutions at extra expense, and entailing special legislation. That process might well culminate in a minority's claiming autonomy within the State. His delegation was fully prepared to concede the principle of non-discrimination, but it was firmly opposed to the grant of special prerogatives which might well create many difficult problems.

From that point of view, it was the Yugoslav proposal that worried him most. The Soviet Union proposal (E/CN.4/L.222), which opened with the words: "The State shall ensure to national minorities the right ...", approached the problem from the viewpoint of the group, but the Yugoslav proposal took the individual as its point of departure, stating that: "Every person shall have the right to show freely his membership of an ethnic or linguistic group ...".

The consequences of such an approach could be very dangerous. It was correct to start with the individual in dealing with his relationship to society in general, but in the case of the inter-relationship between the individual as a member of one group on the one hand and as a member of another and wider group on the other, it was essential that the group be taken as the starting point. The first clause of the Yugoslav proposal would have to be applied universally, since it did not relate to existing minorities, but tended to create and generalize what he would describe as a "minority complex". It would be unwise to encourage the disruptive tendency to form new minority groups. He also had serious misgivings about the phrase "to use without hindrance" (*de se servir sans obstacles*), since an individual's obligations to the State might be interpreted as "hindrances" in the sense of obstacles. He had particularly in mind countries, particularly Latin-American countries, which, while possessing no minorities in the true sense, had indigenous communities integrated

within the national community, foreign colonies which had their own institutions but which were not minorities, and immigrants who were gradually being integrated in the country's life.

He would like to draw the Commission's attention to the clear definition of minorities given in a text proposed by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, and quoted in the Secretary-General's memorandum entitled "Definition and Classification of Minorities" (E/CN.4/Sub.2/85):

"In States inhabited by well-defined ethnic, linguistic or religious groups which are clearly distinguished from the rest of the population, and which want to be accorded differential treatment, persons belonging to such groups shall have the right, as far as is compatible with public order and security, to establish and maintain their schools and cultural or religious institutions, and to use their own language and script in the Press, in public assembly, and before the courts and other authorities of the State, if they so choose."

In its resolution 217 (III) the General Assembly had recognized the difficulty of adopting a uniform solution for the complex and delicate question of minority rights, which had special aspects in each State in which it arose. He mentioned the point not because his attitude towards the proposal was negative, but because he was convinced that caution was essential. In certain regions, minority problems were of special importance since they gave rise to international tension. In such regions minorities should certainly be protected and granted special facilities. The Chilean delegation would be prepared to consider a statute for minorities, but it was strongly opposed to the inclusion in the covenants of articles which might encourage the formation of new minorities. The young countries of Latin America were working for the integration of their national communities. Mexico, for instance, was at present earnestly pursuing the incorporation within its national community of large indigenous groups which had hitherto led, so to speak, a marginal existence owing to lack of communications and the rudimentary level of economic development attained in the areas in which they lived. Those groups had remained untouched by the benefits of modern civilization, and had their own modes of thought and their own languages, but it would be sheer romanticism to make them into minorities. Further, the Latin American countries were countries of immigration, and had opened their doors wide to the peoples of Europe since the end of the last war. Indeed, immigration into Latin America was not merely a movement of individual

families and groups; it had reached the proportions of colonization. The Latin American countries wished the new settlers to become members of the national communities and not to form separate minority groups. Recent history, particularly between 1939 and 1945, had shown the dangers of racial theories, and it was essential to guard against the application of a uniform formula to a problem which had so many diverse aspects. Due regard must be paid to the tasks, the problems and the aims of the countries of immigration.

Mr. KAECKENBEECK (Belgium) agreed with the Soviet Union and Yugoslav representatives that it was essential to supplement the list of human rights by mentioning in one of the articles of the draft covenant the special rights pertaining to members of minority groups. Obviously, the principle underlying the three texts before the Commission could not be challenged. It was simply a question of which to choose. It seemed to him that the text adopted by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities represented a neat synthesis of those rights, and had the further advantage of being sufficiently flexible to command general approval.

Analysing that text, he stressed its strong points; he suggested, however, that the insertion of the words "d'avoir" after the words "ne peuvent être privées" would improve the French text.

The Yugoslav proposal made one interesting point; it referred to the right of every person "to show freely his membership of an ethnic or linguistic group". That involved the introduction of a subjective and voluntary factor into the concepts of "minority" and "minority group", which there was a tendency to regard purely as objective notions. Actually, the issue was a very important one; but it was also an extremely knotty problem, and he wondered whether it was one that could be solved in the Commission. Incidentally, the International Court of Justice had expressed itself in favour of the objective concept of a minority, although he personally had a certain liking for the subjective concept on which the Yugoslav proposal was based.

He had been impressed by the difficulties to which the Chilean representative had drawn attention. They should not be underestimated, and an effort should be made to resolve them, though it would take time and exhaustive research which possibly came more within the Sub-Commission's province. Clearly, the Chilean representative's wish to see exceptions and reservations introduced where necessary

into the article on the rights of minority groups might prove quite legitimate in certain circumstances. Indeed, if the Commission's work was to be made effective, it might be advisable, in the case of articles which gave rise to difficulties, to provide for exceptions or reservations which would be valid for a given period, to be fixed by the Commission. If such provision were made, he was prepared to agree to the adoption of the Sub-Commission's text, subject to slight editorial emendments.

Mr. JEVREMOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that he fully appreciated that, owing to problems arising from their special circumstances, certain countries, such as those of Latin America, might have views about various aspects of the minority question that differed from his own.

The Yugoslav delegation was willing to consider the possibility of inserting in the draft article certain reservations to take those views into account; but it could not agree to minority groups in general being denied their essential rights because of the existence of those special problems.

As to the criticism that the Yugoslav proposal treated the question from the standpoint of the individual rather than from that of the community, he could not himself see how it was possible to guarantee the rights of a group without guaranteeing the rights of individuals. That was certainly true of the right of self-determination, which could not be guaranteed without guaranteeing the right of individuals freely to express their will. The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had always taken the viewpoint of the individual.

During the recent discussion, various delegations had described the rights of minority groups as "special" rights. That was incorrect, for identical rights were enjoyed by the majority group of the population. The Chilean representative contended that in many Latin American countries, a policy of integrating the various population groups into the national community was greatly to be preferred to one of creating a multitude of minority groups. He (Mr. Jevremović) had no intention of criticising the policy of integration, but was anxious that it should be effected democratically. Finally, he could not accept the word "romantic", as applied to the views of the Yugoslav delegation on a problem of which its country had had painful experience; for that experience had given it a realistic determination to seek effective means of protecting minority rights.

If his draft article were rejected by the Commission, he would be willing to support the text adopted by the Sub-Commission, provided it was supplemented by the addition of the last sentence of the Yugoslav proposal, namely: "without being subjected on that account to any discrimination whatsoever, and particularly such discrimination as might deprive him of the rights enjoyed by other citizens of the same State".

The CHAIRMAN, clarifying some of the issues raised during the discussion, said that certain questions of principle had been mentioned. The whole concept of minorities, if not opposed outright, had been queried by at least one representative. A second point needing closer examination was the definition of a minority; in addition, there was the question of reservations.

Minorities - whether welcome or not - were a fact; countries did recognize their existence. In countries where there were no minorities, rights were enjoyed by all citizens to use any national language in private intercourse, and even in schools, the only restrictions being those dictated by considerations of public safety. In some countries, the professing of a religious faith was regarded as part of the attributes of the citizen, who thereby enjoyed freedom of religion without necessarily forming part of a definite religious minority. The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had studied the question of minorities, and the fruits of its work - the reports on its fourth and fifth sessions (E/CN.4/641 and Corr.1 and E/CN.4/670) and Economic and Social Council resolution 443 (XIV) - constituted item 4 of the agenda for the present session. He thought there were two alternatives before the Commission. It could defer further consideration of minority rights until after the discussion of item 4, which would doubtless embrace the question of definition; or it could accept the existence of minorities as a fact, eschew detailed discussion and approach the question along general lines.

As to reservations, he felt they should not be formulated on each article, but should be held in abeyance until the general question of reservations had been examined.

Mr. JEVREMOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained that in suggesting the introduction of certain reservations into the article on minority rights, he had not been thinking of general reservations, but rather of reservations covering certain specific cases applicable only to the issues covered by his draft text.

Mr. DIAZ-CASANUEVA (Chile) said he could not altogether agree with the Chairman about the definition of minorities. It was, of course, true that national minorities were a fact, for example, in Yugoslavia. He would call such groups static minorities, as opposed to the dynamic minorities which, in the present period of mass migration, were embryonic in all national groups of immigrants. He would quote Canada as an example of a country where the transference of national groups maintaining their cultural characteristics had not led to the formation of minorities.

In Chile, a large colonization scheme, based on a programme of mass immigration, was planned for the district of Aysen in the south of the country. Unless, however, a distinction were to be made between the static and dynamic aspects of the matter, there would be some risk of creating a minority problem in that part of the country.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the only aspect of the subject with which he was concerned was the human one.

Every national group, of whatever size or composition, had the right to use its native tongue, to have its children educated as it chose, and to enjoy its own schools, libraries, museums and other cultural organizations. That was not a special right, and he failed to understand the objections of the Chilean representative on that score. The Soviet Union proposal, taken in conjunction with the existing articles of the covenant, would not give rise to any of the difficulties mentioned.

By way of illustration, he would refer briefly to the Turkmen Republic in the south-eastern part of the Soviet Union. The population of that enormous area, which could take in several European countries, was only 1,300,000. The land was mainly desert, though industries were being developed. Before the revolution, the inhabitants had been denied any cultural rights. Only 7 out of every thousand had been literate, and there had been only half a dozen primary schools, reserved in any event mainly for the children of Russian officials. There had been only two or three libraries, no clubs and only one newspaper, published in Russian. The local intelligentsia had been very few in number, and there had been no indigenous doctors or agricultural experts. Today, the situation was very different.

Illiteracy had been abolished, and in 1952 there had been 1,162 schools (29 of which had provided secondary, and 6 higher education), 122 trade union clubs, 312 libraries, 522 reading circles, and 50 welfare centres. Over 70 newspapers were being published, 53 in Turkmeni. The Turkmen Academy of Sciences had been inaugurated in 1952, and there were over 40 laboratories in which, of 37 doctors on the staff, 11 were Turkmen nationals.

He quoted that as an example of how the grant of rights to a minority led to the development of the State and at the same time to the raising of the population's standard of living.

Although the national groups to be considered in connexion with the texts before the meeting might cover a wider field than that contemplated by the Sub-Commission, that was no reason why consideration of the question should be deferred, and he could not agree to any suggestion to that effect. The Soviet Union proposal was comprehensive, and, taken in conjunction with previous work done by the Commission, would enable the latter to submit a satisfactory covenant to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. JUVIGNY (France) said that at the outset the Commission was faced with an extremely complex problem, that of definition. Secondly, there was the problem of the balance within any given State between the majority of the population and the minority groups. There was also a third problem, legal in character, namely the relationship between the State and the minority group.

The need for attempting to strike a balance between the various factors involved made it difficult for him to support either the unduly rigid Soviet Union proposal, or the over-detailed and too specific draft article submitted by the Yugoslav delegation.

The complicated nature of the definition had already been discussed at length at the fourth session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. The report on that session (E/CN.4/641 and Corr.1) made it clear that it had been felt desirable to take into account the idea of loyalty of minorities to the State of which they were nationals. Then, taking concrete examples, the Sub-Commission had made allowance for the subjective factor referred to by the Belgian representative in his statement. But there was no denying that it was a very tricky business to make provision for subjective factors in legal texts.

In its consideration of the complex situations which might arise, the Sub-Commission had made allowance for the possible trend of events and contingencies in particular countries. Thus it would appear to have had in mind some of the problems to which attention had been drawn by the Chilean representative, who had been anxious that the problem of minorities should not be treated merely as a static concept but that its dynamic aspect should be given due weight. Another problem which the Sub-Commission had also seen fit to take up was that of measures for the prevention of action against minority groups designed to cut them off from the rest of the population. Evidently those were dangers which the Sub-Commission had not regarded as imaginary.

The Chilean representative had raised yet other problems, including the extremely difficult question of immigration, a matter of importance to all countries, and to the so-called new countries in particular. Obviously, it would be **feasible** to evade the question by inserting in one of the articles a paragraph specifying that the provisions of the article would not, a priori, apply to immigrants. But that would provide no true solution; it was always possible that sooner or later certain groups of immigrants might claim minority status. Thus there was no cut-and-dried method of solving the problem, and there was no policy in that field that could be applied to all States.

Another problem of balance was that of the right of minorities to their own educational establishments. It was a right which, as the Yugoslav representative had correctly pointed out, must be combined with the right of minority members to attend schools intended for the general population. There was a danger, however, in asking a State to guarantee the right of minorities to their own educational establishments; for a State might deliberately encourage a policy designed to isolate the different population groups, a process which, while it might perhaps protect the culture of the minority group, would also limit its members' opportunities of entering the public service. The safeguarding of the cultural interests of the minority group would then conflict with the protection of its right to full participation in the public life of the nation. It might be thought that, as in the case which the Soviet Union representative had described, certain countries had been able to strike a balance between the two factors; but the present task was to draft a text for international application, and there was no guarantee that all States would wish to achieve a similar balance.

In view of the complexity of those problems, he did not think it advisable to attempt to solve them immediately, by adopting either the Soviet Union proposal or the Yugoslav proposal. As the problem was an important one, however, the draft covenant on civil and political rights should contain an article, however limited, establishing certain rights for minority groups. The French delegation therefore thought it advisable to keep to the definition proposed by the experts who had made a long study of the question and, subject to various drafting changes, to adopt the text of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which had undoubted advantages.

Referring to the interesting picture of Turkmen given by the Soviet Union representative, the CHAIRMAN said that since, so far as he was aware, there was no minority question in the Soviet Union, perhaps the Soviet Union representative's reference to minorities related to the period before the Revolution.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that some six nationalities existed side by side in Turkmen, while a certain number of national minorities enjoyed equal cultural rights.

It was true to say that the nationals of Turkmen and Kazbakhstan were granted more rights than those he had mentioned. He doubted, however, whether the Commission would wish to expand its programme by drawing upon the Soviet Union's experience in that field. If it did, however, he would be only too happy to assist it. He did not claim that the problem could be fully and finally settled by the adoption of the Soviet Union proposal, for other articles also related to the subject, such as articles 1, 2, 3, 5 and 19; but he believed that his text represented a step forward towards developing of greater human potentialities.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the right of peoples to self-determination was recognized by law in Egypt as in the Soviet Union; a recent instance of its implementation by the Egyptian Government was the signing of the Sudan Agreement with the United Kingdom Government.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.