

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.466
3 May 1954
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Tenth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 7 April 1954, at 2.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

Report of the sixth session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention
of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (continued):

Draft resolution C - measures to expedite the work of the
Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/703, annex I; E/CN.4/L.372 and 373)
(continued)

Draft resolution D - Future work of the Sub-Commission on the
protection of minorities (E/CN.4/703, annex I)

Study of discrimination in employment and occupation
(E/CN.4/703, paragraph 123; E/CN.4/L.363 and 364)

(19 p.)
54-11333

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CASSIN	(France)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. WHITLAM	Australia
	Mr. NISOT	Belgium
	Mr. LABARCA)	
	Mr. ORTEGA)	Chile
	Mr. HUCHUN)	
	Mr. CHENG PAONAN)	China
	Mr. GHORBAL	Egypt
	Mr. JUVIGNY	France
	Mr. ROUSSOS	Greece
	Mr. RAJAN	India
	Mr. PIRACHA	Pakistan
	Mr. INGLES	Philippines
	Mr. BIRECKI	Poland
	Mr. ASIROGLU	Turkey
	Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
	Mr. MOROZOV)	
	Mr. SMIRNOV)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. HEWITT)	
	Mr. GREEN)	United States of America
	Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT	Uruguay

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. MANNING	International Labour Organisation
Mr. ARNALDO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

PRESENT (continued):

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category B and Register:

Mr. MOSKOWITZ	Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations
Mr. JOFTES	Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
Mr. LONGARZO	International Conference of Catholic Charities
Mr. HARLOND	National Baptist Convention Inc.
Mr. LESZYNSKI	<u>Nouvelles equipes internationales</u>
Mr. POLSTEIN	World Union for Progressive Judaism

Secretariat:

Mr. SCHWELB	Deputy Director of the Division of Human Rights
Mrs. BRUCE) Mr. DAS)	Secretaries of the Commission

REPORT OF THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES: (1) DRAFT RESOLUTION C - MEASURES TO EXPEDITE THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMISSION (E/CN.4/703, ANNEX I; E/CN.4/L 372 AND 373) (continued)

Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that the essence of the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution C was reproduced without any change whatever in the amendment submitted by the Philippines and Uruguay, since the effect of that amendment was to draw the Assembly's attention to the requests set forth in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of resolution J. He felt, therefore, that all the arguments advanced against resolution J and draft resolution C applied to the amendment also. He concurred in the Soviet Union and Polish representatives' objections to the request for reconsideration of resolution 677 (VII) and felt that such reconsideration would not facilitate the Sub-Commission's work. He had, however, no objection to measures really designed to expedite the Sub-Commission's work and, in particular, to the proposal that the Commission on Human Rights should set aside adequate time to review the Sub-Commission's work. His delegation would vote against the two-Power amendment.

Mr. PIRACHA (Pakistan) said that he was not convinced that there were sufficient grounds for granting rapporteurs remuneration over and above the travel and subsistence allowances they normally received. He also doubted the propriety of asking the General Assembly to reconsider resolution 677 (VII). His delegation was, therefore, inclined to abstain when the vote on draft resolution C was taken. However, it could support the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment even though it had certain shortcomings. His delegation would not have been able to vote for the United Kingdom amendment in its original form but would support it as amended by the Greek sub-amendment on the understanding that the "study" could include not only a study of the present situation in regard to minorities but also recommendations it might like to make.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) pointed out that the amendment submitted by his delegation and that of the Philippines concerned a procedural question only. By adopting draft resolution C in its original form the Commission would have appeared to take a position on the substance of the problem. The effect of the two-Power amendment, which simply requested the Council to transmit resolution J to the Assembly, would be to obviate such an interpretation, which was detrimental to the principle of draft resolution C. When the Assembly in its turn considered the question, supporters and opponents would be able to discuss the substance of the problem.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) said that it was his delegation's opinion that the Commission on Human Rights should express its opinion on the resolutions adopted by the Sub-Commission. He would not be able to support either paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution C or the joint Philippine and Uruguayan amendment. The arguments that had been advanced during the discussion had not modified his view concerning paragraph 1 and he would vote for the United Kingdom amendment as amended by the Greek proposal.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Polish and Ukrainian representatives that paragraph 1 of draft resolution C should not be amended. The text of the United Kingdom amendment, as modified by the Greek proposal, was ambiguous and he felt that such a text would have the effect of complicating the Sub-Commission's work. He had the same objections as the Ukrainian representative to the two-Power amendment. In his opinion it did not concern a procedural question only; if the Commission transmitted the Sub-Commission's resolution to the Economic and Social Council and asked the Council to draw the General Assembly's attention to certain paragraphs in it, that would be tantamount to an implicit recommendation. His delegation would vote against the amendment and, if it was incorporated in the resolution, would vote against the resolution as a whole. He asked the Philippine and Uruguayan delegations not to insist on the Commission's voting on the amendment. Those delegations would be perfectly free to bring the matter up again later, either in the Economic and Social Council or in the General Assembly. The maintenance of the amendment at present was liable to be prejudicial to draft resolution C as a whole.

Mr. RAJAN (India) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution C as it stood, for it felt that a study of the present situation as regarded minorities throughout the world was of paramount importance. In view of the statements made during the discussion and of his delegation's previous votes, however, he would vote in favour of the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment. He would vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendment also, although that did not mean that he gave it his unreserved approval.

Mr. ROUSSOS (Greece) recalled the discussion at the previous meeting on the interpretation to be given to the resolution adopted the day before and pointed out that the United Kingdom amendment, as amended by the Greek proposal, referred to the resolution as a whole and not to a part of it only.

Mr. ORTEGA (Chile) held that the two-Power amendment was a compromise between the provisions of draft resolution C and the ideas expounded by the United Kingdom representative. His delegation would vote for the amendment, which enabled the Commission to avoid taking a decision on the matter. He felt that the rule laid down in General Assembly resolution 677 (VII) was contrary to the universally recognized principle that work should be paid for in proportion to the time and effort expended on it. That principle applied with even greater force to the work of eminent experts, and he felt, as did the Philippine representative, that if competent experts were required it would be very difficult to approach only those who were free of financial cares. He recalled in that connexion the prolonged controversy which the question of the remuneration of Members of Parliament had provoked in his country; the Chilean Parliament had gained much by ceasing to recruit its members necessarily and solely from among people who had private means. For that reason of principle his delegation would vote either for the original text of draft resolution C or for the Uruguayan and Philippine amendment. He stressed that the Sub-Commission's requests as set forth in resolution J were well-founded. The fact that the Secretariat was not in a position to furnish the necessary assistance and that the Sub-Commission

was not able to appoint an independent expert placed the Sub-Commission in a difficult position. The members of the Commission who had spoken against the appointment of an expert should realize that the Commission was bound to provide other means of facilitating the Sub-Commission's work. In that connexion he again drew the Commission's attention to paragraph 1 of the Sub-Commission's resolution J, which in spite of its importance had not yet been discussed. His delegation intended to submit, jointly with the Uruguayan delegation, a draft resolution requesting the Economic and Social Council to authorize the Sub-Commission to hold annual sessions of up to six weeks' duration.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) had already stated that he would have preferred to vote for the original text of paragraph 1 of draft resolution C. While he objected to the United Kingdom amendment in its original form, the Greek proposal modifying that amendment was a compromise which he was willing to accept.

The Uruguayan and Chilean representatives had brilliantly put the case for the Philippine and Uruguayan joint amendment and he associated himself with their observations. The USSR representative had asked the sponsors of the amendment to withdraw it; he in turn would like to appeal to the USSR representative to act with a sense of justice and fairness and not to stand in the way of the Commission's transmitting the Sub-Commission's request to the Assembly, through the Council. While it was true that there was nothing to prevent any delegation from bringing the Sub-Commission's recommendation to the attention of the General Assembly, it was also true that those who opposed that recommendation in the Commission would be free to vote against it in the General Assembly. Hence, no rights would be prejudiced by the simple transmittal of the Sub-Commission's recommendation to the General Assembly. It would not be the first time that the General Assembly had been invited to reconsider one of its resolutions: the Commission had but to recall that, after having decided to prepare a single covenant on human rights, the Assembly had been induced to reverse its decision and to declare that the United Nations would prepare two draft covenants; subsequently some delegations had even contemplated questioning the Assembly's second decision and had proposed a return to the first idea, the drafting of a single covenant. Whatever had been its views on that subject, the Philippine delegation had never objected to requests being submitted to the Assembly for the reconsideration of any of the

latter's resolutions. That being so, he found it hard in the present case to understand why, even if they were in the majority, the delegations which thought that resolution 677 (VII) should not be reconsidered wished to oppose those which thought otherwise, the more so since some of the States Members of the General Assembly who were not represented on the Commission might well see valid grounds for reconsidering the resolution, and, moreover, the Commission would do no more than simply transmit the Sub-Commission's request, without deciding on the substance of the matter. The specific purpose of the amendment in document E/CN.4/L.373 was to remove any possible ambiguity on that point; that being the case, the Commission could not in all justice object to the Sub-Commission's request being referred to the only organ competent to receive it.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to proceed to the vote.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. ROUSSOS (Greece), pointed out that the Greek delegation's sub-amendment had been accepted by the United Kingdom and could therefore be considered as part of the United Kingdom amendment and be put to the vote with it.

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Commission to vote, firstly, on the preamble of draft resolution C; secondly, on the United Kingdom amendment (E/CN.4/L.372), with the amendment proposed orally by Greece; thirdly, on paragraph 1 of the operative part, either in its original form, or as modified by the United Kingdom amendment, according to whether the latter had been rejected or adopted; fourthly, on the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment (E/CN.4/L.373) - as a result of its decision on that amendment, the Commission might not have to vote on draft resolution C, paragraphs 2 and 3; finally, on draft resolution C as a whole.

The preamble of draft resolution C was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The United Kingdom amendment, as amended by Greece, was adopted by 12 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 1, as amended, of the operative part of draft resolution C was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Philippine and Uruguayan amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions

Draft resolution C as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China), explaining his vote, pointed out that during the general discussion he had stated that his delegation did not think that the Fifth Committee should reconsider resolution 677 (VII) but nevertheless saw no objection to the Sub-Commission's request being transmitted to the General Assembly, through the Council. It was in that spirit that he had voted for the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment, its views on that amendment being exactly the same as those of the Australian delegation. The USSR representative had, moreover, shown that the amendment did not alter the substance of the original text of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. He had seen no need, however, to vote against the draft resolution as a whole and had merely abstained from voting, since it was ultimately a matter of addressing a resolution to the Council and he was well aware what attitude his delegation would take on it in the Council.

Mr. ROUSSOS (Greece) said that the fact that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment in no way prejudged its attitude concerning paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Sub-Commission's resolution J. It was unlikely that the General Assembly would finally be induced to reverse its decision.

Mr. JUVIGNY (France) felt he must repeat that resolution 667 (VII) had been adopted almost unanimously. At the time, the delegations which had interpreted it most liberally had stated clearly that it should not be reconsidered unless the requests submitted to that effect were based on valid grounds and very specific considerations. In view of the problematical and indefinite nature of the study contemplated in resolution J, his delegation had not thought it proper to bring to the attention of the higher organs of the United Nations a draft resolution not supported by adequate reasons and had therefore voted against the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment.

Mr. GREEN (United States of America) said he had voted in favour of the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment, because he considered it purely procedural. The United States delegation had grave doubts, however, on the substance of resolution J, and its vote did not prejudge the attitude it would take in the Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) agreed with the French representative. The Assembly would use its own judgment in assessing the authority of a resolution adopted by eight votes only.

Mr. GHORBAL (Egypt) said he had voted for the United Kingdom amendment, the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment, and the draft resolution as a whole. He associated himself with the remarks the Indian and Philippine representatives had made during the discussion. The Philippine and Uruguayan amendment was purely procedural and in no way prejudged the decision to be taken on resolution 677 (VII); in adopting it, the Commission had merely referred that important matter to the General Assembly, in which sixty States would examine it, taking all relevant factors into account.

Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) had voted against the United Kingdom amendment, for he felt that even with the Greek modification it weakened paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, in that it did not reproduce all the factors in the draft resolution the Commission had adopted the previous day. He had supported paragraph 1 although the United Kingdom amendment had been adopted, because even in its amended form it still offered some possibility of safeguarding some of the principles which should govern the Sub-Commission's work.

His delegation had made it clear that it could not support paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution C, in which the Sub-Commission had suggested a procedure which was not in accordance with the provisions of the earlier General Assembly resolutions; moreover, it considered that the question of the Sub-Commission's procedure had been sufficiently discussed. The Philippine and Uruguayan amendment in no way altered the substance of paragraphs 2 and 3, since a decision by the Commission to invite the Council to transmit the Sub-Commission's request to the Assembly could certainly not be looked upon as purely procedural. He had therefore voted against that amendment and it was only because it had been adopted that he had voted against the draft resolution as a whole. The fact that he had voted in favour of paragraph 1, even after the adoption of the United Kingdom amendment, clearly showed that his delegation accepted the general ideas on which draft resolution C was based.

Mr. PIRACHA (Pakistan) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole when it was put to a vote after the Philippine and Uruguayan amendment had been adopted. He thought, however, that in deciding to transmit the Sub-Commission's request without comment to the Council, for communication to the General Assembly, the Commission had taken a procedural decision only. He reserved the position of his delegation on the subject of granting additional remuneration to rapporteurs in the Economic and Social Council and in the General Assembly.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) shared the United Kingdom representative's interpretation and considered that the adoption of the United Kingdom amendment, as amended by Greece, would not prevent the Sub-Commission's proceeding with the study of the position as regards minorities throughout the world.

He expressed the hope that when resolution J was transmitted to the Council the part of the Sub-Commission's report (paragraphs 218-225) in which were explained the imperative reasons that had led the Sub-Commission to submit its request would also be transmitted.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) strongly objected to the suggestion put forward by the representative of the Philippines in explaining his vote. In the first place, that suggestion would introduce an entirely new procedure; it was not the custom to transmit extracts from a report in support of a recommendation. Furthermore, to communicate to the Council a text containing arguments in favour of reconsideration of resolution 677 (VII) would be submitting documentation with a certain bias; if the Philippine representative's suggestion were adopted, it would be necessary to consider communicating to the Council the summary records of the debates, during which a majority of delegations had clearly indicated that they were not in favour of any reconsideration of the resolution adopted by the Assembly, and to give their arguments. In the circumstances, it would be much better merely to transmit to the Council the text of resolution J, particularly since the report of the Sub-Commission was an official document, a copy of which was filed, and the Council could refer to it if it saw fit to do so.

He had voted in favour of the preamble to the draft resolution. He had voted against the United Kingdom amendment because he thought it dangerous, in that it might raise difficulties of interpretation; he had nevertheless voted for paragraph 1, because, even as amended by the United Kingdom, it need not be interpreted as going against the decision taken by the Commission the previous

day. Finally, the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Philippines and Uruguay, against which the USSR delegation had voted, had forced him to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) pointed out that he had not formally proposed, or even suggested, that the part of the report setting forth the considerations underlying the Sub-Commission's request should be transmitted to the Council; he had simply expressed the hope that it would be done. At any rate, he was sure that those members of the Council and of the General Assembly who wished to ascertain the reasons for the Sub-Commission's recommendation would have to read the pertinent portions of the Sub-Commission's report.

DRAFT RESOLUTION D - FUTURE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES (E/CN.4/703, ANNEX I)

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) explained that the purpose of draft resolution D was to request the Commission on Human Rights to approve the decision of the Sub-Commission, in its resolution H, to include in its future work consideration of the matters dealt with at its previous sessions and referred back to it by the Commission on Human Rights for further consideration. He pointed out an omission in the English translation of the draft resolution: the first line of the operative part should read: "to include in its programme of future work".

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China) pointed out that draft resolution D was purely procedural and it was even permissible to wonder if it had been necessary for the Sub-Commission to submit it for the approval of the Commission on Human Rights. That being so, his delegation could see no objection to voting for it.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation saw no reason against voting for a text, which, as the Philippine representative had said, merely requested the Commission on Human Rights to approve the inclusion, in the programme of future work of the Sub-Commission, of matters which it had itself referred to the Sub-Commission for continued consideration. Nevertheless,

he thought it rather strange that the only draft resolution the Sub-Commission had submitted for the express approval of the Commission should be the very one it had adopted in execution of a decision taken by the Commission itself. It appeared that the Sub-Commission had not thought fit to request the Commission to approve other decisions which it had taken and which had nonetheless given rise to lengthy debates in the Commission, whereas in that particular case it would have been well within its rights to take the Commission's approval for granted.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines), replying to the comments of the United Kingdom representative, pointed out that the Sub-Commission had merely been complying with the dictates of courtesy in informing the Commission that consideration of the questions referred to in resolution D had not been resumed and would not be resumed for some time, not, in fact, until the study on the present position as regards minorities throughout the world had been completed. It had been trying, as it were, to reply in advance to the questions which the Commission might have raised on the matter.

Mr. ROUSSOS (Greece) thought that the Commission should proceed to a vote.

Replying to a question from Mr. NISOT (Belgium), Mr. INGLES (Philippines) pointed out that the expression "Interim Measures to be taken for the Protection of Minorities", appearing in resolution H, should be understood to refer to interim measures which might be taken in that field before the meaning of the term "minority" had been specifically defined.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) did not see what interim measures could be taken to protect minorities until some precise definition of the term "minority" had been produced.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) thought that that resolution would have to be considered by the Sub-Commission in the light of the Commission's resolution requesting it to consider further the whole question of minorities, and he saw no reason to think that action in resolution D would be taken in advance of the consideration of that general question.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) presumed that the United Kingdom representative's interpretation was the same as that of the Sub-Commission and that in the circumstances the Belgian delegation would be able to vote for draft resolution D, without its vote prejudging anything.

Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) reserved his delegation's right to interpret draft resolution D according to its own understanding of that draft resolution. That resolution gave the Commission the possibility of continuing its work in the field of minorities. The Polish delegation did not agree with the interpretation given by the United Kingdom and Belgian delegates.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) was surprised that the representative of Belgium should have such difficulty in understanding the term "minority", since the Commission had set up a Sub-Commission for the very purpose of protecting minorities and had already adopted a resolution on that question at its current session. His delegation would vote without hesitation for draft resolution D, which, from the very fact that it made a contribution to the study of human problems constituted a step forward.

Draft resolution D as a whole was adopted unanimously, by 17 votes.

STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATION (E/CN.4/703, paragraph 123; E/CN.4/L.363 and 364)

Mr. GREEN (United States of America), presenting his delegation's draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.363), explained that the draft referred to resolution C adopted by the Sub-Commission. He recalled that at its ninth session the Commission had approved the consideration by the Sub-Commission of the procedure to be followed in studying discrimination in the field of employment and occupation. Although the Sub-Commission had not seen fit to submit resolution C for the approval of the Commission, it would appear that the Economic and Social Council's approval of that study would be required, since it would call for the assistance of the Secretary-General, the International Labour Organisation, other specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations. That was the purpose of the United States draft resolution.

He explained that in the preamble of the draft resolution the Commission noted resolution C of the Sub-Commission and in sub-paragraph (a) it recommended that the Economic and Social Council approve the proposed study. With regard to sub-paragraph (b), he drew attention to the letter dated 26 March 1954 from the International Labour Office to the Secretary-General (E/CN.4/L.364), announcing that the ILO had agreed to undertake the proposed study. He pointed out that in the interests of co-ordination it seemed better to address an official request to the ILO, which would admittedly be retroactive, since the ILO had already started work on the matter. He thought that it would be well to establish a precedent in that respect, since the Economic and Social Council was responsible for co-ordinating all the work of the United Nations in social matters. Furthermore, he explained that paragraph 2 of the operative part of the Sub-Commission's resolution C contained the word "preparatory", but that although it was obvious that the Sub-Commission would have the right to discuss the proposed study and draw conclusions from it, the word had been omitted from sub-paragraph (b) of the United States draft resolution, because it was the ILO which was to undertake the study.

With regard to sub-paragraph (c), he explained that it referred to paragraph 6 of the operative part of the Sub-Commission's resolution C. He thought that, from the very fact that there was as yet no well-established procedure, it was better to leave it to the Economic and Social Council itself to issue invitations to the organs referred to in the last paragraph and that the material in question should be sent to the ILO alone rather than to both the ILO and the Sub-Commission.

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China) thought that it was clear from paragraphs 2 and 5 of the operative part of the Sub-Commission's resolution C that the preparatory study would be undertaken by the ILO and then considered by the Sub-Commission, which would then submit a report based on the combined efforts of the ILO and the United Nations. If that was so, he suggested that the word "preparatory" should be inserted before the word "study" in sub-paragraph (b) of the United States draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.363).

Furthermore, with reference to paragraph 7 of annex II of the Sub-Commission's report (E/CN.4/703) he would like to ascertain from the representative of the Secretary-General whether, if the Commission adopted the United States draft resolution, it would be possible to include the cost of the study in question in the 1955 budget, or if that expenditure could not be included in the budget of the Publications Board.

Mr. SCHWELB (Secretariat) explained that paragraph 7 of annex II was designed to meet the requirements of rule 28 of the rules of procedure but that inclusion in the 1955 budget was an entirely different matter, and, secondly, that the Publications Board was a Secretariat organ responsible for advising the Secretary-General on publications and had no budget apart from that of the United Nations.

Mr. GREEN (United States of America) drew the attention of the representative of China to paragraph 2 of the operative part of resolution C of the Sub-Commission, as also to the letter of the ILO to the Secretary-General (E/CN.4/L.363), and said that he thought that the ILO would co-operate with the Secretary-General in undertaking the study to be considered by the Sub-Commission at its seventh session.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in the French text of sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part of the United States draft resolution, the word "touchant" should be replaced by the phrase "dans le domaine de".

Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) inquired of the Chairman whether the Spanish text of that sub-paragraph was a correct version of the English text. He was glad that the comments appearing in the Sub-Commission's resolution C had been embodied in a more concrete form in the United States draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.363), which his delegation would support.

He stressed the importance of sub-paragraph (c) of the draft resolution, which would enable a large section of world public opinion to be reached. He could wish, however, that the material studied might refer particularly to the legislation of various Member States, in force in both the metropolitan countries and in the non-self-governing territories, and he asked the United States representative if the wording of sub-paragraph (c) of his draft resolution could be interpreted in that sense.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) said that the Belgian delegation would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution; it was glad that the proposed study was now to be undertaken by an organ of proved competence and authority.

Mr. PIRACHA (Pakistan) inquired whether it was necessary for the Commission to ask the Economic and Social Council formally to approve the study in question.

Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China), replying to the representative of Pakistan, pointed out that when a subsidiary organ proposed measures involving expenditure, the authorization of the Economic and Social Council was required.

Mr. GREEN (United States of America), replying to the representative of Uruguay, pointed out that paragraph 3 of the operative part of resolution C of the Sub-Commission referred to the general principles adopted by the Sub-Commission to guide the special rapporteur in the preparation of the study

of discrimination in the field of education; furthermore, section II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii), of the operative part of resolution B relating to that study referred specifically to the general trend and development of legislation in that connexion.

Replying to the representative of Pakistan, he affirmed that the approval of the Economic and Social Council was necessary, since the proposed study required the collaboration of bodies outside the United Nations. He stressed the fact that the United States draft resolution would not affect the substance of resolution C of the Sub-Commission.

Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) had reached the conclusion that his delegation would have to submit amendments to the United States draft resolution, particularly since that draft contained no provision requesting the Commission to approve the proposed study.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) pointed out that sub-paragraph (a) of the United States draft resolution was not in conformity with the usual practice of the Commission. As the Commission had already approved the proposed study at its ninth session, without reference to the Economic and Social Council, there seemed no point in asking the Economic and Social Council to approve it. He thought that it would be enough if the Commission confirmed the resolution which it had adopted on that question.

Furthermore, he was surprised at the United States proposal in sub-paragraph (c) of the draft resolution, that the Commission should recommend that the Council should approve certain requests made by the Sub-Commission to the Secretary-General. He thought that the Sub-Commission, like the Commission, was fully entitled to do that for itself. He asked for clarification of the legal position from the Secretary-General.

The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Uruguay that the Spanish text of sub-paragraph (a) of the United States draft resolution was an accurate rendering of the English text.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.