

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1299th
MEETING**

Monday, 11 October 1965,
at 3.5 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 58:	
<i>Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination . . .</i>	57
Agenda item 62:	
<i>Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance:</i>	
(a) <i>Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance;</i>	
(b) <i>Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance</i>	60

**Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO
(Mexico).**

AGENDA ITEM 58

Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (A/5803, chap. IX, sect. I; A/5921; A/C.3/L.1208-1212, L.1216-1226; E/3873, chap. II and annexes I and III)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the item which the Third Committee was now taking up was a most important one. In 1963 the General Assembly had adopted (resolution 1904 (XVIII)) the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination unanimously; he hoped that the draft Convention, submitted by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1015 B (XXXVII) and set out as an annex to the note by the Secretary-General (A/5921), would also be adopted unanimously.

2. The Committee had before it a number of amendments (A/C.3/L.1208-1212, A/C.3/L.1216-1226), all relating to matters of substance. So far as the final clauses were concerned, he suggested that the officers of the Committee should together with the Secretariat prepare a preliminary draft which would be submitted to the Committee at a later meeting.^{1/}

It was so decided.

3. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had decided not to hold a general debate on the present item.

4. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) said it was gratifying that at the present early stage in its work the Third Committee was taking up the draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which the United States delegation supported in its present form and which could make a

significant contribution to the advancement of human rights.

5. The United States Government assigned the highest priority to the objectives of the draft Convention, and was demonstrating by deeds that it was determined to put an end to racial discrimination. While it did not claim to have completed that task, it believed that it had taken decisive steps in the fight for freedom and the struggle against discrimination, ignorance, poverty, fear and prejudice.

6. Over the past few years the United States Congress had adopted three highly important laws. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 established the right of everyone, without regard to race, colour, religion or national origin to the full use of certain places open to the public, such as hotels, restaurants, theatres, sports arenas and the like; and the fact that such matters were being dealt with by Federal and not state legislation was a break with the past. The Act guaranteed freedom of access to Federal jobs and employment of every kind throughout the United States, and established conciliation and enforcement machinery to prevent discrimination in employment on the basis of race, colour, religion or national origin.

7. While the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had strengthened earlier legislation on the right to vote, it had remained for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to guarantee the prompt enfranchisement for all United States citizens. The Act prohibited the use of tests for voting qualifications where those had been a means of discrimination against Negroes in the registration of voters; in addition, it authorized the Federal Government to intervene if the state authorities which had responsibility for registering voters failed to observe the guarantees in the United States Constitution. The number of Negroes enrolled as voters had already risen by about 150,000.

8. Lastly, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which aimed at the elimination of poverty, was of great importance for the implementation of the equality objectives of the Civil Rights and Voting Acts providing aid programmes for the rural and depressed urban areas in which 75 per cent of the Negro population lived. The Act had created more job opportunities for minorities and had resulted in the establishment of new industries in towns and villages where employment had been shrinking or technological change had displaced workers, the formation of a domestic Peace Corps, called VISTA, which was sending volunteers to help the people in slum neighbourhoods, and the setting up of a Job Corps to train young people who had drifted away from school before they had acquired an elementary education.

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1237.

9. It was worthy of note in that connexion that the number of Negroes in schools of higher learning in the United States had almost doubled in fifteen years, that the number of non-white professional workers had more than doubled in ten years, and that among women college graduates the median income of Negroes exceeded that of whites. Progress had also been made in the lower schools; as the result of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, school authorities seeking Federal aid had to prove that they made no distinction on the grounds of race in the conduct of their schools. A recent count showed that only 65 of the approximately 25,000 school districts in the United States had not met the requirements.

10. Independently of its commitment to the eradication of racial discrimination at home, the United States Government wished to join with others in international action towards the same end, and felt that the draft Convention before the Committee was a step in the right direction. The United States delegation was sponsoring two amendments to the text. The first (A/C.3/L.1211), which it was submitting jointly with Brazil, proposed an additional article condemning anti-Semitism; its object was to strengthen the text. The second (A/C.3/L.1212), which it was submitting jointly with France, was aimed at clarifying the meaning of the expression "national origin" by specifying that there was nothing in that expression to prevent States from making a distinction between their treatment of their own citizens and nationals and their treatment of aliens.

11. Mr. RESICH (Poland), referring to his delegation's first amendment (A/C.3/L.1210), said that in the original text of the preamble the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, in order to illustrate what pernicious doctrines and racial practices were to be condemned, had included a reference to nazism, which was the most violent and conspicuous form of racial discrimination. The Polish delegation felt, with all due respect for those who held that the Convention should be turned towards the future and not the past, that in an instrument such as that before the Committee nazism should not be passed over in silence. Moreover, since the object of the preamble was to set forth the principles and purposes of the Convention and the historical reasons for drafting it, and since, in addition, the preamble was of great importance for the interpretation of the substantive articles, there was every justification for including such a reference—which would also constitute a warning that the Polish delegation regarded as by no means redundant.

12. Mr. ZOHRAH (New Zealand) said that there could be few, if any, moral issues of greater consequence to the international community than that of racial prejudice and discrimination. Nor was there any doubt that the United Nations should devote itself to studying the causes of such prejudice and discrimination and to initiating measures that would focus world-wide attention on the problem and help to overcome it.

13. As a multiracial society New Zealand had a natural interest in race relations. While discrimination had no place in his country, he thought that no people could claim to be entirely free of prejudice. That was a world-wide problem, concerning the individual in his

personal relationships, societies in terms of their own well-being, and countries in their relations with one another, particularly where a country practised discrimination as a conscious act of policy. That was why the international community was so preoccupied with the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

14. The Third Committee had special responsibility in the field of human rights; through its work on basic instruments it had played its part in making Governments and peoples aware not only that there were still many areas of the world where performance fell far short of fundamental standards but also that even in those countries that could claim with justification to live traditionally by those standards, their unflinching observance could not be taken for granted.

15. In considering racial prejudice and discrimination the Committee must remember that it was acting in a field where individual attitudes were in the last resort as important as the official policies of Governments. It must therefore bear in mind that the Convention would be significant for the influence it would have on individuals as much as on the Governments to which it was addressed and which would assume the legal obligations; it should accordingly be couched in strong and unequivocal terms. His delegation felt that the preamble and substantive articles drawn up by the Sub-Commission constituted a good and strong text; improvements could no doubt be made and further work was of course needed on the implementation provisions and final clauses, but as it stood the text combined strength with flexibility and was generally acceptable to his delegation. One advantage of the Commission's text was that it recognized that solutions to problems of discrimination were to be found by a variety of means. That flexibility would encourage Governments to approach the question of adherence with responsibility and thus enhance the chances of obtaining the maximum number of ratifications. For it was only if a significant number of Member States adhered to the Convention that it would be truly effective.

16. With regard to the organization of work on the draft Convention, his delegation considered that the Committee might begin by studying the preamble as a whole and then proceed to discuss each article in turn.

17. Miss TABBARA (Lebanon) said that her delegation had participated in the work of the Commission on Human Rights and would approve the articles as adopted by that body. It was also prepared to support any amendments which might strengthen or clarify the text.

18. In order to bring the text of the Convention into line with that of the Declaration, which had been adopted unanimously, her delegation wished to introduce some amendments and would submit them later in writing. In the first preambular paragraph the word "principle" should be put in the plural since both the principle of dignity and that of equality were concerned. In the seventh preambular paragraph, the word "Concerned" should be replaced by "Alarmed", which was stronger (A/C.3/L.1222).

19. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) welcomed with great satisfaction the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and said that there was no racial, national or religious

discrimination in his country, whose Constitution guaranteed equal rights and privileges to all citizens.

20. His delegation was on the whole satisfied with the draft Convention before the Committee but might make some comments on it later if it found it necessary to do so.

21. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) said that his delegation fully endorsed the principles on which the draft Convention was based.

22. In Turkey discrimination had never given rise to any problems, nor did it do so at the present time. The principle of equality was embodied in the Turkish Constitution and was scrupulously respected in practice.

23. With regard to the text of the Convention itself, he was gratified that the amendment submitted by the United States and French delegations (A/C.3/L.1212) provided some clarification regarding the application of the Convention. He observed that the text of the draft Convention made no reference to legal persons; that he considered a deficiency. With regard to article V, his delegation felt that the list of rights the enjoyment of which must be guaranteed was either too long or too short; of the rights mentioned, a number needed to be made more precise. So far as procedure was concerned, the text did not indicate the date on which the Convention was to enter into force, nor who was to be the depository.

24. His delegation would have some comments to make when the Committee discussed the text article by article and accordingly reserved the right to speak at that time.

25. Mr. NSENGIYUMVA (Rwanda) stressed the importance his delegation attached to the work of the Third Committee, whose task it was to identify the great social and human trends in the world today and to record the aspirations of mankind. Rwanda endorsed the resolutions adopted by the Committee since they were on the same lines as its own legislation. The Rwandese Constitution gave great importance to the question of human rights; it guaranteed to all citizens the enjoyment of fundamental rights.

26. His delegation welcomed the fact that the United Nations was working on an international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. It had no criticism to make of the text of the Convention and was prepared to adopt it as it stood, while reserving the possibility of supporting any amendment which might improve its form or substance.

27. Mr. K. C. PANT (India) said that since its accession to independence India had never ceased supporting the principles enunciated in the draft international Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and had participated in the drafting of the text in the Commission on Human Rights; it could only welcome the fact that the question was being studied by the Third Committee which, it was to be hoped, would soon succeed in producing a final text. The adoption of the Convention would be a landmark in the history of the work of the Third Committee and in the history of mankind. It was not, of course, to be expected that the Convention would eliminate overnight racial prejudices so deeply and so long rooted in the

customs of many countries, and even in the policies of their Governments. But it was to be hoped that it would exert on countries a moral pressure whose effects would be felt over the long term. In addition, it would propose a number of standards for the civilized countries and for that reason it must be drafted with extreme care and caution.

28. He recalled that the Indian Constitution guaranteed equality to all Indian nationals, without discrimination of any kind. Article 15.2 related more particularly to freedom of access to public places; article 16.2 prohibited discrimination in employment; article 17 abolished untouchability in all its forms. That form of discrimination, which was peculiar to India, had already been condemned by the 1950 Constitution. Article 29, paragraph 2, prohibited discrimination in education and in the granting of aid to educational institutions. Lastly, the Constitution provided for special treatment for the underprivileged groups of India, a special form of discrimination designed to undo the wrong done to those groups in the past.

29. Introducing his delegation's amendments (A/C.3/L.1216) he explained that the first one, relating to article I, was intended to meet the objections raised by many delegations to the words "national origin".

30. The second amendment, concerning article V, made the original text more flexible and, through the deletion of the words "the right of everyone" left States free to decide for themselves whether the same guarantees should be afforded to aliens and nationals. Many delegations had stressed and criticized the text's ambiguity on that point.

31. Mrs. MAKSIMENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that her delegation's intention, in proposing (A/C.3/L.1208) that article IV, subparagraph (a) should state specifically that the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof should constitute an offence punishable by law, was to strengthen the text.

32. Mr. GARCIA (Brazil) said that in proposing jointly with the United States delegation (A/C.3/L.1211) that anti-Semitism should be expressly condemned his delegation was remaining faithful to the Brazilian Government's traditional liberalism.

33. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) said that he supported the amendments in documents A/C.3/L.1208, 1209 and 1212. He would be unable to support the amendments in documents A/C.3/L.1210 and 1211 unless the references to anti-Semitism and nazism were deleted, as the task of the Third Committee was to prepare a convention and not a detailed study of discrimination.

34. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) asked what specific meaning was to be attached to the word "anti-Semitism" in document A/C.3/L.1211.

35. Mr. BECK (Hungary) requested an explanation of the distinctions between "national origin", "nationality" and "citizenship" drawn in the second amendment to article I submitted by France and the United States (A/C.3/L.1212).

36. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that he had intended to provide further explanations at a later stage of the

discussion, but would give immediately the explanation requested by the Hungarian representative.

37. The word "nationality" had a stricter and more specific meaning in French legal terminology than in that of other countries. It was understood to cover all that concerned the rules governing the acquisition or loss of nationality and the rights derived therefrom. His delegation, together with that of the United States, had submitted the amendment in order to ensure that no difficulties would be created in France and other countries using similar definitions by mistaken interpretation of the word "nationality".

38. Mr. ZOU PANOS (Cyprus) asked the sponsors of the amendment in question to explain any difference there might be between nationality and ethnic origin.

39. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) said that an individual's national origin might be different from his ethnic origin and that one might very well be a citizen of a country without belonging to the largest ethnic group in that country.

40. Princess NAKATINDI (Zambia) said that she unreservedly supported the idea of a convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination; she reserved the right to comment later on the amendments.

41. The Constitution of Zambia granted equal rights to all citizens without any discrimination whatsoever. Every citizen had access to employment of every kind and children of different races attended the same schools, which had not been the situation when Zambia had been a colony. Women had the right to vote; they had access to employment of all kinds and some of them occupied important posts in the administration.

42. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that his country unreservedly supported the draft Convention before the Committee; that instrument would not of course cause the chronic scourge of racial discrimination to disappear overnight but it would mark an important milestone on the way to equality between all peoples and all races.

43. In his delegation's opinion article VII was among the most important articles of the Convention, for the principles acquired in childhood were retained throughout maturity and old age; efforts to eliminate racial prejudice should therefore begin in the schools.

44. His country's legislation guaranteed all the rights enumerated in article V of the draft and the Government ensured that no Panamanian national or alien was deprived of his individual or collective rights.

45. His delegation, together with others, had submitted the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1226, one of which was intended to emphasize, in the sixth preambular paragraph, that discrimination between human beings was capable of disturbing the harmonious coexistence of persons even within the same State and to draw attention to the fact that the racial prejudice which set individuals against each other was one of the most difficult forms of prejudice to eradicate and was still very much alive in many States. In that connexion he pointed out that although in the Latin American countries racial discrimination did not exist in law, the situation was quite different in practice.

That was because racial prejudices had their origin in a combination of geographic, cultural, social and religious factors. Nevertheless, no matter how complex the reality was, the Convention should propose an ideal of racial equality.

46. The CHAIRMAN observed that the debate was becoming somewhat confused; some delegations were submitting amendments to one or another article of the Convention while others were reviewing the history of the Convention and others again were requesting explanations of various amendments.

47. He proposed that, beginning the next day, the Committee should take up the preamble as a whole, after the sponsors of amendments had presented their texts.

48. The Committee would then consider articles I to VII after which it would take up the new substantive articles. It would then begin consideration of the articles on measures of implementation and, lastly, take up the final clauses as a whole.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 62

Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance:

(a) Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (A/5803, chap. IX, sect. II; A/5925; A/C.3/L.1215, L.1227; E/3873, paras. 294, 296, 303; E/3925 and Corr.1 and Add.1-5);

(b) Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (A/5939, A/6003, chap. XIII, sect. I; A/C.3/L.1215, L.1227; E/4024, chap. II)

49. The CHAIRMAN observed that, as the Secretary-General's note (A/5925) made clear, in spite of the considerable efforts made by the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the Third Committee, it had not been possible, for lack of time, to complete a draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.

50. With regard to the draft Convention, document A/5939 recalled that the Commission on Human Rights, at its twenty-first session, had adopted a preamble and four articles on the basis of a preliminary draft submitted by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

51. He drew attention to the fact that Greece should be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.3/L.1215).

52. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that the Third Committee found itself in a somewhat special situation, as the Commission on Human Rights, because of its very heavy agenda, had been able to complete only the beginning of the draft Convention which the General Assembly, at its seventeenth session (resolution 1781 (XVII)), had requested it to prepare.

53. As a substantive discussion would be rather difficult in these circumstances, the Committee should merely decide to invite the Commission on Human Rights to complete its work. That was the object of

the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1215). The preamble of that draft merely recalled the various decisions already taken by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights concerning the draft Convention and draft Declaration on the elimination of religious intolerance. In addition it thanked the Commission for the work already accomplished.

54. The three very short operative paragraphs were purely procedural in nature and contained nothing new. Paragraph 3, which merely reaffirmed the wish already expressed by the General Assembly, suggested that the two drafts should be given priority consideration at the twenty-first session.

55. The draft resolution was purely formal in nature, and his delegation hoped that it would be adopted unanimously. It would give useful encouragement to the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council, and would stimulate them to more rapid completion of the two documents, in accordance with the decision taken at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly.

56. Mrs. BEN-ITO (Israel) said that it was unfortunate that there had not been time to complete the preparation of the draft Declaration and the draft Convention, which the General Assembly and various other bodies had been discussing for three years. In view of the importance of the question, it would be only logical if, when the documents were completed, the General Assembly gave them priority at the following session.

57. It was unnecessary for her to emphasize the interest which the Israel delegation took in the question of discrimination. It was common knowledge that the Jewish people had been subjected, over the centuries, to all forms of religious and racial discrimination. They had been the victims of holy wars, the Inquisition and pogroms. They had been confined in ghettos and had very often had to practice their religion in secrecy. Indeed, such persecution was continuing in certain countries at the present time.

58. Therefore, wishing to see the work on the draft Convention and the draft Declaration completed as quickly as possible, her delegation suggested that the Committee should close the debate and refer the question to the Commission on Human Rights so that the General Assembly might consider the drafts at its twenty-first session.

59. Mr. RIDLEY (Australia) said that he fully supported the draft resolution. He recalled that Australia, in keeping with the spirit of tolerance which informed its policy and with which its people was imbued, had always afforded a refuge to the victims of religious or other persecutions and that the Australian Constitution explicitly prohibited all discrimination, including religious discrimination.

60. As the Australian delegation had stated on several occasions, it regarded discrimination as an aberration and sincerely hoped that measures would be taken to educate the public and to teach it to practise tolerance.

61. Mr. SAKSENA (India) observed that although three years had passed since the subsidiary organs of the United Nations had been asked to draft texts concerning

the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, his delegation found no reason to be critical of the delay in the submission of a final draft by the Commission. The instruments on religious intolerance involved serious problems of a philosophical and conceptual nature. His delegation, as a member of the Commission, knew that there had not been the slightest slackness in the work. He hoped that the work on that subject would soon be brought to a successful conclusion. He therefore regretted the use of the word "Regrets" in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1215); except for that, his delegation would support the draft resolution.

62. He recalled that religious intolerance was an evil that was practically unknown in India, where Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Christianity and other religions flourished side by side. He quoted excerpts from one of the Edicts of Asoka, some 2,300 years old, to show that religious tolerance had always been practised in India.

63. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) said that religious tolerance was a Moslem and Arab tradition and was one of the essential conditions for freedom of conscience and religious freedom. The Constitution of Iraq guaranteed to all citizens the right to practise their religion whatever it might be.

64. Nevertheless, the Declaration and the Convention should state the right of everyone freely to practise his religion, in so far as it was compatible with public order and morality in general.

65. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) felt that the elimination of religious intolerance was an item of the utmost importance. Such intolerance was entirely at variance with the traditions of her country.

66. The United States delegation had hoped that the work on the draft Declaration and Convention would be carried on simultaneously with the work on the elimination of racial discrimination, and regretted that it had not been possible to do so. In view of the urgency of the problem, the General Assembly should ask the Economic and Social Council to invite the Commission on Human Rights to complete the preparation of the instruments in question in time for the Economic and Social Council to consider them at its March session, and should take up the instruments as a matter of priority at its twenty-first session. The world should know where the United Nations stood on the question of religious intolerance.

67. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) expressed surprise that anyone should consider drafting a declaration and a convention on the elimination of religious intolerance simultaneously. The drafting of a convention was an extremely delicate undertaking which gave rise to endless controversy. Conventions were not always ratified by a sufficient number of countries and, furthermore, many articles remained a dead letter. He therefore thought it unfortunate that in the draft resolution a number of countries proposed that the Commission on Human Rights should be requested to prepare a draft convention. In his view, the question of the desirability of drafting a convention should be decided and the contents of such an instrument discussed only after the Declaration had been completed.

68. In addition to the great religions which had millions of adherents, there were thousands of other religions which had an equal right to be protected. Religious tolerance consisted in guaranteeing freedom of conscience to everyone, including free-thinkers. But however necessary it might be to guarantee religious freedom, the adoption of a convention could, in certain cases, create unforeseen difficulties. For example, some religions required their faithful to observe special dietary rules which, if generally applied, could have economic repercussions with which certain States might be unable to cope. The Committee should also guard against the danger of yielding to pressure from certain groups, which viewed the proposed Convention as a means of protecting their own interests.

69. The Saudi Arabian delegation would like the text of the draft resolution to be reworded so as to refer only to the Declaration.

70. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) asked the co-sponsors of the draft resolution to delete operative paragraph 1—as he felt that it was not for the Committee to blame anyone—and paragraph 3, which was unnecessary in view of paragraph 2.

71. Mr. SAKSENA (India) supported the Mauritanian representative's request for the deletion of paragraph 1.

72. Mr. PARDOS (Spain) requested that the texts on the elimination of religious intolerance should be given priority, not only at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, but also in the Economic and Social Council.

73. The spirit of tolerance had presided over the birth of the international community, but it was necessary to strengthen that spirit by positive measures and to guarantee freedom to all persons in the matter of religion. Spain, which was profoundly catholic, respected religious freedom and had provided a refuge for thousands of victims of racial and religious persecution. The Spanish delegation would therefore give full support to the draft Declaration and the draft Convention.

74. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) said that his country's Constitution guaranteed complete freedom of religion and his delegation was therefore prepared to support the draft Declaration and, in due course, the draft Convention, on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.

75. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) agreed with the Mauritanian representative that there was no reason to retain paragraph 3 after paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

76. She shared the Saudi Arabian representative's view that the Declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance should be adopted before any work was started on the Convention.

77. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that he had taken note of the various suggestions which had been made concerning the draft resolution. However, since he could speak only on behalf of his own delegation, it might be preferable to allow the fourteen co-sponsors time to consult one another.

78. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) submitted two formal amendments (A/C.3/L.1227). He proposed that in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1215) the words "on the two drafts" should be replaced by "of the draft Declaration" and the word "they" before "may be submitted" should be replaced by the word "it".

79. He also proposed that operative paragraph 3 should be replaced by a new text whereby the General Assembly would decide to postpone the question of completing the preparation of the draft Convention until it had adopted the draft Declaration.

80. Mrs. VILLGRATTNER (Austria) said that the question of the preparation of a declaration and a convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance and, in particular, the question of the order in which they should be taken up, had been debated at length in the past. In her view it was far more the responsibility of the Commission on Human Rights than of the Third Committee to enter into details and to consider the religious, ideological and legal aspects of the problem. Since the draft resolution was already the result of a compromise, she felt that it and the amendments should be voted on immediately.

81. Mr. CHK'IKVADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be desirable to allow delegations time to think the matter over. A number of very important questions had been raised concerning both substance—the position of the United Nations in the campaign against religious intolerance and the advisability of drafting a convention at the present time—and form. Accordingly he proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

82. The CHAIRMAN observed that, under rule 120 of the rules of procedure, a motion for adjournment had precedence over a motion for the closure of the debate.

The motion to adjourn the meeting was adopted by 57 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.