

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held on Friday, 27 April 1973, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. VALENCIA RODRIGUEZ

/...

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS AND COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER
ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (continued):

(a) SECOND PERIODIC REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES DUE IN 1972 (CERD/C/R.30/Add.14)
(continued)

Pakistan (CERD/C/R.30/Add.14)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Akram (Pakistan) took a place at the Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it the second periodic report of Pakistan, which was contained in document CERD/C/R.30/Add.14. Pakistan had presented two previous reports, contained in documents CERD/C/R.3/Add.10 and Add.42, which had been considered by the Committee at its second, third and fourth sessions and had been found unsatisfactory.

Mr. HAASTRUP said that he considered the second periodic report of Pakistan to be highly satisfactory. Referring to the introductory material contained in the first five paragraphs of the report, which related to political issues, he agreed with the statement in paragraph 5 that even the widest interpretation of the Convention and the Committee's functions under it would exclude its competence to consider those issues.

He recalled that, when the two previous reports of Pakistan had been considered unsatisfactory, the Committee had decided to ask for additional information from the Government of Pakistan. Before that information had been received, a member of the Committee had raised a point which related to the political issues touched upon in the introduction to the current report. He (Mr. Haastrup) had opposed that member's right to raise such issues because the supplementary report had not yet been received by the Committee. Once again, he appealed to members not to discuss the highly political matters referred to in the introductory paragraphs of the current report.

Turning to the substance of the report, he was pleased to note that it quoted the various provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan which related to the appropriate articles of the Convention. Those provisions satisfied the obligations which a State Party was expected to fulfil under the terms of the Convention.

/...

(Mr. Haastrup)

The Government of Pakistan had made no attempt to hide the fact that certain problems existed in its territory which hinted at racial discrimination. On the contrary, the report showed that the Government of Pakistan was constantly endeavouring to solve those problems. For example, mention was made of a law dealing with the question of the caste system. Moreover, various sections of the Constitution relating to fundamental rights and freedoms, which satisfied the requirements of article 5 of the Convention, were quoted in full. Mention was also made of various measures relating to the mandatory provisions of articles 4, 6 and 7 of the Convention; such measures related to education, minority groups and action taken to safeguard the interests of backward areas. The fact that it had taken those positive measures proved that the Government of Pakistan was fully aware of its responsibilities under the Convention and was taking appropriate action to give full effect to the provisions of that instrument.

He felt that the Government of Pakistan was to be commended for producing a detailed and sincere report.

Mr. ABOUL-NASR associated himself with Mr. Haastrup's view that the Government of Pakistan was to be commended on its second periodic report, which was detailed enough for the Committee to consider it satisfactory. He agreed in particular with Mr. Haastrup's remarks concerning the political view referred to in the introductory paragraphs. The Committee should confine itself to considering the substantive content of the report.

Paragraph 3 of the report referred to diversities of language and custom between various regions in Pakistan and divergence of interest between the different social classes. Such diversities were common to most countries in the world. It was further stated that efforts were being intensified to alleviate those differences and to ensure that they did not lead to inequities.

He had two comments to make, on which he hoped the representative of Pakistan would be able to provide some clarification. In the first place, he understood that a new Constitution had been adopted after the current report had been drafted. He wondered whether there were any changes in the Constitution which related specifically to racial discrimination and whether the guarantees provided for in the earlier Constitution had been maintained.

/...

(Mr. Aboul-Nasr)

Secondly, he noted that the report had been drafted in February 1972, before the Committee had communicated to States Parties its request for information concerning their relations with the racist régimes of southern Africa. Although he was personally aware that the Government of Pakistan had always implemented all the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations relating to the boycott of those régimes, he would be grateful if the representative of Pakistan could confirm that fact.

Mr. SOLER agreed with the two previous speakers that the second periodic report of Pakistan was a satisfactory one. However, he would be grateful for some clarification with regard to paragraph 9. The first provision under the heading "Fundamental rights" stated that "No person shall be deprived of life or liberty save in accordance with law". Later provisions under that heading, however, referred to the rights of citizens. The use of the word "citizen" would be unequivocal in the context of political rights but in the context of freedom of movement the use of that word was ambiguous. In so far as the report referred to freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of trade, business or profession and freedom of speech for citizens, he wondered whether all persons resident in the country were covered by the term "citizen". He asked for clarification on that point.

Mr. SAYEGH noted that the report faithfully followed the guidelines established in document CERD/C/R.12. The Committee should welcome that fact, the more so since many other reports had not followed that practice. Moreover, the fact that legal texts were quoted in full in the report was very helpful to the work of the Committee. He hoped that more States Parties would follow that practice.

On the basis of the information contained in the report, it could be said that the provisions of article 5 and some of the provisions of article 4 of the Convention were covered by existing legislation in Pakistan. He hoped that the Committee would receive additional information relating to measures taken in

/...

(Mr. Sayegh)

accordance with article 4 of the Convention in response to the request to States Parties contained in document CERD/C/R.56.

In paragraph 2 of the report, it was stated that the people of Pakistan were racially homogenous. That point was reiterated in various parts of the report. However, in paragraph 3, mention was made of diversities of language and custom between the various regions. It was difficult to see how those two statements could be reconciled, especially in view of the provisions of article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which appeared to equate race with colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin. All those concepts were used synonymously.

Mr. ORTIZ-MARTIN said that the well-documented report of Pakistan was most satisfactory, in so far as it followed all the guidelines laid down by the Committee and was of a comprehensive nature.

He would like clarification regarding certain aspects of the terminology used in the report. Under the heading "Fundamental rights", mention was made of a number of individual rights and freedoms under the Constitution. In the section relating to freedom of movement, it was stated that any citizen who possessed a passport or a valid travel document was entitled to leave and return to Pakistan. It was further stated that citizenship in Pakistan could be acquired by birth, or by descent or by naturalization. He wondered whether those provisions connoted any difference between nationality and citizenship, which were different concepts. Nationality was a much broader term than citizenship; every national of a country need not be a citizen of that country, and not every citizen was a national. Nationality could be acquired by birth, and that was often used as a criterion for distinguishing it from citizenship. He realized that different States used different terminologies, in accordance with their own legal concepts, but he felt that, in the report of a State Party, legal terminology should be used in such a way as to preclude the possibility of misinterpretation.

The first paragraph of the section relating to freedom of trade, business or profession declared the right of every citizen to enter upon any lawful profession or occupation, and was qualified by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the second paragraph of that section. He wondered whether the provisions in (a), (b) and (c) related to citizens only or to nationals in general.

/...

(Mr. Ortiz-Martin)

On page 5 of the report, under the heading "Opportunities to participate in national life, etc.", it was stated that the people of different areas and classes should be enabled to participate fully in all forms of national activities, including employment in the service of Pakistan. He wondered whether the word "people", as distinct from "citizens", was used intentionally in that case. It would be interesting to know whether the persons to whom the provisions of that section applied were the same as the persons covered by the provision relating to social security, which stated that all citizens should have the opportunity to work and earn an adequate livelihood and also to enjoy rest and leisure.

The same problem arose in respect of the section relating to non-discrimination in respect of access to public places. Again, the provisions of that section covered the citizens of Pakistan. He wondered what was the status of visiting foreigners, resident foreigners, nationals and residents in general, with regard to those provisions. Did the term "citizen" cover all those categories of people, or was it possible that they might be discriminated against with impunity?

With regard to paragraph 12 of the report, which stated that Fundamental Right No. 19 of the Constitution provided for the abolition of untouchability, he wondered whether those persons previously classified as untouchables had been granted the status of citizens.

Mr. MACDONALD said that he found the report of Pakistan a very interesting one, especially in so far as it referred to legal provisions currently in force designed to encourage the harmonious integration of people of different regions and classes and to ensure fair treatment for minorities. The authors of the report had obviously taken pains to make it conform to the Committee's guidelines. The structure of the report clearly showed that efforts were being made to bring the domestic situation in Pakistan into line with the provisions of the Convention.

He had a number of questions to put to the representative of Pakistan. In the first place, he wondered whether the terms of paragraph 11 of the report, stating that since the phenomenon of racial discrimination was not known in Pakistan it had not been found necessary to adopt specific legislative, judicial and administrative measures to eliminate racial discrimination, should be taken to mean that no legislative or other measures had been adopted subsequent to the ratification of

/...

(Mr. Macdonald)

the Convention to give precise effect to article 4 of the Convention. Paragraph 22 of the report referred to Martial Law Regulation No. 77, section 1, which forbade incitement to racial hatred by the press. The terms of that Regulation, however, were narrower in scope than the requirements of article 4 of the Convention. He wondered, therefore, whether there were any specific legal provisions in Pakistan designed to implement article 4 of the Convention, or whether it was felt that the combination of the statutes and regulations referred to in the report met the requirements of article 4 in a general manner.

With respect to the provisions referred to on page 8 of the report, which related to safeguards as to educational institutions in respect of religion, he wondered whether any additional steps had been taken to give effect to Pakistan's obligations under article 7 of the Convention, which called on States Parties to adopt immediate and effective measures, particularly in the fields of teaching, education, culture and information.

He noted that the report referred to a number of excellent provisions designed to give effect to article 5 of the Convention. Under the heading "Freedom of speech", it was stated that every citizen had the right to freedom of speech and expression, subject to any reasonable restrictions imposed by law; one of those restrictions pertained to friendly relations with foreign States. He asked for clarification regarding the scope and status of that restriction.

In addition, he would be grateful if the Committee could be informed of any administrative or other measures - apart from legal provisions - that had been adopted by the Government of Pakistan to prevent racial discrimination. In particular, he would be interested in any information relating to human rights commissions, law reform agencies, provisions for legal aid and so on: in other words, the entire apparatus needed to give effect to the laws of a modern State.

Mr. CALOVSKI said that the present report was a great improvement on previous ones: the Government of Pakistan had made an effort to follow the Committee's guidelines and was clearly anxious to co-operate fully. He welcomed the determination of that Government to give effect to the provisions of the Convention. The legislation guaranteeing the rights and interests of minorities, referred to in paragraph 16 of the report, was of particular interest to the Committee.

/...

(Mr. Calovski)

The report cited several constitutional and legal provisions to demonstrate that article 5 of the Convention had been fully implemented in Pakistan. However, as Mr. Aboul-Nasr had said, it would be useful if additional information could be given on some aspects of those provisions. Specifically, he would welcome a comment on the statement made in paragraph 11, which might be taken to mean either that some provisions of the Constitution were self-executing or that the requirements of the Convention were already met by existing legislation.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could accept the statement in paragraph 2, to the effect that the Islamic tradition precluded any possibility of racial discrimination, as true of the situation in Pakistan. Paragraph 3 recognized the existence of economic and social inequalities but insisted that they were not due to racial discrimination. Thus the measures taken to remove the inequalities could not be considered measures to combat racial discrimination.

The Committee itself had not raised the questions dealt with in paragraph 4; it had never been the Committee's wish that the Government of Pakistan should comment on political issues, for such issues fell outside the Committee's competence.

He welcomed the statement in paragraph 7 concerning the position of the Government of Pakistan on racial discrimination and apartheid.

Paragraph 9 illustrated the way in which fundamental human rights were protected in Pakistan. Such comprehensive information was most welcome, especially since it had been generally lacking in previous reports. The Government of Pakistan had clearly given full effect to article 5 of the Convention. The restrictions on freedom of movement, imposed by law in the public interest, applied to all citizens and did not involve questions of racial discrimination.

Many States Parties had made statements similar to the one contained in paragraph 11, namely, that since racial discrimination did not exist, there was no need to enact specific measures to combat it. He assumed that the paragraph meant that the Government had already enacted laws to give effect to the safeguards provided in the Constitution.

The Committee took note of the statement in paragraph 12 that untouchability had been abolished; it would like to have the text of Fundamental Right No. 19 of the Constitution.

/...

(The Chairman)

All States Parties which had minority groups among their populations should note the establishment in Pakistan of a Ministry of Minorities Affairs, referred to in paragraph 16.

All the measures described in paragraph 17 to safeguard the interests of "backward areas" were timely and would benefit the population of those areas.

Subparagraph 18 (3) was a particularly important safeguard of equality in education, while the newly established National Council for Arts and Culture, referred to in paragraph 20, would do much to develop regional understanding.

It would be helpful if the Government of Pakistan could tell the Committee the results of the implementation of the measures banning incitement of enmity or hatred, which were described in paragraph 22.

The Committee welcomed the assurance in the Pakistan Government's response (CERD/C/R.51) to general recommendation III that Pakistan maintained no diplomatic or commercial relations with the racist régimes of southern Africa.

The second periodic report of Pakistan was satisfactory in both content and form.

Mr. PARTSCH said that he had been impressed by the comprehensiveness of the information provided in the report; he welcomed, in particular, the details given in paragraph 16 of legislation relating to articles 5 and 6 of the Convention.

He had some difficulty with paragraphs 11, 12 and 13: paragraph 11 seemed to be saying that, because of the general safeguards provided in the Constitution, there was no need for specific legislation concerning racial discrimination; but paragraph 13 stated that there were specific laws relating to the incitement of hatred between different classes or groups of persons - a question of racial discrimination as defined in article 1 of the Convention. Paragraph 22 also described measures banning incitement of enmity or hatred. Certainly, the Committee was more interested in information on specific legislation than in general statements such as those made in paragraph 11 and in the introductory paragraphs of the report.

He could quite understand that the Government of Pakistan did not want to enter into a dialogue on the recent tragic events in the India/Pakistan subcontinent.

/...

(Mr. Partsch)

He could not, however, agree with the assertion in paragraph 5 that the issues involved fell outside the Committee's competence. He had studied the White Paper issued by the Pakistan Government in August 1971 and had concluded that certain ethnic questions were involved in those issues. Of course he accepted the Pakistan Government's explanation that it did not wish to discuss those issues because they were bound up with so many economic and political matters quite unconnected with racial discrimination or self-determination; any ethnic discrimination had certainly been a less important element in the affair. However, the point must be made that economic and political issues could involve racial discrimination and could fall within the Committee's competence.

Mr. DAYAL agreed that the present report was a great improvement on previous ones and that the Government of Pakistan had made a commendable effort to follow the Committee's guidelines.

Like Mr. Aboul-Nasr, he had been struck by the apparent contradiction between the statement in paragraph 2 that the people of Pakistan were racially homogenous and the admission in paragraphs 16 and 17 that there were minorities in Pakistan. Certainly there were "backward areas" in the country, and the Government of Pakistan was to be commended for its efforts to integrate those areas into the national life.

Like some other members of the Committee, he could not fully understand the import of paragraphs 11, 12 and 13. The Committee had recently decided that if States Parties considered it unnecessary to enact specific legislation in accordance with article 4 (a) and (b) of the Convention, they should explain to the Committee how their existing legislation gave effect to that article. He hoped that the next report of Pakistan would deal with the matter.

He shared Mr. Macdonald's interest in Martial Law Regulation No. 77, section 1. He would like to know to what extent the Regulation superseded the relevant provisions of the Constitution or whether it should be taken together with those provisions. It would be useful to know whether the new Constitution of Pakistan would embody the constitutional provisions cited in the report.

/...

(Mr. Dayal)

He had not wanted to refer to the recent tragic events in the subcontinent and he certainly had no wish to initiate a political controversy. However, since the matter had been raised in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report, the Committee should avoid giving the impression that in commending the report as a whole it also endorsed the statements made in those paragraphs. There were certainly no political implications in the Committee's request to the Government of Pakistan to submit information on the manner in which it was carrying out its obligations under article 5 of the Convention. The Government of Pakistan had given no reasons for declaring such matters outside the Committee's competence. The Committee was a body of experts but not a body of expert ostriches: it was entitled to seek information if only to determine whether certain matters fell within its competence. The Government of Pakistan was perhaps correct in stating that the situation had arisen because of the "inability of the previous Government and the East Pakistan leadership" to resolve political and economic grievances. However, it was for the Committee to decide whether the situation contained elements of racial discrimination. Subsequent events in the subcontinent were a matter of history. It might be wondered whether the conflict had been caused by an inability to resolve grievances or by an attempt to resolve them by military means. He regretted that he had had to comment on such matters at a time when the process of healing and reconciliation was progressing so well. He was sure that everyone concerned hoped for a better future for the entire subcontinent.

He would like to draw attention to one technical point: the Chittagong Hill Tracts were situated in an area no longer within the jurisdiction of the Pakistan Government, i.e., in the territory of the Republic of Bangladesh. The report was dated February 1972, and the Republic of Bangladesh had come into existence in March 1971.

Mr. DEHLAVI said that he found himself in something of a quandary since he was a national of Pakistan and Ambassador of Pakistan to Moscow. At the same time, he was expected to examine the report of his country in his capacity as an independent expert and a member of the Committee. In view of the consensus

/...

(Mr. Dehlavi)

that the information contained in the report was satisfactory, he would have preferred not to speak at all and to leave the representative of his country to answer the various queries or refer them to his Government. However, certain comments had been made to which he felt compelled to reply.

Mr. Dayal, whose restrained tone he had appreciated, had made two points which seemed irreconcilable. On the one hand, he had found regrettable the reference in the report to the Chittagong Hill Tracts which, as he had put it, were now within the competence of a new State. On the other hand, he had taken exception to the reference to certain events which he had said were a matter of history.

He agreed with the view that the use of the term "citizen" was perhaps a little arbitrary and that the term "nationals" might have been more appropriate. He had also noted the remark regarding the use of the word "illegal" at the end of paragraph 11.

While Mr. Haastrup's remarks had, in the main, been extremely gratifying, he had referred to problems that hinted at racial discrimination which seemed to be reflected in the report. He (Mr. Dehlavi) would like categorically to assert that the concept of racial discrimination was foreign to Pakistan's philosophy and religion. Pakistan had from the beginning openly and unreservedly condemned racial discrimination in any form and no hint of the evil could be found within its territory. It was true that reference was made in the report to the need for measures to prevent inequities in the economic, social and political fields, but that was one of the problems which almost all developing countries encountered. The measures in question had been incorporated in the new Constitution, a copy of which would no doubt soon be supplied by the Permanent Mission.

Certain comments had been made regarding the question of freedom of movement. Subject to certain restrictions for security purposes, every Pakistan national was entitled to a passport and no restrictions, other than the normal ones, were imposed on foreigners. Moreover, some of the provisions in the Constitution regarding an opportunity to gain a livelihood covered foreigners.

/...

(Mr. Dehlavi)

He believed not only that the report complied with the guidelines laid down by the Committee but also that it showed that racial discrimination was non-existent in Pakistan. Furthermore, the Government of Pakistan had co-operated in a very forthright manner with the Committee and had shown its willingness to ensure that the objectives of the Convention would be attained.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK associated himself with those speakers who had judged the report satisfactory on account of the substantive information contained on the legislative, judicial and other measures designed to protect the citizens of Pakistan against racial discrimination in any form. The information submitted complied with the guidelines issued by the Committee and was sufficiently detailed and thorough. However, his approval of the report in no way signified that he agreed with the appraisal of the recent events on the sub-continent referred to in paragraph 4.

Mr. HAASTRUP said that he wished to clear up any misunderstanding which might have arisen regarding his earlier statement. His allusion to possible hints of racial discrimination had been prompted by the statement in paragraph 3 to the effect that conscious attempts had been made to ensure that diversities of language and custom did not lead to inequities. Indeed, in paragraph 4 the report seemed to acknowledge that the efforts being made had not altogether succeeded in eliminating economic, social and political inequities.

Mr. DAYAL said that he wished to reply to Mr. Dehlavi's query regarding the Chittagong Hill Tracts. He had merely expressed the hope in his earlier statement that no reference would be made in future reports submitted by the Government to areas outside its jurisdiction.

Mrs. OWUSU-ADDO said that the document under consideration was one of the most complete and satisfactory reports received by the Committee. The information contained was in keeping with the guidelines set. Moreover, it clearly showed that practical and positive steps had been taken to prevent racial discrimination in Pakistan. Like several other members, she was of the opinion that the contents of paragraphs 4 and 5 were of a political nature and should therefore not be

/...

(Mrs. Owusu-Addo)

discussed by the Committee. Since the texts of the laws in Pakistan referred to in paragraph 13 would be of interest to the Committee, she hoped that they would be provided in subsequent reports.

Mr. DEHLAVI explained that he had not addressed any query to Mr. Dayal; he had made a statement of fact. One simply could not refer to a part of the world in one breath and in the next express disinclination to discuss the events connected with it.

Mr. ANCEL said that the report was very complete and entirely satisfactory in every way. He wished only to add that a discussion of the contents of paragraphs 4 and 5 was unquestionably outside the competence of the Committee.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that his Government attached the greatest importance to the implementation of the provisions of the Convention. He personally would communicate to it the points made in the discussion so that they might be reflected in future reports.

He welcomed Mr. Aboul-Nasr's interest in the new Pakistan Constitution which had been adopted by the National Assembly on 15 April 1973 and had included or updated some of the legal provisions contained in the report.

As the Chairman had pointed out, information regarding Pakistan's attitude towards the racist Governments of southern Africa was to be found in document CERD/C/R.51, which stated that the Government was determined to have nothing to do with those régimes and that it categorically condemned apartheid and racial discrimination in all its forms. Moreover, the new Constitution provided for support by Pakistan to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in combating racial discrimination and apartheid.

The difference between a citizen and a national was a technical point which he would refer to the authorities in his country. The answer probably lay in the fact that the drafters of the legislative provisions in question had followed past practice in Pakistan. However, the introductory part of the new Constitution was more comprehensive in its scope and stated:

/...

(Mr. Akram)

"3. The State shall ensure the elimination of all forms of exploitation and the gradual fulfilment of the fundamental principle, from each according to his ability, to each according to his work.

"4. (1) To enjoy the protection of law and to be treated in accordance with law is the inalienable right of every citizen, wherever he may be, and of every other person for the time being in Pakistan."

Every provision concerning fundamental rights in the new Constitution should be interpreted in the light of those introductory paragraphs, unless it was specifically provided otherwise.

Mr. Sayegh had detected an apparent contradiction between the statement that the people were racially homogeneous and the assertion that diversities of language and custom existed between various regions. He believed the difficulty was semantic and that his Government, in using the word "homogeneous", had meant to imply that there were no barriers to upward or lateral social mobility or to geographic movement, just as there was no friction between peoples of different regions.

Reference to the provision of the Constitution regarding the abolition of untouchability had been made in a previous report. However, the provision had been omitted from the new Constitution since it was felt that the concept of untouchability had been successfully eradicated in the period since independence. No distinctions were made between people from that former category and other nationals of Pakistan.

A slight misunderstanding had arisen concerning the purport of paragraph 11. Since racial discrimination, whether by persons or institutions, was unknown in Pakistan it was felt that there was no need for legislative or other measures to eliminate the evil. However, as the report indicated, there were a number of legislative provisions which penalized acts of racial discrimination.

Mr. Macdonald had raised the question of education and cultural measures under article 7 of the Convention. That subject was fairly amply dealt with in article 22 of the new Constitution, which stated:

(Mr. Akram)

"(1) No person attending any educational institution shall be required to receive religious instruction, or take part in any religious ceremony, or attend religious worship, if such instruction, ceremony or worship relates to a religion other than his own.

"(2) In respect of any religious institution, there shall be no discrimination against any community in the granting of exemption or concessions in relation to taxation.

"(3) Subject to law -

(a) No religious community or denomination shall be prevented from providing religious instruction for pupils of that community or denomination in any educational institution maintained wholly by that community or denomination;

and

(b) No citizen shall be denied admission to any educational institution receiving aid from public revenues on the ground only of race, religion, caste or place of birth."

He believed that the text of that article answered to some extent Mr. Macdonald's point regarding discrimination in the field of education. During the recent nationalization of the education sector, his Government had overcome the difficulties posed by private institutions maintained by religious orders by granting them special concessions. Henceforth, entry to all educational institutions not only would be free from religious considerations but would be subject to the sole criterion of merit.

Mr. Macdonald had also queried the constraint imposed on freedom of speech by the proviso regarding friendly relations with foreign States. That proviso was included in the Constitution of many countries and in Pakistan was interpreted very flexibly by the Government.

With regard to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report, he assured Mr. Partsch that the Government had no intention whatever of withholding from the Committee's consideration any matter which was its concern and would gladly bring any cases of racial discrimination to the Committee's attention. He believed, however, that his Government was entitled to state its view that the Committee should

/...

(Mr. Akram)

exercise caution in respect of the turbulent events on the subcontinent referred to in those paragraphs. As his Government saw it, the process of reconciliation and healing had been initiated when the political leader of the former eastern province had been released from imprisonment by the President of Pakistan. He would hesitate before entering into any acrimonious discussion, since that would only retard the healing process, which he was confident would bear fruitful results over the next few months.

The CHAIRMAN said he took it to be the consensus of the Committee that the report of Pakistan was satisfactory. He expressed the hope, on the Committee's behalf, that information on the various points raised in the discussion would be included in future reports.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

/...