

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 334TH MEETING

held on Friday, 8 April 1977, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. KAPTEYN

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (agenda item 3) (continued):

(1) THIRD PERIODIC REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES DUE IN 1977 (continued)

Netherlands (CERD/C/9) (concluded)

1. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that he would try to answer the questions put by the Committee by subject-matter rather than in the order in which they had been asked. Mr. Dayal had raised some questions about the proposed amendments to the Constitution. He wished to explain that there had not yet been time to consider the amendments proposed in the bill which had recently been introduced in Parliament. As the members of the Committee were aware, the procedure for amending a Constitution was cumbersome and lengthy; also, the present Parliament was to be dissolved and new elections would have to take place before the proposals could be voted upon. The proposal to give non-nationals the right to vote and to stand for election at the municipal level would involve, apart from a constitutional provision, the enactment of more detailed national legislation dealing with the conditions in which such rights might be exercised. He wished to assure Mr. Blishchenko that non-nationals would certainly be allowed to form political parties which might participate in municipal elections. No doubt many different languages would have to be used when non-nationals participated in elections; however, the public authorities in the Netherlands already disseminated information in several languages, including Arabic and the languages used by migrant workers. Mr. Blishchenko had inquired whether problems of languages arose only in connexion with access to medical services; he wished to inform him that the bureaux mentioned in annex II of the third periodic report of the Netherlands (CERD/C/9) were of an experimental nature and would be able, at a future date, to provide interpretation services in sectors other than health, when a better idea of the needs and requirements of other sectors had been obtained.

2. With regard to the issue of certificates of non-Jewish origin, the countries concerned had not, at the time in question, been parties to the Convention; he hoped that the members of the Committee would understand his wish to limit his remarks to what he had already stated. The population registers were in no way registers of race; persons were asked to answer certain questions - name, address, religion, etc. - on a voluntary basis. No questions were put about race. In reply to the question raised by Mr. Aboul-Nasr, a black Catholic might register as a Catholic but never as a black.

3. Some questions had been raised about sentences passed by the courts in the Netherlands. In connexion with the case of the bar-owner who had been prosecuted for racial discrimination under section 429 (d) of the Criminal Code, there had been two points at issue; the maintenance of order and the question of discrimination. The Court had found that the bar-owner had maintained order in a non-discriminatory way, as had been proved by the fact that white persons had not been allowed to enter the bar because it was overcrowded.

4. In connexion with the Netherlands People's Union, the members of the Committee might be interested to learn that, following the reply by the Minister of Justice to Mr. Molleman, Member of Parliament, which was reproduced in annex I of the report, six persons had been sentenced to two weeks' imprisonment and a leader of the Union would be imprisoned for four weeks. The sentences had been widely reported in all Netherlands newspapers.
5. Mr. Brin Martinez had inquired whether the Moluccans were entitled to Netherlands citizenship. The attitude of the Netherlands authorities had originally been based on the assumption that the Moluccans would stay only temporarily in the Netherlands, but it had become obvious that most Moluccans would have to settle permanently. However, since they had not been able to retain their previous nationality and did not wish, for political reasons, to become Dutch citizens - although they could have done so if they had wished - a special status was required for them.
6. In conclusion, some questions had been asked about the form and structure of the third periodic report. The Netherlands authorities had tried to follow the guidelines laid down by the Committee, and his delegation had noted the appeal by Mr. Sayegh on the question of reporting on the implementation of article 7 of the Convention. He would transmit the views expressed by the Committee to his Government, with a view to improving his country's report in that respect.
7. Mr. SAYEGH said that he had understood the representative of the Netherlands to say that the countries referred to on page 2 of the report had not, at the time, been parties to the Convention. Did that mean that they had subsequently become parties? Or had they abandoned the practice referred to on page 2 of the report? It would be helpful if the Committee could have some further clarification on that point. Secondly, if a Netherlands citizen had the intention of emigrating to a country where it was advantageous to be a Jew, and asked for a certificate stating that he was a Jew, would such a certificate be withheld or given?
8. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands Government had not taken any steps to ascertain whether or not the countries referred to on page 2 of the report had become parties to the Convention. That was clearly outside the scope of the obligation under which it reported. Secondly, a case such as that described by Mr. Sayegh had never arisen in the Netherlands and it was difficult to speak in general terms; however, he saw no reason why there should be an exception to the requirements mentioned by the Minister of Justice.
9. The CHAIRMAN expressed the gratitude and appreciation of the Committee for the spirit of co-operation shown by the Netherlands Government and hoped that the representative of the Netherlands would convey its thanks to his Government.
10. Mr. Walkate withdrew.

(i) FOURTH PERIODIC REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES DUE IN 1976 (concluded)

Panama (CERD/C/8) (concluded)\*/

11. Mr. VALENCIA RODRIGUEZ said that a drafting group had prepared a draft decision for the consideration of the Committee. The drafting group felt that the document was objective and reflected the views of the Committee, and it hoped that the Committee would be able to accept it unanimously. The text of the draft decision read as follows:

"The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination,

"Having examined the fourth periodic report of the Government of Panama under article 9 of the Convention,

"Taking note of the information contained therein on the situation obtaining in that part of the sovereign territory of the Republic of Panama known as the 'Panama Canal Zone' in so far as it relates to the problem of racial discrimination,

"1. Concerned at the fact that the Government of the Republic of Panama is unable, for reasons beyond its control and contrary to its own determination, to fulfil the responsibilities undertaken by it as a State Party to the Convention, in a part of its national territory,

"2. Expresses the hope that the question will be resolved at an early date so that throughout the territory of the Republic of Panama, the laws and measures adopted by its Government in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Convention may be equally applied,

"3. Invites the Government of the Republic of Panama to keep the Committee informed of any developments in the matter,

"4. Draws the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations to the situation, and asks it to ensure that no practices of racial discrimination in the 'Panama Canal Zone' are permitted."

12. Mr. NETTEL thanked the members of the group for their second draft which, in his view, was a considerable improvement on the first one. After the clarifications he had received from the Chairman, he now accepted the fact that it was within the competence of the Committee to adopt such a draft decision, and he was in agreement with the general tenor of the text which had just been read out. However, two passages caused him some difficulties. Operative paragraph 1 expressed concern at the fact that the Government of the Republic of Panama was unable, "for reasons beyond its control and contrary to its own determination", to fulfil its responsibilities. That statement appeared to show a certain bias, in that it expressed a judgment on a bilateral dispute concerning the interpretation of a treaty. He would prefer the phrase "for reasons beyond its control and" to be deleted. Secondly, he wondered whether the Committee should not refer the situation in the Panama Canal Zone to the competent bodies of the United Nations rather than to the General Assembly, since the General Assembly might not be the competent body to deal with the situation.

---

\*/ Resumed from the 332nd meeting.

13. Mr. BLISHCHENKO thought that the first draft had been better than the present one, which did not reflect the concern shown at least by some members of the Committee, who considered that racism and racial discrimination were prevalent in the Panama Canal Zone and that the Government of the Republic of Panama was unable to eliminate racial discrimination throughout its national territory. He was therefore not satisfied with the present text. On the other hand, since he appreciated that the drafting Committee's main objective had been to work out a minimum text which could be accepted by consensus, he was willing to go along with it.

14. Mr. SAYEGH said that the references by preceding speakers to a "first draft" were extremely misleading, since the summary records of the Committee's meetings showed that no first text had been put before the Committee formally, although there had in fact been an earlier draft, which had not been submitted to the Committee. With regard to the expression "for reasons beyond its control", he did not think that the Committee would be taking sides in the controversy if it recorded what no party to the conflict disputed - namely, that the situation in the so-called Panama Canal Zone was not under the control of the Government of Panama. Neither the other side, nor the Government of Panama, nor anyone else doubted that the Government of Panama was unable to control effectively the conditions in the Panama Canal Zone; why, therefore, should the Committee be hesitant about retaining those words, since they in no way indicated a substantive judgment on the political aspects of the problem? He considered that the Committee must ask the General Assembly to ensure that no practices of racial discrimination in the Panama Canal Zone were permitted, because it was the only organ to which the Committee could address itself. If the General Assembly decided to refer the matter to another body, it could do so, but it was not for the Committee to indicate to which body of the United Nations the General Assembly should address its request. Finally, it had occurred to him that the draft decision should contain a first preambular paragraph reading "Recalling its decision 3 (IV)", in conformity with the Committee's usual practice.

15. The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Sayegh for his proposal concerning the first preambular paragraph of the draft decision and noted that the members of the Committee appeared to be in favour of it.

16. Mr. BRIN MARTINEZ said that the issues raised by Mr. Nettel compelled him to stress how important it was that the members of the Committee should realize the seriousness of the situation in the Panama Canal Zone. He recalled the circumstances in which the Treaty of 1903 had been concluded, and described the impact of the Treaty on Panama itself. He stressed that Panama's efforts to regain and exercise its sovereignty over the territory of the Panama Canal Zone had brought it into conflict with the most powerful nation in the world. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was the competent United Nations body to deal with questions of racial discrimination and must, therefore, take action on the situation in the Panama Canal Zone.

17. Mr. ABOUL-NASR appealed to the Committee not to re-open the debate on an issue which it had discussed exhaustively time and again. He suggested that unless any member had major difficulties with the text, the Committee should adopt it forthwith by consensus.

18. The CHAIRMAN associated himself with the appeal by Mr. Aboul-Nasr.

19. Mr. INGLES said that he could, in general, agree with the draft decision, which substantially corresponded to the guidelines he had given in a previous statement. However, he considered that in operative paragraph 2 the words "the question" were unclear; it would be more consistent to say "the situation", or "the problem". Alternatively, if it were desired to retain the words "the question", it might be better to say, "the question which gave rise to the foregoing situation". While he agreed that the Committee should address itself to the General Assembly, he did not consider that the request contained in the last part of operative paragraph 4 was appropriate under article 9 of the Convention. The Committee appeared to him to be making a judgment, something which it could do only in the special circumstances described in article 11 of the Convention. He considered that the Committee could do no more than draw the attention of the General Assembly to the situation in the Panama Canal Zone, and that the rest of operative paragraph 4 should be deleted.

20. Mr. NETTEL thanked Mr. Sayegh for his clarifications and said that he would not object to the reference to the General Assembly in operative paragraph 4. However, he was not sure that he agreed with Mr. Sayegh's arguments concerning operative paragraph 1, because the control referred to was not control over the territory of the Panama Canal Zone but control over the exercise of certain legal rights. He did not share Mr. Brin Martinez's expertise but he had tried to be objective, and he did not feel competent to pass judgment on the interpretation and application of a bilateral treaty which was considered by one of the parties, at least, to be in force. He would not stand in the way of consensus but would like his position to be reflected in the Committee's records.

21. Mr. DAYAL, speaking as a member of the drafting group, said that he would have no objection to the word "question" in operative paragraph 2, and the word "matter" in operative paragraph 3, being replaced by the word "situation".

22. Referring to the second preambular paragraph, he said that the word "problem" should be retained, since it could not be denied that racial discrimination was a problem.

23. The request in operative paragraph 4 that the General Assembly should ensure that no practices of racial discrimination in the Panama Canal Zone were permitted was in line with the Committee's function of making suggestions and general recommendations to the General Assembly in accordance with article 9 of the Convention.

24. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft decision by consensus, with the following amendments: an introductory preambular paragraph would be added, reading: "Recalling its decision 3 (IV)"; and the words "question" in operative paragraph 2 and "matter" in operative paragraph 3 would be replaced by the word "situation". The decision would be adopted on the understanding that the comments and reservations of members would be reflected in the summary record.

25. Mr. HOUSHMAND (Secretary of the Committee) suggested that the date, 26 August 1971, should be inserted after the reference to Committee decision 3 (IV) in the new preambular paragraph.

26. It was so agreed.

27. Mrs. WARZAZI suggested that the word "Again" should be inserted before the words "Draws the attention" at the beginning of operative paragraph 4.
28. It was so agreed.
29. In reply to a question by Mr. INGLES, Mr. SAYEGH said that the second part of operative paragraph 4 did not prejudge the situation as Mr. Ingles had supposed. The initial proposal made in the drafting group had been that the phrase should read: "and asks it to ensure that practices of racial discrimination in the Panama Canal Zone are terminated". A member of the drafting group had objected that that wording would prejudge the issue since it would imply that such practices were in existence. The phrase had therefore been replaced by the present formulation which it was felt would avoid prejudgment of any kind. He hoped that that explanation would make it possible for Mr. Ingles not to dissociate himself from the consensus.
30. The CHAIRMAN said that he had originally had the same reaction as Mr. Ingles, but had afterwards interpreted the phrase in the same manner as Mr. Sayegh, and was therefore prepared to accept it.
31. Mr. INGLES said that, if the General Assembly were in a position to ensure that no practices of racial discrimination in the Panama Canal Zone or elsewhere were permitted, there would scarcely be any need for a convention on the subject. It was the General Assembly itself that had considered the Convention necessary. In his view, the second phrase of operative paragraph 4 should be deleted, leaving the General Assembly to take whatever action it considered appropriate. He would, however, be prepared to join in the consensus, provided that his reservation was recorded in the summary record.
32. Mr. BLISHCHENKO said that he could not accept the interpretation given by Mr. Sayegh. Unless the Committee drew the attention of the General Assembly to practices of racial discrimination of which it was aware, the Convention would be meaningless. The Committee was obliged to do so by virtue of its relationship with the General Assembly, and of the requirements of article 9 of the Convention. All members of the Committee had admitted that racial discrimination was practised by the United States of America in the Panama Canal Zone, which was part of the territory of the Republic of Panama.
33. The CHAIRMAN said that individual members of the Committee could speak only for themselves. They could not speak for the Chairman or other members.
34. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that everyone was entitled to interpret the text in his own way, but no one could impose his own interpretation on others. Any member with comments or reservations to make could have them reflected in the summary record of the meeting.
35. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft decision by consensus on the understanding that members' comments and reservations would be recorded as usual.
36. It was so agreed.
37. The draft decision, as amended, was adopted.

38. Mr. BAHNEV, explaining his attitude to operative paragraph 4 of the decision, said that it was entirely within the Committee's competence to request the General Assembly to take action in accordance with the statements made by Committee members when discussing the report of the Government of Panama. He had definite views on the manner in which the General Assembly could help to eliminate practices of racial discrimination in the Panama Canal Zone, which the report of the Government of Panama had shown to exist. He interpreted the second phrase of operative paragraph 4 of the decision in the light of those views.

39. Mr. SAYEGH, recalling the statement he had made at the 331st meeting, said that the decision which the Committee had just taken went less far than he would have liked. He had only accepted the present wording in the interest of consensus. According to his interpretation, the last phrase neither included a suggestion that racial discrimination was being practised nor prejudged the issue in the other sense.

40. Speaking as Rapporteur, he said that any reservations made by Committee members would appear in the summary records, but such reservations could be reflected in the annual report only in general terms, since the names of members were not included in the relevant chapter of the report.

41. Mr. PARTSCH said that he had been able to join in the consensus decision after hearing Mr. Sayegh's interpretation to the effect that there was no implication in operative paragraph 4 that racial discrimination existed in the Panama Canal Zone. He nevertheless considered the last phrase to be somewhat illogical.

(1) THIRD PERIODIC REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES DUE IN 1977 (concluded)

Denmark (CERD/C/R.98/Add.3)

42. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs. Dahlerup (Denmark) took a place at the Committee table.

43. Mrs. DAHLERUP (Denmark) said that she appreciated the opportunity of being present during the Committee's consideration of the third periodic report of Denmark (CERD/C/R.98/Add.3), which was self-explanatory and which should be read as a continuation of and supplement to the first and second periodic reports. The report, which consisted mainly of replies to questions raised by the Committee during its consideration of the second periodic report, was in four parts, dealing respectively with the Ombudsman, violations of section 78, subsection (2), of the Constitution, violations of the Racial Discrimination Act and local autonomy for Greenland. She would follow the Committee's discussion carefully and would be pleased to reply as far as possible to any questions raised. Any points she was unable to answer would be dealt with in her Government's next periodic report.

44. Mr. VALENCIA RODRIGUEZ recalled that, when discussing the first and second periodic reports of Denmark, the Committee had shown its keen interest in the useful information supplied and in the many steps taken by Denmark to comply with the Convention. He had noted that no new legislation on racial discrimination had been enacted in Denmark since the second report had been submitted, and that the present report was a continuation of and supplement to the first and second reports.

45. He commended the Government of Denmark for having provided information in response to the questions raised by the Committee, and he welcomed in particular the information concerning the function of the Ombudsman to receive complaints of racial discrimination by public authorities.

46. He expressed appreciation for the information given in section II of the third periodic report concerning section 78, subsection (2), of the Constitution of Denmark, on which the representative of Denmark had given preliminary information during the Committee's consideration of the second periodic report. His interpretation of that provision in the Constitution was that the courts had discretionary powers to determine whether the activities of an association were in contravention of the relevant provisions of the Constitution or other laws and, if so, to declare that the association should be dissolved. He would be glad to know whether his interpretation was correct.

47. The arrangement under section 931 of the Administration of Justice Act whereby cases of violation of the Racial Discrimination Act were dealt with by the police, and decisions taken on them at the administrative level would be subject to admission of guilt, would have the advantage of speed. He had also noted the provisions of section 937 of the same Act.

48. With regard to the information on liability to punishment for violation of the Racial Discrimination Act, he would be glad to know at what stage the prohibition of the actual existence of a company or similar body took place, so that the Committee could determine to what extent the relevant part of the law, and particularly article 132 (a) of the Danish Penal Code, was in line with article 4 (b) of the Convention.

49. Referring to the statement that it was a punishable offence to take part in the continued activities of an association after it had been prohibited provisionally by the Government or dissolved by judgment, or to join such an association after it had been prohibited or dissolved, he asked whether penal proceedings could be instituted against those administering the association. He would also be interested to know what form the punishment for such an offence would take: imprisonment, or merely a fine. What would be the penalty for members of an association who had committed an illegal act before the association had been prohibited or dissolved?

50. He had taken note of all the information given in the report and was pleased to observe that the Danish Government was prepared to give full effect to its legislation on racial discrimination. He thanked the Government of Denmark for the information it had provided with respect to Greenland.

51. None of the three reports received from Denmark contained sufficient information with respect to that country's relations with the racist régimes in southern Africa or to Denmark's fulfilment of its obligations under article 7 of the Convention. He hoped that additional information on those two points would be given by the representative of Denmark or included in the next periodic report.

52. Mr. NETTEL commended the Government of Denmark on its excellent report.

53. The Danish law cited in relation to article 4 (b) of the Convention referred specifically to the use of violence or instigation to violence, whereas article 4 (b) of the Convention made no such reference but simply referred to

organizations, and organized and other propaganda activities, which promoted and incited racial discrimination. The methods used to promote or incite racial discrimination were usually far more subtle than the use of violence.

54. Mr. SAYEGH said that the informative report of Denmark responded to the Committee's observations, comments and questions. The only reference made by Denmark to article 7 of the Convention, however, was that contained in the last paragraph of its first periodic report (CERD/C/R.50/Add.3) to the effect that no need had been seen for special measures to give effect to the provisions of article 7, since it was natural in all sectors of Danish education to provide teaching in human rights, including the prohibition against racial discrimination. At its earlier sessions, the Committee had observed that that information was somewhat sketchy, and some members had asked for further information, which had unfortunately not been included in the third report. While the statement he had cited could satisfy the Committee as far as the situation itself was concerned, adequate reporting of the steps taken to comply with the provisions of article 7 of the Convention was also necessary if the requirements of article 9 were to be fulfilled. Such reporting was not a mere formality. It would be helpful not only to the Committee but also to other States Parties to the Convention which might be uncertain of the manner in which they should apply article 7. He hoped the Government of Denmark would include some detailed information on its application of article 7 of the Convention in its next report. The information so far received was confined to a description of what was being done in the field of education, whereas article 7 referred to measures in a number of fields. Steps had probably been taken also in the fields of information and culture, for example. If so, it would be useful to know of them; if not, a fuller implementation of article 7 might be required.

55. Mr. BLISHCHENKO said that the first three periodic reports received from Denmark showed that its Government had resolved to comply with its obligations under the Convention and to co-operate with the Committee. The third periodic report represented a serious effort to reply to the questions raised by the Committee during its consideration of the second periodic report.

56. He welcomed the information provided in the part of section I entitled "The Ombudsman and racial discrimination". It was important for that official to be empowered by law to take appropriate measures with respect to cases of racial discrimination in any administrative sector.

57. He asked whether the Convention was to become a part of Danish law or whether the only legislation was to be the Racial Discrimination Act, which appeared to cover only article 4 (b), to some extent article 6 and possibly the condemnation of racial discrimination in article 3, and not the Convention as a whole. Unlike Mr. Nettel, he interpreted the Racial Discrimination Act as fully covering article 4 (b).

58. He asked what was the position of the Danish Government with regard to apartheid, and whether the Government considered that the provisions of article 3 of the Convention were met by accession to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. He would also be interested to know what steps Denmark had taken to break off relations with the racist régimes in southern Africa with a view to isolating them and bringing their racist practices to an end.

59. He had noted from section IV of the third periodic report that the measures described for implementing article 2, paragraph 2, of the Convention went no further than intentions. He would be glad to know what steps were to be taken to apply that article as a result of the recommendation in the preliminary report of the Committee for Local Autonomy in Greenland mentioned in that section of the periodic report.

60. In conclusion, he thanked the representative of Denmark for her participation in the Committee's work.

61. Mr. DAYAL recalled that, during its examination of the first two periodic reports of Denmark, the Committee had unanimously expressed the view that the Danish Government was endeavouring seriously, sincerely and earnestly to fulfil its responsibilities under the Convention both in the letter and in the spirit. The third periodic report strengthened that opinion.

62. He noted that the Ombudsman could take action, either himself or through the public prosecutor, in cases of racial discrimination, but that his terms of reference were confined to public authorities, complaints against individuals being dealt with by the public prosecutor.

63. Referring to Mr. Nettel's comments, he drew attention to the following statement in the second periodic report of Denmark:

"'Activities which promote and incite racial discrimination' may thus be declared illegal under the provisions of the Penal Code referred to in the comments above re article 4 (a) and under Act No. 289 of 9 June 1971 to which reference was made in the initial report.

"The Convention requires that participation in organizations which promote and incite racial discrimination shall be regarded as an offence punishable by law. Under section 132 a of the Danish Penal Code it is a punishable offence to take a part in the continued activities of an association after it has been prohibited provisionally by the Government or dissolved by judgement or to join such an association after it has been prohibited or dissolved." (CERD/C/R.77/Add.2, p.6.)

64. He maintained his view that the requirements of article 4 (a) and (b) of the Convention were substantially met by the legal provisions obtaining in Denmark.

65. Referring to section 937 (1) of the Administration of Justice Act, quoted in the third periodic report, he observed that it seemed somewhat unusual to ask an accused person whether he had any objection to being let off with a caution or whether he would prefer to be imprisoned. He would welcome an explanation from the Danish representative.

66. He noted with satisfaction that progress continued to be made towards granting the inhabitants of Greenland a greater share in their own administration.

67. Mr. DECHEZELLES said that he would confine his remarks to the question of migrant workers, which had been referred to in the second periodic report submitted by Denmark. It was stated in that report that aliens other than nationals of the other Nordic countries or of Member States of the European Communities were not allowed to take up employment in Denmark unless they held work permits; but presumably, once permits had been issued, migrant workers had the same rights and

privileges as Danish workers. He wished to know how many migrant workers from Nordic States, from Member States of the European Communities and from other States there were in Denmark, and what proportion of the total population they represented. It would also be interesting to know how such workers lived and how their rights to health, social security and vocational training were protected. Further information on those matters, and also on measures taken to help their families adapt to life in Denmark, might be included in the next report submitted by Denmark.

68. Mrs. DAHLERUP (Denmark) said that she would try to reply to some of the questions raised. Although no cases of racial discrimination had come before the Danish Ombudsman, the very fact that his office existed was a guarantee that racial discrimination would not be tolerated. With regard to the implementation of article 7 of the Convention, reference had already been made in the second periodic report to the circular issued by the Ministry of Education in connexion with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Danish teachers considered it their duty to promote understanding, tolerance and friendship; and Government action in that area was therefore not required. She would, however, request her Government to submit further information in its next report concerning the measures it had taken to ensure that radio and television programmes and school textbooks contained no discriminatory material.

69. In Denmark, national law was carefully examined and, when necessary, adapted before international conventions were ratified. The Danish Government considered that its ratification of the Convention was in itself sufficient implementation of article 3, but it had in addition often expressed its condemnation of apartheid and racial segregation through its support of the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies.

70. Further information on Greenland would be submitted in the next report, but she could state that the Committee for Local Autonomy in Greenland had been working hard to find a satisfactory solution to the problem, with the general aim of recommending some kind of home rule similar to that enjoyed by the Faroe Islands.

71. There were still many migrant workers in Denmark, despite increased unemployment in the country. The proportion of migrant workers from other Scandinavian countries was naturally rather high because those workers encountered no language problem. In January 1975, there had been just over 5 million Danish citizens and almost 100,000 non-citizens in Denmark.

72. She would convey to her Government, for further consideration, the requests for information and the questions raised by members of the Committee.

73. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Denmark for her participation in the discussion and asked her to convey to her Government the Committee's appreciation for its efforts to further a constructive dialogue with the Committee.

74. Mrs. Dahlerup withdrew.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

75. The CHAIRMAN noted that two members of the Committee would have to leave at the weekend and two more members on the morning of Friday, 15 April. He therefore suggested that all items on which decisions were required should be considered before other items. He also suggested that consideration of item 6 of the agenda, relating to reservations, declarations and statements of interpretation made by States Parties to the Convention, should be postponed to the sixteenth session, since the time remaining before the end of the present session was so short, and since, at the next session, which would be held in New York, members of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs would be available for consultation.

76. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.