



**Convention on the Elimination
of all Forms of Discrimination
Against Women**

IN LIBRARY

MAY 7 1984

UN/DA COLLECTION

Distr.
GENERAL

CEDAW/C/SR.29

5 April 1984

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: SPANISH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Third session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 27 March 1984, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. IDER

CONTENTS

Adoption of the draft report (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-0750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION
AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW/C/CRP.1) (continued)

Paragraph 112

1. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed the following amendments: in the second sentence, after the word "political", the word "economic" should be added; in the penultimate sentence, the word "sectors" should be replaced by the word "professions"; and that the fifth sentence should be placed after the sixth, to which it related.
2. Paragraph 112, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 113

3. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed the following amendment to the third sentence: after the word "established", the words "various corrective measures, such as" should be inserted. She also proposed that, in the antipenultimate sentence, after the word "leave", the words "and partially paid leave to take care of a child" should be added.
4. Paragraph 113, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 114

5. Paragraph 114 was adopted.

Paragraph 115

6. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that the first sentence should be amended to read "There is no prostitution in the Soviet Union and rape is severely punished".
7. Paragraph 115, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 116

8. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that, in the first sentence, the words "although no women were members of the Politburo" should be deleted, since they did not reflect the actual situation: there had previously been a woman member of the Politburo, although it was true that there were currently no women members of that body. She also proposed that the percentage in the second sentence should be corrected, since the proportion of women in the Presidium constituted 33 per cent and not 37 per cent as stated in the report. She also suggested the addition of the words "at the Party Congress" at the end of the second sentence. Lastly, she proposed deletion of the words "and administrative" near the end of the penultimate sentence, since they referred to officers of the armed forces and there were no women officers in the armed forces.

9. Ms. CARON said that, in her view, the first of those amendments would alter what had been said. As to the other amendments, she believed that they would change the substance of the question, and she therefore could not accept them.
10. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that the purpose of her first amendment was to correct the information contained in the first sentence. Since the sentence was couched in the past tense, it did not reflect reality, since there had in the past been women members of the Politburo.
11. Ms. PEYTCHEVA proposed that the second clause of the first sentence should be amended to read "although no women are members of the Politburo".
12. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD expressed the view that the proposed amendments introduced substantive changes, and that that was not the purpose of the Committee's consideration of the draft report.
13. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, proposed that the tense of the verb in the second clause of the first sentence should be changed in order to reflect more accurately the views expressed.
14. The CHAIRPERSON said she understood that the Committee agreed that it should be stated that there were currently no women members of the Politburo, and suggested that the Rapporteur should be requested to draft wording which better corresponded to the contents of the report agreed upon by the Committee.
15. Ms. CORTES, referring to the use of tenses, said that, when it was a question of a law in force, the present tense should be used, since it alluded to something that existed. The past tense should be used only when it applied to a past occurrence.
16. Ms. CARON, referring to the replacement of "37 per cent" by "33 per cent", said that, in paragraph 13 of summary record CEDAW/C/SR.19, the figure given was 37 per cent. Unless that was a typographical error, it was not possible to change what had been said.
17. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said she did not see why there was a misunderstanding: the official report of the USSR gave the correct figure, which was 33 per cent. If the Secretariat had made an error, it should be corrected so that the documents prepared by the Committee contained correct data.
18. Paragraph 116, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 117

19. Ms. BIRYUKOVA, referring to the third sentence, said that there were no office-worker collectives in the Soviet Union, although there were collectives for engineers, public employees, etc. The words "office-worker" should therefore be deleted.
20. Paragraph 117, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 118

21. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that the second sentence should be amended to read: "The Committee actively co-operated with the Permanent Committees of Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on problems connected with the work and lives of women and the protection of mothers and children, and with women's commissions in the trade unions". In order to correspond with that, in the following sentence the word "Committee" should be made plural. Lastly, the final sentence should be amended to read: "Members of the Permanent Committees were deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Union Republics and also local soviets, and were experts on women's issues".

22. Paragraph 118, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 119

23. Ms. PEYTCHEVA said that, according to the established practice in the United Nations system, if a member of a body expressed the desire for the inclusion of his or her views, reservations or objections in the report of that body, that should be done. Unfortunately, that practice had not been respected in the draft report before the Committee. Ms. Regent-Lechowicz and she herself had both expressed very clear views, which should be included in the report. Consequently, in paragraph 119 the first sentence should end with the word "reply", and a new sentence should be added after it, reading "Some experts stated that the USSR fully implemented the provisions of the Convention and that the Soviet women played a very important role in the life of their people".

24. Ms. REGENT-LECHOWICZ supported the amendment proposed by Ms. Peytcheva.

25. Ms. CARON said that she was in agreement with what had been proposed except for the words "some experts"; since only two people were involved, those words should be replaced "a number of experts", "a few experts" or "two experts". Moreover, the remainder of paragraph 119 should be maintained as proposed.

26. Ms. PATIÑO drew attention to paragraph 3 of chapter V ("Suggestions and recommendations based on the examination of reports"), which stated that some experts had recommended that the attention of States parties should be drawn to the desirability of applying the positive experiences referred to specifically in the reports of the German Democratic Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Cuba in order to make further progress in eliminating discrimination against women, not only de jure but also de facto. That wording met the concerns expressed by Ms. Peytcheva and Ms. Regent-Lechowicz and should perhaps be transferred to the part of the report which dealt with the countries mentioned.

27. Ms. REGENT-LECHOWICZ said that the words "a number of experts" would appear to meet the objections of Ms. Caron.

28. Mr. NORDENFELT said it should be made absolutely clear that it was not the opinion of the Committee as a whole but the opinion of two of its members which was being reflected.

29. Ms. REGENT-LECHOWICZ said that it was not United Nations practice to specify the number of persons who had expressed an opinion. The words that should be used were "the majority of members" or "some members" or "the Committee". Otherwise, it would be the only occasion on which a specific number of members was referred to.

30. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD said that, on the contrary, it would not be the only occasion on which the number of persons expressing an opinion was stated. Paragraph 126 of the draft report began "Two members of the Committee remarked that ...".

31. The CHAIRPERSON said that it was United Nations practice to refer to "a number of experts", thereby making it quite clear that it was not the opinion of the entire Committee.

32. Ms. MUKAYIRANGA supported the comments of Ms. Caron and Mr. Nordenfelt. If the remarks were made not by the Committee as a whole but by the experts from Poland and Bulgaria alone, the report should record that fact.

33. Mr. NORDENFELT said that in the current instance it was appropriate, in his opinion, to refer to two experts, since that number was a small fraction of the membership of 21 persons. Failing a mention of the exact number, the words "a few" should be used.

34. Ms. BIRYUKOVA expressed the view that the Committee should observe the traditional practice of United Nations bodies. She proposed that, if the number of experts was stated in the paragraph in question, the Committee should review the entire report and give exact numbers in all the paragraphs.

35. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, believed that the Committee should use the words "a few", as suggested by Mr. Nordenfelt; that would reflect the situation accurately.

36. Ms. PEYTCHEVA said that she could accept the Rapporteur's suggestion. Perhaps the dispute had arisen because the Russian version of paragraph 34 of the summary record of the 19th meeting employed the equivalent of the word "some" instead of the equivalent of the words "a number of". The latter would have been more accurate in the Russian version.

37. Mr. NORDENFELT said that he failed to understand why some members were against specifying exact numbers when it came to reflecting the opinion of one or two experts. That was an acceptable and common practice in drafting reports, as was demonstrated by paragraphs 126 and 129 of the very report under consideration. In the paragraph in question it was necessary to reflect, in all the languages, the fact that few experts had expressed that opinion.

38. Ms. BIRYUKOVA supported the Rapporteur's suggestion. In her opinion, it would not be appropriate to refer to paragraphs which the Committee had not yet considered. The Committee would come to them in due course.

39. The CHAIRPERSON said that, if there was no objection, she would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraph 119 with the final change suggested by the Rapporteur.

40. Paragraph 119, as amended, was adopted.

Report of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (paras. 120-148)

41. Ms. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ proposed that the paragraphs should be considered in sets of 10 and that all statements should relate to the substance unless someone objected very strongly to the wording of the draft report. Members should not make statements on minor drafting points in the various languages.

42. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, agreed with the previous speaker. With regard to the part of the draft report concerning the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, a number of amendments had been submitted to paragraphs 137 to 144.

43. Ms. CARON apologized for referring again to the preceding section of the draft report. It should be recalled that there was a paragraph on which the Rapporteur and Ms. Biryukova had yet to agree. She asked whether the Chairperson intended to revert to that paragraph later.

44. The CHAIRPERSON said that the Rapporteur would in due course revert to that paragraph. She invited the members of the Committee to comment on paragraphs 120 to 137.

Paragraphs 120 to 137

45. Ms. PEYTCHEVA said that there was a translation error in the Russian version of paragraph 121, the last word of which was the equivalent of "Constitution" instead of the equivalent of "Convention". She proposed that in the first sentence of paragraph 132 the words "it was not clear how" should be replaced by the words "a question was asked as to how". The Russian version of the twelfth line of that paragraph read "some experts asked" whereas it should read "one expert asked". She would like that technical error to be corrected by the Secretariat. The same sentence stated that "some women did not avail themselves of that possibility for fear of losing their jobs". That wording represented an incorrect interpretation of a question which she herself had put at the corresponding meeting. She proposed that it should be replaced by the words "some women did not avail themselves of the possibility in order not to abandon their careers for too long".

46. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD said that the justification for the request was not clear to her and asked for an explanation of the reason for the change.

47. Ms. PEYTCHEVA explained that, during the meeting at which the Committee had considered the matter, she had asked a question concerning the additional maternity leave provided for working mothers in the Byelorussian SSR, since in her own country, a sociological study had demonstrated that many young professionals, especially in the scientific and technological sectors, did not avail themselves of

(Ms. Peytcheva)

the paid additional maternity leave and preferred to return to work early in order not to abandon their careers for too long. It was well known that the social phenomenon of unemployment did not exist in Bulgaria; consequently, it was incorrect to say that women were afraid of losing their jobs.

48. Ms. CARON, referring to paragraph 126, asked what was to be done about the phrase "Two members of the Committee", since the Committee had decided not to use numbers.

49. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that, in order to keep the text consistent, throughout, wherever there was a specific reference to one or two experts, it should be replaced by the accepted formula, namely "some" or "several". She also requested the Secretariat to adjust the wording of the Russian version. All of the comments and the lengthy discussion at that day's meetings had been occasioned by the careless drafting of the Russian text, not only in the paragraph under consideration, but throughout the report. The Russian text as it stood was unacceptable.

50. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD said that, if specific turns of phrase were being used in order to reflect the facts, she did not see why, when it was a case of one or two experts, the reference could not be worded as precisely as possible.

51. Ms. LAMM said that the discussion on the Byelorussian SSR's report had not been clearly rendered in the text. Several experts, including herself, had expressed appreciation for the report, but the text before the Committee made no reference to that fact, although it was reflected in the relevant summary record. With regard to the answers supplied by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR, which were covered in paragraph 37 et seq., she requested that those paragraphs should be compared with the summary record of the relevant meeting, because in her view the two documents differed greatly.

52. Mr. NORDENFELT said that he did not recall that the Committee had taken any decision on whether, from paragraph 119 on, a specific number of experts should be mentioned. If members believed that the matter was an important one, the paragraphs that had already been adopted would have to be re-examined. That difficulty could be avoided by using a different wording, such as "it was noted", "a request was made", "information was requested", etc.

53. The CHAIRPERSON said that, if she heard no objection, she would take it that the Committee agreed to retain the wording of the paragraphs which it had already adopted.

54. Ms. BIRYUKOVA asked that it should be recorded that she accepted the report up to paragraph 137 only on the condition that the Secretariat formulated the Russian text correctly, since as it stood, it would need too many amendments.

55. The CHAIRPERSON said that she would convey Ms. Biryukova's request to the Secretariat.

/...

56. Ms. REGENT-LECHOWICZ, turning to paragraph 136, suggested that the words "The Committee remarked" should be replaced by the words "Certain experts remarked" or "Some experts remarked", since all the members of the Committee were not involved.

57. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that, if there were no objections, paragraphs 120 to 136 should be adopted.

58. Paragraphs 120 to 136, as amended, were adopted.

Paragraph 137

59. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said that the following amendment had been submitted to reword paragraph 137:

"In her reply, the representative of the Byelorussian SSR said that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, one of the 15 Union Republics which constituted the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, had its own political and State structure, its own legislative and legal system. The representatives of the Byelorussian SSR took an active part in the activities of the higher bodies of the Soviet Union, thus participating directly in decision-making with respect to all matters of concern to the Republic."

60. Ms. CARON said that she had no objection to replacing paragraph 137 but wished to know whether the text of the amendment had been compared with the summary record and whether the two texts agreed, so that the ideas expressed during the meeting were reflected. If that was the case, she would accept the proposed amendment.

61. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said that the text of the amendment did not differ greatly from the text of the summary record; the contents were very similar, and it was a question of form rather than substance.

62. Paragraph 137, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 138

63. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, read out the following amendment to reword paragraph 138:

"The Republic's women took an active part in the work of political, State and judicial bodies. In the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian SSR, women accounted for 37.1 per cent of the deputies, and in local Soviets of People's Deputies, for 49 per cent. Women constituted 25 per cent of members of judicial bodies and 48 per cent of elected trade union officials. In the Byelorussian SSR, women held high-ranking offices in various fields of endeavour. They acted as heads of enterprises and organizations, as judges and procurators and as directors of State farms, eight-grade schools and secondary schools. Women held the offices of Vice-Chairperson of the Council of Ministers of the Byelorussian SSR, First Secretary of the Young Communist League Central Committee, Chairperson of the Byelorussian Trade and Industry

(Ms. Bernard)

Chamber, Secretary of the Republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, and minister (of the food processing industry and of every-day services). Six of the Deputy Ministers in the Republic were also women. Women accounted for 26 per cent of the total membership of the Byelorussian Communist Party and were represented in party organs at all levels, from primary organization to the Central Committee."

64. Ms. CARON asked whether the Rapporteur could assure the Committee that the amendment which she had read out corresponded to the summary record.

65. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said that she could not guarantee that texts corresponded to summary records, especially in the case of lengthy amendments; nor could she guarantee that amendments were not new or substantive.

66. Ms. CORTES observed that the text of the amendment seemed to be new and that, if the Committee accepted it, it would have to deal with the problem of considering new material.

67. Ms. ILIC expressed concern over the delay in considering the report and suggested that the Committee should accept the amendments and should trust the work of the Rapporteur.

68. Ms. BIRYUKOVA supported that suggestion and expressed appreciation of the Rapporteur's dedication; she suggested that the Rapporteur should be entrusted with the task of comparing the amendments with the Secretariat documents.

69. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, requested the opportunity to verify if the text of the amendments corresponded to that of the summary records and said that she could have a reply by the next meeting.

70. Ms. CORTES said that she had confidence in the Rapporteur's work and suggested that the Committee should go on to consider paragraphs to which no amendments had been proposed.

71. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said she had been informed that, should the amendments be adopted, there would be 145 instead of 148 paragraphs.

72. The CHAIRPERSON suggested postponing consideration of the remaining paragraphs dealing with the report of the Byelorussian SSR and going on to consider the paragraphs relating to the report of the Ukrainian SSR.

73. Mr. NORDENFELT, raising a point of order, asked whether amendments could be proposed by persons who were not members of the Committee. He referred to rule 48 of the rules of procedure.

74. The CHAIRPERSON said she recalled that, at the previous meeting, it had been decided that both the Secretariat and the Rapporteur would bear in mind the comments of States parties regarding the consideration of their reports.

/...

Paragraphs 149 to 195 (report of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)

75. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that, in order to speed the work of the Committee paragraphs 149 to 195 of the report should be considered together.

76. Ms. BIRYUKOVA called attention to several errors. Paragraph 149 referred to "April" whereas the Committee had actually met in August. In the second sentence of paragraph 152 the words "Ukrainian SSR" should read "Ukraine" and the words "more completely" should have been included after the words "combine their work". Near the end of paragraph 191 the reference should have been to "eight-year schools", rather than to "primary schools", which no longer existed. In the second sentence of paragraph 192, the words "who need such assistance" should be substituted for the words "in poor economic situations". Minor drafting changes should be made in paragraph 193; and in the fourth sentence of paragraph 195, the phrase "long hours" should be replaced by "irregular hours".

77. Ms. PEYTCHEVA observed that, in the last sentence of paragraph 152, it was not clear what was being referred to by the words "statistical data on the exercise of the rights of women": since the Labour Code could not possibly restrict the supplying of statistical data, there must be some mistake. In addition, paragraph 173 referred to "pensions to blind workers", but that did not seem to be the correct expression.

78. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD proposed that the beginning of paragraph 155 should be amended to read "The representative was commended both on ...".

79. Mr. NORDENFELT said that perhaps another long discussion could be avoided if the first sentence of paragraph 155 were formulated in the following manner: "The representative of the State Party was commended both on her presentation and on the organization of the report".

80. Paragraphs 149-195 as a whole, as amended, were adopted.

Paragraphs 196 to 239 (report of Sweden)

81. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that, in the first sentence of paragraph 201 the word "commended" should be replaced by the word "thanked". Also the phrase "Some experts stated that" should be added to the beginning of the second sentence, otherwise the text would not be in keeping with the summary record. In paragraph 202, she proposed replacing the word "welcomed" by the word "considered".

82. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD said that she agreed with Ms. Biryukova on the use of impersonal formulations when referring to praise received by the representatives.

83. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, read out the following amendment to paragraph 224: the second sentence should be divided into two and should read: "In this regard the Swedish philosophy was that the concept of equality required a readiness to abolish all kinds of discrimination based on sex. It was true that women were the ones who were traditionally discriminated against but some discrimination against men could also occur."

84. Paragraph 201, as amended, was adopted.

85. Ms. CORTES, supported by Ms. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ, proposed replacing the word "welcomed" in paragraph 202 by the words "took note of".
86. Ms. BIRYUKOVA, supported by Ms. PEYTCHEVA, pointed out that the Chairperson had overlooked the amendment she had proposed to the second sentence of paragraph 201. As for paragraph 202, it should begin with the words "Some members of the Committee remarked on ...".
87. The CHAIRPERSON, referring to paragraph 201, said that the text had already been amended so that the first sentence was in the passive voice: "The representative of the State Party was commended ...".
88. Ms. PATIÑO asked, on a point of order, if paragraph 201, which had already been adopted, was being considered, or paragraph 202.
89. The CHAIRPERSON said that she had gone back to consider paragraph 201 as a gesture of courtesy towards a member of the Committee.
90. Mr. NORDENFELT said that he had no objection to what had been suggested with regard to paragraph 201 but would like clarification on a procedural matter. Was it possible to reopen consideration of a paragraph that had already been adopted?
91. The CHAIRPERSON said that the same thing had been done at the morning meeting and no one had raised any objection.
92. Ms. REGENT-LECHOWICZ said that the procedural question should not be raised: the Committee should reopen consideration of paragraph 201 because in adopting that paragraph it had not taken into account the amendment proposed by Ms. Biryukova.
93. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said, in reply to Mr. Nordenfelt, that she had at the proper time submitted an amendment that was not taken into account in adopting the paragraph. Yet her amendment was based on paragraph 59 of summary record CEDAW/C/SR.19.
94. Ms. OESER said that she supported the proposal of Ms. Biryukova and Ms. Peytcheva.
95. Mr. NORDENFELT explained that it had not been his intention to oppose either the suggestion to amend paragraph 201 or the renewed consideration of that paragraph.
96. Ms. SMITH said that she had no objection to the amendment proposed and urged the Committee to speed up its deliberations.
97. Ms. PEYTCHEVA read out the proposed text for the second sentence of paragraph 201: "Some experts stated that Sweden had almost fully realized the aspirations of the Committee towards the elimination of discrimination against women".
98. Paragraph 201, as amended, was adopted.

99. The CHAIRPERSON noted that two amendments had been proposed to paragraph 202, consisting of replacing "Members of the Committee" with "Some members of the Committee" and the word "welcomed" with the words "remarked on".

100. Paragraph 202, as amended, was adopted.

101. The CHAIRPERSON recalled that the Rapporteur had read out the amendment which Mr. Nordenfelt had proposed to paragraph 224.

102. Paragraph 224, as amended, was adopted.

103. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said that an amendment to paragraph 225 had been submitted which would insert the following sentence between the second and third sentences: "If persuasion through negotiations with the employer in order to reach an agreement failed to bring about compliance by employers, the Ombudsman had recourse to other measures such as referring a discrimination dispute to the labour court". (In the Spanish text, the second sentence should read: "El Ombudsman se ocupaba de velar por el acatamiento de la Ley sobre la igualdad de hombres y mujeres en cuestiones laborales".) In addition, the following sentence should be added after the third sentence: "So far, the obligation of the employers to take such active measures to promote equality has been met by voluntary means".

104. Ms. BIRYUKOVA, referring to paragraph 203, pointed out that the last sentence did not coincide with what was reflected in summary record CEDAW/C/SR.19. She proposed that that sentence should be amended to read: "Nevertheless, some experts pointed out that the Equal Opportunities Act was evidently not observed in practice, since the proportion of women in high-level posts and in the judiciary was very low, and in that connection asked for additional information ...", the rest of the sentence remaining unchanged.

105. Ms. SMITH agreed that that was in line with the summary record; the observation was, however, misguided, since compliance with the Equal Opportunities Act did not mean that a specific number of women must be appointed to those posts. The problem was that there were not enough qualified women in Sweden, and the law did not stipulate that there must always be an equal number of men and women. However, given that one expert had brought up the subject during the debate, it would have to be included in the report if Ms. Biryukova insisted.

106. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that more than one expert had drawn attention to that situation. In addition to herself, Ms. Bernard and Ms. Veliz de Villalvilla had also referred to it, as was clear from the record.

107. Ms. SMITH agreed it was unfortunate that so few women occupied high-level posts; however, that did not constitute a violation of the Equal Opportunities Act, since such a violation required actual cases of discrimination. She simply wished to point out that it was not true that the Equal Opportunities Act was not observed in Sweden.

108. Ms. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ said she agreed with Ms. Smith. In her recollection, at the previous session, Ms. Bernard had not said that the Equal Opportunities Act was not observed in practice, but that there were a small number of women occupying high-level posts. The law did not stipulate that there must be the same number of men and women in those posts, but that both sexes should have equal access to those posts. To solve the problem, perhaps the sentence "Some experts observed that there were few opportunities for women to occupy high-level posts within the judicial system" might be included.

109. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that the problem lay in placing on record that several experts had mentioned that a law was not being implemented. On the basis of paragraphs 59, 61 and 62 of summary record CEDAW/C/SR.19, she proposed that a new paragraph should be included which would read: "Some experts stated that, apparently, the Equal Opportunities Act was not observed in practice, since the proportion of women occupying high-level judicial posts in the country was very low".

110. Ms. SMITH explained that the Swedish law in question was intended to promote equality between men and women and not to guarantee such equality.

111. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD said she agreed with Ms. Smith and Ms. González Martínez; Sweden could not be accused of failure to comply with the law, since it was Swedish female citizens who were not taking advantage of its provisions.

112. Ms. CARON said she believed that the situation would be corrected in due time; it was not for the Committee to do so now. The Committee was merely trying to reflect the comments made, however inaccurate they may have been.

113. Ms. SMITH said she did not think it was possible for the report to reflect everything that had been said. It might make more sense to take note of what was correct and eliminate whatever was incorrect.

114. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said she did not agree with Ms. Smith. Sweden had submitted statistics on unemployment which showed that the proportion of unemployed women was twice that of men, which indicated that there was definite discrimination against women in Sweden. She proposed that a new paragraph should be added after paragraph 203. It would read:

"Some experts said that, evidently, the Equal Opportunities Act was not observed in practice, since the proportion of women occupying high-level administrative and judicial posts, as well as unemployment statistics, demonstrated that, in practice, discrimination against women continued to exist in Sweden."

115. Ms. SMITH stated that, even though the statistics showed that full equality of the sexes did not exist in Sweden, that did not mean that the Equal Opportunities Act was not observed in practice.

116. Ms. ILIĆ said she felt that a reference should be made to "one expert" or "a few experts", since not all members of the Committee had the same opinion. She reiterated her positive appraisal of the report of Sweden.

117. Ms. CORTES thought that the appropriate words were "a few experts".

118. The new paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

119. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that paragraph 216 should begin with the words "Some experts commended ...".

120. The CHAIRPERSON said that, if there were no objections, she would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendment to paragraph 216.

121. It was so decided.

122. Paragraphs 196-239, as a whole, as amended, were adopted.

123. Ms. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ said she thought it might be advisable to forego consideration of the reports of some States, since the Committee could not leave any question pending, given that its membership was about to change.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.