



COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Fifth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 28 March 1955, at 2.35 p.m.

CONTENTS

Nationality of married women:

- (a) Report on comments from Governments on the draft convention on the nationality of married women (E/CN.6/259 and Add.1-3; E/CN.6/L.153 and Corr.1, E/CN.6/L.163, 164, and 165)
- (b) Report on changes in legislation concerning the nationality of married women

Participation of women in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies (E/CN.6/L.178)

Educational opportunities for women:

- (a) Progress report on access of women to education (E/CN.6/266; E/CN.6/L.177 and 180)
- (b) Report on access of women to apprenticeship (E/CN.6/264)
- (c) Report on the status of women in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories (E/CN.6/255, 260 and Add.1-2)

17 p.

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Miss BERNARDINO	Dominican Republic
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mrs. RÖSSEL	Sweden
<u>Members:</u>	Miss CHAMORRO-ALAMAN	Argentina
	Mrs. DALY	Australia
	Mrs. NOVIKOVA	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
	Miss TSENG	China
	Miss MAÑAS	Cuba
	Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX	France
	Mrs. GUERY	Haiti
	Miss ROESAD	Indonesia
	Mrs. TABET	Lebanon
	Begum ANWAR AHMED	Pakistan
	Mrs. DEMBINSKA	Poland
	Mrs. FOMINA	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mrs. SAYERS)	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. ATLEE)	
	Mrs. HAHN	United States of America
	Mrs. SANCHEZ de URDANETA	Venezuela
	Mrs. MITROVIC)	Yugoslavia
	Mr. BOZOVIC)	
<u>Also present:</u>	Mrs. LOPEZ	Colombia
	Mrs. FUJITA	Japan
	Mrs. de TEJEIRO	Panama

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mrs. FIGUEROA	International Labour Organisation
Miss SALAS	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Representative of an inter-governmental organization:

Mrs. de CALVO	Inter-American Commission of Women
---------------	------------------------------------

PRESENT: (continued)

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

<u>Category A:</u> Miss SENDER	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
Miss KAHN } Mr. DESSAU }	World Federation of Trade Unions
Mrs. FOX	World Federation of United Nations Associations

Category B and Register:

Miss GUTHRIE } Miss STRAUSS }	International Alliance of Women
Mrs. CARTER	International Council of Women
Mrs. MEINANDER } Miss POLLITZ }	International Federation of Business and Professional Women
Miss LAGEMAN	International Federation of Friends of Young Women
Miss ROBB) Miss MCGILLICUDDY)	International Federation of University Women
Miss LALONDE) Miss RISENBERGER)	International Federation of Women Lawyers
Mrs. WOLLE-EGENOLF	International League for the Rights of Man
Mrs. ROBERTS	Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations; Associated Country Women of the World
Mrs. WALSER	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Miss GAINES	World Assembly of Youth
Mrs. RICHMAN	World Jewish Congress
Mrs. ZIZZAMIA	World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations

<u>Secretariat:</u> Mrs. TENISON-WOODS	Chief, Status of Women Section
Mrs. GRINBERG-VINAVER	Secretary of the Commission

NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN: (a) REPORT ON COMMENTS FROM GOVERNMENTS OF THE DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN (E/CN.6/259 and Add.1-3; E/CN.6/L.153 and Corr.1; E/CN.6/L.163, 164 and 165); (b) REPORT ON CHANGES IN LEGISLATION CONCERNING THE NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

Miss MAÑAS (Cuba) thought that the difficulties were likely to be solved by the Yugoslav amendment at the last meeting, to substitute for the final paragraph of the introductory part of the draft resolution to be submitted to the Economic and Social Council, the following:

"Recommends to the General Assembly that an international convention on the nationality of married women, containing the following preamble and articles, be adopted".

Mrs. FOMINA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that they would favour the Yugoslav proposal, provided that their respective amendments were included in an annex to the Commission's report.

Mr. ATTLEE (United Kingdom) wished to explain his vote before the Draft Convention was put to the vote.

The United Kingdom delegation would vote against the new article proposed by the United States because it would be best to leave well alone. Absolute equality in the matter of nationality was, of course, the ideal but it was an ideal that could not be achieved for the time being. As could be seen from documents E/CN.6/259 and Add.1-3, many Governments were not prepared at the present time to extend to men the privileges accorded to women. If the United States amendment were adopted the number of States that might accede to the convention would be greatly reduced.

The draft convention submitted by Cuba was a big step forward, whereas the United States amendment would take the Commission back to the point where it had been two years before.

Mrs. DALY (Australia) agreed with the United Kingdom representative.

The United States amendments were not in keeping with the views expressed in the comments from Governments. Moreover, the amendments implied a substantive change, since they would replace the convention on the nationality of married women with a convention on the nationality of married persons, and her Government would not be able to accept such an instrument. For the reasons she had mentioned she would vote against the United States proposals.

Mrs. MITROVIC (Yugoslavia) said that she would support the United States

amendments to articles 1, 2 and 3 of the draft convention because they were in keeping with Yugoslav legislation. However, she agreed with the French representative that their adoption would weaken the Convention's chances of success and that it would be better not to go beyond the problem of married women for the time being. Men's difficulties in the matter of nationality were purely theoretical, and adoption of the United States proposals would scarcely be of benefit to them. Accordingly, she would vote for the draft convention, whether the United States amendments were adopted or not.

Mrs. HAHN (United States of America), unlike the United Kingdom and

Australian representatives, considered the draft convention on the nationality of married persons submitted in 1953 the better text. It was only by examining the problem from the viewpoint of married persons that women could be assured full equality with men in the matter of nationality. She was aware that some Governments could accept only limited commitments but nothing less than equality would be acceptable to the United States Government.

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France) reiterated the view she had expressed at a

previous meeting that adoption of the United States amendments would make it more difficult for some Governments to accede to the convention. Nevertheless, she would vote for the amendments because they were in harmony with a position of principle that the Commission should support.

Miss TSENG (China) said that she would vote for the United States amendments, although it would be regrettable if they prevented some Governments from acceding to the convention.

The CHAIRMAN put the new article proposed by the United States (E/CN.6/L.165) to the vote.

The proposed article was rejected by 8 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) explained that she had abstained because, as she had already indicated, her country had as yet no nationality legislation.

The CHAIRMAN put the United States amendment to article 1 of the draft convention to the vote.

The amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote article 1 of the draft convention submitted by Cuba (E/CN.6/L.153).

Mrs. GRINBERG-VINAVER (Secretary of the Commission) pointed out that the words "d'un de leurs nationaux avec une étrangère" in the French text should be replaced by the words "entre ressortissants et étrangers".

At the request of the Cuban representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

France, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Dominican Republic.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: France, Indonesia, China.

Article 1 was adopted by 13 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the United States amendment (E/CN.6/L.165) to article 2 of the draft convention to the vote.

The amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put article 2 of the draft convention to the vote.

At the request of the Cuban representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: China, Indonesia, France.

Article 2 was adopted by 13 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Mrs. HAHN (United States of America) withdrew her amendment to article 3.

The CHAIRMAN put article 3 of the draft convention, as amended by the Australian representative, to the vote.

At the request of the Cuban representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Argentina, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Indonesia, Lebanon, Pakistan, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: France, Sweden.

Article 3 was adopted by 15 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

At the request of Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France), the CHAIRMAN called for a vote by division on the preamble to the draft convention.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The second and third paragraphs of the preamble were adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution of the Commission on the Status of Women to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution addressed to the Economic and Social Council, as amended by Yugoslavia, to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Commission's draft resolution, the draft resolution addressed to the Economic and Social Council, the preamble to the draft convention and the first three articles of the draft convention.

At the request of the Cuban representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Lebanon, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: France, Indonesia.

The Commission's draft resolution, the draft resolution addressed to the Economic and Social Council, the preamble to the draft convention and the first three articles of the draft convention were adopted by 15 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Miss MAÑAS (Cuba) expressed her delegation's thanks to the representatives who had voted for the draft convention. The wide support the text had received showed the importance attached to the question and the Commission's wish to co-operate in efforts to free women from the discrimination to which they were subjected.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the draft convention and the accompanying draft resolutions would be submitted to the Economic and Social Council, together with an annex including the amendments submitted.

Mr. ATTLEE (United Kingdom) recalled that his delegation had proposed two minor drafting amendments to replace the words "contracting parties" in the preamble by "contracting States", so that the same expression might be used in the preamble and in the articles, and to replace the words "will affect" in article 2 of the English text by "shall prevent".

The CHAIRMAN said that the necessary changes would be made.

PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (E/CN.6/L.178)

Miss CHAMORRO-ALAMAN (Argentina) said that the purpose of her delegation's draft resolution (E/CN.6/L.178) was to express the Commission's wish that women should participate in the work of the United Nations and to encourage non-governmental organizations to influence opinion to that end. She thought that the text would be generally acceptable to the Commission.

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France) thought that the Argentine draft should not give rise to any difficulties. She proposed that the words "at the national level" in the second operative paragraph should be deleted in order to make the text clearer.

Mrs. HAHN (United States of America) supported the Argentine draft resolution in principle, but proposed that the words "but to encourage" in the fifth line of the second operative paragraph should be replaced by the words "in order to encourage".

Mrs. DALY (Australia) pointed out that, in that case, the words "not only" at the beginning of the paragraph should be deleted.

Miss CHAMORRO-ALAMAN (Argentina) accepted the French, United States and Australian amendments.

Mrs. RÖSSEL (Sweden) thought that the first operative paragraph was not strong enough, in view of the reference to Article 8 of the Charter in the preamble. The United Nations must find methods and point the way for Member States.

Mrs. DALY (Australia) agreed.

Mrs. HAHN (United States of America) proposed that a new paragraph should be inserted between the first and second operative paragraphs, reading:

"Suggests that, in seeking recommendations from Governments, attention be called to the policy of the United Nations as to the eligibility of both men and women to such positions."

Mrs. FOMINA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that the Secretary-General's attention should be drawn to the need to appoint women to high posts, but did not think that the word "policy" was appropriate.

Mrs. DALY (Australia) suggested that the word "principles" should be substituted for the word "policy" in the paragraph the United States representative had proposed to add to the Argentine draft.

Mrs. HAHN (United States of America) accepted that suggestion.

Mrs. SAYERS (United Kingdom) proposed that the words "Urges the Secretary-General to keep constantly in mind..." at the beginning of the first operative paragraph should be replaced by the words "Confident that the Secretary-General will take into consideration...".

Mrs. DALY (Australia), supported by Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France) and Mrs. GUERY (Haiti), proposed the deletion of the second operative paragraph. There could be no doubt that non-governmental organizations would continue to perform their functions, and the purpose of the draft resolution would be clearer without that paragraph.

Mrs. SANCHEZ de URDANETA (Venezuela) suggested that the words "are being called upon to play" in the second paragraph of the preamble should be replaced by "are playing", as the phrase thus amended would be nearer the truth.

Mrs. CHAMORRO-ALAMAN (Argentina) accepted the United Kingdom, Australian and Venezuelan amendments.

The CHAIRMAN put the Argentine draft resolution (E/CN.6/L.178), as amended, to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Commission's heavy agenda. So that the documents before the Commission and the resolutions it was to transmit to the Council might be studied thoroughly, she proposed that only one of the questions listed under item 7, the report on part-time employment of women, for the ILO, should be considered at the current session and that consideration of the other two aspects of the question of economic opportunities for women should be postponed until the tenth session.

(The Chairman)

She informed the Commission that the Polish delegation had submitted an amendment to draft resolution E/CN.6/L.177 on educational opportunities for women. As the time-limit for the submission of drafts on that question had expired, the Commission must decide whether it wished to consider the Polish amendment.

Mrs. BEMBINSKA (Poland) pointed out that her delegation's amendment (E/CN.6/L.180) was purely formal and introduced no new factors.

Mrs. SANCHEZ de URDANETA (Venezuela) considered that the Commission might study a purely formal amendment together with the draft resolution of the Resolutions Committee (E/CN.6/L.177).

Mrs. FOMINA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Commission might agree to consider the Polish amendment, since the Resolutions Committee's text had been distributed only that morning.

Mrs. NCVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that the Commission would be unwise to pay too much attention to procedural questions. Moreover, the time-limit had applied to the original Pakistani text (E/CN.6/L.171), and not to the Resolution Committee's draft.

Begum ANWAR AHMED (Pakistan) said that the Commission should not create a precedent by departing from the proper procedure; the Polish representative would, however, be entitled to submit her amendment when the draft resolution was discussed in plenary meeting.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to examine the draft resolution in document E/CN.6/L.177 and the amendment to it (E/CN.6/L.180).

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN: (a) PROGRESS REPORT ON ACCESS OF WOMEN TO EDUCATION (E/CN.6/266; E/CN.6/L.177 and 180); (b) REPORT ON ACCESS OF WOMEN TO APPRENTICESHIP (E/CN.6/264); (c) REPORT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN TRUST AND NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (E/CN.6/255, 260 and Add.1-2)

Mrs. DALY (Australia) said she had not been able to support that resolution in the Resolutions Committee. The Commission had already decided to address seven draft resolutions to the Council on the nine items it had discussed so far, including one recommending the adoption of the draft convention on the nationality of married women, a most complex subject. The Council would be examining the Commission's report at its summer session, which would last only four weeks. The Council's agenda was very heavy, and the Commission should not ask the Council to spend a disproportionate amount of time on the Commission's report, particularly as some members of the Council had stated, at an earlier session, that the Commission had sent too many draft resolutions to it.

Moreover, the draft resolution under consideration (E/CN.6/L.177) was somewhat unusual in that it dealt with the work of only one specialized agency and criticized it strongly. The Commission should propose such a resolution only after careful consideration and after satisfying itself that the criticism was justified. It had not had time to do so, and, if it sent such a resolution to the Council, UNESCO would certainly ask to be heard, and that would further lengthen the Council's debates. As the United States representative had pointed out at the 185th meeting, much had been gained at the last session by postponing the consideration of resolutions on some aspects of family law. She therefore proposed that the Commission should express appreciation of UNESCO's report (E/CN.6/266) in its own report and postpone consideration of the draft resolution until the next session.

Begum ANWAR AHMED (Pakistan) could not agree to postponing the draft resolution on educational opportunities for women (E/CN.6/L.177) until a later session. It was of great importance to countries with under-developed economies. She would therefore have to ask for a roll-call vote on the Australian proposal.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Commission's report would be taken up at the twentieth session of the Council, which was to last only three weeks, although the agenda (E/2680) was already very heavy.

Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) agreed with the Pakistan representative that the Commission should not postpone consideration of the matter until its tenth session. The fact that the Council's agenda was overloaded was not sufficient justification. The Commission was careful not to adopt too many draft resolutions, and it had merged a number of texts, for that reason; it could do no more than that. The Commission had its own terms of reference and obligations to consider, and it could not disregard two such important matters as educational and economic opportunities for women. Incidentally, it should be able to dispose of them very quickly.

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France), supported by Mrs. GUERY (Haiti), also felt that the Commission should carry out the task entrusted to it and not be unduly concerned with the Council's agenda.

Mrs. FOMINA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was rather surprised at the turn the debate had taken. She saw no reason for postponing consideration of the question of economic and educational opportunities for women and she agreed with the French and Haitian representatives on that point.

Mrs. DEMBINSKA (Poland) also thought that the draft resolution (E/CN.6/L.177) should be taken up without further delay.

Mrs. HAHN (United States of America) pointed out that the problem of the number of resolutions adopted came up every year. Obviously, however, the fact that the Commission had adopted a number of draft resolutions on other subjects before taking up educational opportunities for women was no reason for rejecting the draft in document E/CN.6/L.177. She therefore suggested that the Chairman should appoint a committee to devise new working methods, so that the Commission would not encounter the same difficulties year after year.

In reply to a question from Miss ROESAD (Indonesia), the CHAIRMAN said that, while there had been no official request from the Economic and Social Council, she knew from her own experience that the Commission's report had been criticized. That was why she had urged the members of the Commission not to adopt too many draft resolutions and to prepare its texts with the greatest care.

Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) saw little usefulness in any work which was not followed by a resolution. She attached great importance to draft resolution E/CN.6/L.177 and would have to vote against the proposal to postpone consideration of it.

Mrs. DALY (Australia) appreciated the Pakistan and Haitian representatives' point of view, but still felt that the Commission would do well to postpone the question of educational opportunities for women until the next session when it would have more time to study it. Also, the Commission should consider the Council; she therefore maintained her proposal.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the vote should be postponed until the next day.

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France) pointed out that there had been no general debate on document E/CN.6/L.177 prepared by the Resolutions Committee and it could well be improved. The Commission already had before it an amendment to the text, and she intended to submit another one, so as to make the text shorter. Moreover, if the Commission were to be concerned solely with submitting as conformist a report as possible to the Council, there would hardly be any reason for its existence.

Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) thought that the Commission was following a dangerous course. Today, it was being asked to adopt fewer resolutions and to confine itself to studying certain questions; tomorrow

(Mrs. Novikova, Byelorussian Soviet
Socialist Republic)

it would be abolished. The Council's criticism should not make the Commission forget its appointed task, which was to fight for the equality of women in all fields, including education.

Mrs. TABET (Lebanon) felt that the Commission should not be deterred by the number of resolutions it had adopted, when a draft serving the interests of under-developed countries was involved.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that her remarks had been purely general, and applied to no draft resolution in particular. If called upon to submit the Commission's report to the Council, she would provide herself with the Commission's summary records so as to have the documents on hand when replying to any objections that members of the Council might raise.

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France) said that the draft prepared by the Resolutions Committee (E/CN.6/L.177) was a combination of Pakistani and Haitian proposals on the education of women in under-developed areas and a Venezuelan text on an altogether different problem, which was incorporated in the last paragraph of the draft. That last paragraph made the text rather complicated and she wondered whether the Venezuelan representative would not agree to its deletion.

Mrs. SANCHEZ de URDANETA (Venezuela) gladly agreed to the deletion of the paragraph, if that would make the joint text clearer. She had submitted her amendment in view of the reaction of members of the Commission to the UNESCO report.

Miss SALAS (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) wished to make a few comments on document E/CN.6/L.177.

(Miss Salas, UNESCO)

The paragraph beginning with the words "Considering that the results so far obtained" implied a criticism of UNESCO, for which she would like to know the reasons. She added that the programme of UNESCO was approved by the General Conference formed by the seventy-two member states.

The paragraph beginning with the words "Suggests to UNESCO" was not in accordance with procedures and practices for the granting of aid to member governments. She had before her a circular letter, dated 18 January 1955 (T/1165), in which the Director-General of UNESCO offered such aid to Member States, in the field of education, as development of schooling at the primary level, training of rural school teachers and access of girls to education. Any request for help from UNESCO must, however, come directly from the Member States concerned. If Haiti wished to set up a teacher-training centre, for example, the Haitian Government must itself put forward a request for assistance. But UNESCO regulations stipulated that such assistance could only be provided on the express request of Member States. The situation was different where regional projects were concerned; then the decision must be taken by the General Conference.

She also wished to know exactly what the Haitian representative meant by cultural and educational centres and whether those were normal or primary schools, pilot projects or fundamental education centres.

The Commission could well delete the last paragraph, since it had already been agreed that the content of UNESCO's report for next year would be on higher education.

Mrs. GUERY (Haiti), in reply to the UNESCO representative's first remark, noted that the paragraph of the preamble in question confirmed the first paragraph, and was not a criticism, quite the contrary. The Commission would merely like to see UNESCO's efforts better rewarded.

As for the cultural and educational centres, she had already spoken of the hotel schools and other branches that might be set up by the educational groups. Her examples were naturally taken from Haiti's own experience, but that did not necessarily mean that she was making a request on behalf of her country. UNESCO's help did not always seem to be effective, and it might therefore be useful to find out the reasons for that, and to suggest improvements.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.