

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.6/SR.106  
21 May 1952

ENGLISH

Original: ENGLISH and  
FRENCH

Dual Distribution

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Sixth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 26 March, 1952, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Political rights of women (item 3 of the agenda)  
(continued):

- (b) Report on the action taken on the draft convention on political rights of women adopted by the Commission at its fifth session (E/CN.6/184 and Add.1 and 2 thereto, E/CN.6/L.58, E/CN.6/L.59, E/CN.6/L.60, E/CN.6/L.61, E/CN.6/L.61/Corr.1) (continued)

Present:

Chairman:

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (France)

Members:

Miss LUTZ	Brazil
Mrs. NYEIN	Burma
Mrs. NOVIKOVA	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
Mrs. FIGUEROA	Chile
Miss TSENG	China
Miss MANAS	Cuba
Mrs. de l'OFFICIAL	Dominican Republic
Mrs. FIROUZ	Iran
Mrs. TABET	Lebanon
Miss PELETIER	Netherlands
Mrs. ROSS	New Zealand
Begum Fida HASSAN	Pakistan
Miss KALINOWSKA	Poland
Mrs. POPOVA	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mrs. GOLDMAN	United States of America

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Miss FAIRCHILD
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Miss DAS

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

World Federation of Trade Unions	Mrs. CHIOSTERGI
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions	Mrs. ETIENNE

Category B

Catholic International Union for Social Service	Mrs. SOUDAN
--	-------------

Conférence Internationale des

Charités Catholiques (replacing  
Caritas Internationalis)

Miss OSTERTAG

Representatives of non-governmental organizations (continued):Category B (continued)

International Association of Penal Law	)	Mrs. ROMNICIANO
International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law		
International Council of Women		Miss van EEGHEN
International Federation of Business and Professional Women		Mrs. HYMER Miss TOMLINSON
International Federation of Friends of Young Women		Mrs. BERTHOUD van WERVEKE
International Federation of University Women		Mrs. WIBLE-GAILLARD
International League for the Rights of Man		Mrs. BAER
Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations		Mrs. HYMER Miss BARRY
Pax Romana		Miss ARCHINARD
Women's International League for Peace And Freedom		Mrs. BAER
World Union for Progressive Judaism		Lady NATHAN of CHURT
<u>Register</u>		
Associated Country Women of the World		Mrs. RUSSELL
Open Door International		Mrs. BAER
St. Joan's International Social and Political Alliance		Miss BARRY

Secretariat:

Mrs. Tenison-Woods	Representative of the Secretary-General
Mrs. Grinberg-Vinaver	Secretary to the Commission

## POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN (item 3 of the agenda) (continued);

(b) Report on the action taken on the draft convention on political rights of women adopted by the Commission at its fifth session (E/CN.6/184, and Add.1 and 2 thereto, (E/CN.6/L.58, E/CN.6/L.59, E/CN.6/L.60, E/CN.6/L.61 and E/CN.6/L.61/Corr.1)

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile), continuing the statement she had begun at the previous meeting, wished to comment on the amendments and additions (E/CN.6/L.60 submitted by the Soviet Union representative to the draft convention.

The Chilean delegation was in full agreement with the principle that there should be no discrimination on grounds of race, colour, nationality, birth, property status, language or religion. During its six years of participation in the work of the Commission on Human Rights, the Chilean delegation had constantly and consistently urged that that principle should be given its due place in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the draft International Covenant on Human Rights. It had also made strong representations to that effect in the Third Committee of the General Assembly whenever the question of clauses prohibiting discrimination had arisen. Moreover, she recognized that discrimination on the grounds mentioned in the Soviet Union text was practised in certain countries, and in her opinion that fact should not be overlooked; but where such discrimination did exist, it was exercised as much against men as against women, although it was true that in everyday life it was often harder on the women.

Nevertheless, the problem, where it existed, was one that affected both sexes equally. In those circumstances the Commission was not called upon to include such a clause in a draft convention on the political rights of women. Regrettable though it might be, the Commission's terms of reference did not permit it to deal with matters concerning the rights of both sexes. Moreover, the Economic and Social Council had affirmed, in resolution 48 (IV), that "The Commission shall also make recommendations to the Council on urgent problems requiring immediate attention in the field of women's rights with the object of implementing the principle that men and women shall have equal rights...". Thus the Commission's task was to secure equality of status with men for the women of all countries; and even though, in certain States, the legal and social status of men was not satisfactory, the Commission was not qualified to recommend that



women be given a better status than them. The campaign against discriminatory measures in general was directly within the competence of the Commission on Human Rights alone. The sole concern of the Commission on the Status of Women should be to oppose discrimination based on sex.

Therefore, although she approved of the principle stated in the Soviet Union proposal, she did not think that it could be included in the draft convention on political rights of women. Appropriate provisions had already been embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and would appear in the International Covenant on Human Rights. She was far from the opinion that certain problems should be neglected or referred to other bodies; but the Commission should not go beyond its terms of reference.

She thought that the Soviet Union amendment to Article 2, which sought the inclusion of a reference to central and local elective bodies, was valuable, and was prepared to incorporate it in her own text if the Soviet Union representative agreed.

On the other hand, she wondered whether the new Article 4 proposed by the Soviet Union delegation would be useful. By acceding to and ratifying an international convention, States implicitly undertook to adopt all necessary measures to give it effect, and in particular to amend their national legislation appropriately. Of course, States sometimes failed to implement that implicit undertaking; but no action could be taken against them in international law. It would therefore appear that article 4, if adopted, would remain a dead letter.

Lastly, the Chilean delegation agreed with the Soviet Union delegation that an effort should be made to extend the application of the convention to all territories, whatever their status. Having participated in the work of the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, the Chilean delegation was well aware of the situation, and considered the adoption of the necessary measures a matter of urgency. But there again the problem was one that concerned both men and women, and since the Commission must confine itself to improving the status of women it should leave the initiative in the matter of the territorial application of the Convention of the Trusteeship Council and the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly.

Reverting to her own proposal (E/CN.6/L.59), she repeated that she was prepared to incorporate in Article 2 thereof the reference to publicly elected bodies proposed by the Netherlands representative.

The wording of the Chilean text was clearer and shorter than that adopted by the Commission at its fifth session, although there were no substantive differences between the two. Moreover, the Chilean text had the advantage of making it easier for women to be, not only elected, but also appointed, to public office on equal terms with men, which was not provided for in the text submitted by the United States delegation.

Miss TSENG (China) noted that the Soviet Union amendments to the three articles of the original draft convention (E/CN.6/184, page 2) referred to discrimination on several grounds, but omitted reference to discrimination on grounds of political views. In her opinion, it was most important that there should be no such discrimination, but its existence was making itself only too painfully felt in her own country, where women who held political opinions hostile to the regime at present in control of the country were being subjected to cruel persecution.

Mrs. FIROUZ (Iran) proposed on behalf of her own delegation and that of Lebanon that the original resolution containing the draft convention as approved by the Commission at its fifth session (E/CN.6/184, pages 1 and 2) should be retained unchanged.

Mrs. GOLDMAN (United States of America) said that both at past sessions and at the present session of the Commission the United States delegation had attempted to take a consistent position. It had always maintained, and still maintained, that a convention was desirable in the interests of women in certain countries; at the same time, it had always maintained, and still maintained, that such a convention was not really necessary for the United States of America itself. It was perfectly logical that the United States delegation should make a reservation if specific references were made to the eligibility of women for public appointment, since otherwise the United States Government might be involved

in difficulties in connexion with military appointments, for which United States women, who were not liable for military service, were naturally not eligible. That was not to say that a large number of posts to which public appointments were made were not open to American women: as she had already said, there were large numbers of women in the United States civil service, particularly in judicial posts. In any case, the Chilean representative, in proposing the inclusion in the draft convention of a specific reference to eligibility for appointment, was probably under-estimating the political capacities of women who, once they enjoyed full voting rights, would be certain to see that their sex received a fair share of public appointments. That, indeed, was the only way in which women would get them.

She approved of certain of the amendments proposed by the Chilean representative to the draft convention: in particular, the phrase "on equal terms with men" seemed preferable to the phrase "on the same conditions as men". With regard to the Chilean representative's acceptance of the Soviet Union delegation's proposed addition of the words "central and local", she was inclined to think that that modification was unnecessary, and might prove ambiguous. She considered that the wording "all public offices" used in the United States text would adequately cover all possible contingencies.

In conclusion, she appealed to representatives to subordinate their personal preferences for certain texts to the need for reaching agreement, and so endowing the under-privileged women of the world with the rights that really belonged to them.

Miss MANAS (Cuba) considered that the Brazilian proposal (E/CN.6/L.58) went outside the Commission's terms of reference by referring to "citizens" in the first paragraph, instead of to women only. The Soviet Union proposals (E/CN.6/L.60) went even further beyond the Commission's terms of reference by introducing subjects which were clearly within the competence of other United Nations bodies. Article 3 in the United States text (E/CN.6/L.61) was unsatisfactory, because it did not formally state the right of women to hold public

appointments. On the whole, therefore, it seemed that the Chilean proposal (E/CN.6/L.59) was the most satisfactory, since it was concise, clear, and above all placed special emphasis on the winning for women of equality with men, which was perhaps the Commission's principal aim. For that reason the Cuban delegation would support the Chilean proposal.

Miss PELTIER (Netherlands) agreed with the criticisms made of the Soviet Union proposal, which certainly introduced extraneous issues. The other three proposals did not err in that respect, but they were none the less unsatisfactory in that they were attempts to touch up an existing text, and such attempts were rarely completely successful. The Brazilian proposal was an attempt to shorten the original draft convention, despite the general agreement that the first version was satisfactory from the point of view of brevity. As to the United States draft, its omission of the conception of the right to hold public appointments, as distinct from the right to be elected to public office, was a serious defect. With regard to the Chilean proposal, while it was true that it was satisfactory in content, it was inferior to the original text in form: the logical division of the latter into three parts, comprising articles on the right to elect, to be elected, and to hold office, was surely preferable. For those reasons the Netherlands delegation supported the proposal of the Iranian and Lebanese representatives that the draft convention, as approved by the Commission at its fifth session, should be retained unamended.

Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that both the original draft convention and three of the proposals seeking to amend it all suffered from the same defects of inadequacy and incompleteness. The principal excuse advanced to justify those lacunae had been that the Commission on the Status of Women was not entitled, under its terms of reference, to attempt to raise standards for women independently, without reference to existing standards for men, but had as its main task the promotion of equality between the sexes. She was by no means convinced that important precedents did not exist in the work of other United Nations bodies for exceeding the narrow limits imposed by terms of reference, but in any case it would surely be impossible to accuse the

Commission of departing from its terms of reference if it attempted to take some positive action to improve the lot of women, rather than contenting itself with proclaiming their equality with men.

One of the ways in which such action could be taken was by including in the draft convention specific safeguards against discrimination on a number of grounds, as had been proposed by the Soviet Union representative. Similarly, it was vital that any privileges won must be equally enjoyed by women in Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, which was the purpose of the Soviet Union representative's proposed new article 5.

It seemed to her delegation highly regrettable that so many members of the Commission should support the principle underlying the Soviet Union amendments, and even concede the existence of the abuses which they were intended to eliminate, yet refuse to accept those amendments on purely formalistic grounds.

Her delegation would, of course, vote for the Soviet Union proposal (E/CN.6/L.60), and hoped that other delegations would follow suit.

Mrs. POPOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed her disappointment that the observations made by the majority of the members of the Commission were hardly calculated to promote the preparation of a convention which would genuinely and unreservedly endow women with the rights due to them.

Typical of the statements which had had the effect of blocking progress, and which stood in marked contrast to the progressive utterances of a few representatives, notably those of Poland the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, were the interventions of the Chilean representative, whose objections to the Soviet Union proposal in general, and in particular to the proposal that specific provision should be made for guarding against discrimination, were based on the familiar claim that such provision was already made elsewhere, particularly in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the draft International Covenant on Human Rights. But the fact that men as well as women suffered from discrimination did not constitute grounds for affirming that the Commission on the Status of Women was not competent to take up the cudgels on behalf of the

feminine sex. It was, indeed, clearly stated in the Commission's terms of reference that part of its task was to combat discrimination against women, and the question of whether that discrimination affected men as well was entirely irrelevant. It was therefore logical and proper that specific provision should be made for the elimination of discrimination on the grounds enumerated in the first three articles of the Soviet Union proposal.

The same criticism - that they, too, went beyond, the Commission's terms of reference - had been made by the Chilean and other representatives in respect of Articles 4 and 5 of the Soviet Union text. In spite of the fact that it was conceded that all necessary measures must be taken to prevent the convention from becoming a dead letter (Article 4) and to ensure that its provisions applied to all territories, whatever their status, under the jurisdiction of signatories (Article 5), support for the Soviet Union delegation's initiative was withheld on the grounds that it concerned a field that was barred to the Commission.

She herself, on the contrary, was convinced that the amendments to the original draft convention embodied in her proposal were fully in accordance with the Commission's terms of reference, and that their adoption was essential if the convention was to have any real value.

Miss KALINOWSKA (Poland) agreed with the Soviet Union representative that adoption of the Soviet Union proposal would broaden the basis of the convention without exceeding the Commission's terms of reference. Failure to adopt the Soviet Union amendments, on the other hand, would mean that the convention, if, indeed, it had any effect at all, would merely benefit a comparatively small number of already privileged women. The Chilean representative appeared to fear that there was a danger of granting too many rights to women: what that and other representatives were apparently attempting to do, was to secure the grant of too few rights to too few women. Moreover, that attempt was being justified by the invocation of such obsolete devices as obscurity of phraseology, procedural difficulties, absence of competence etc.



Miss van EEGHEN (International Council of Women), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said that most of the proposals before the Commission included statements to the effect that women should be entitled to vote in all "elections". Elections were, however, not the only means by which a people expressed its will; there existed, for example, such institutions as the referendum. It therefore seemed to her that it would be preferable either to state that "women shall be entitled to vote on equal terms with men", omitting all reference to elections, or to adopt the Brazilian delegation's formula to the effect that "the right of citizens to vote shall not be .....".

Miss LUTZ (Brazil) said that she would have refrained from commenting on the amendments suggested by other delegations had it not been for the attacks on her own proposal, especially that made by the representative of Chile.

She explained why some of the phrases used in the United States and Chilean texts appeared to her less suitable than those she had herself proposed, but declared that she felt the difference was largely one of language, rather than principle. The language need not be so precise as it would have to be if the convention were to be administered as law, since each signatory State would evolve its own legislation in its own appropriate language.

The text proposed by the Soviet Union representative, however, differed radically in three respects from all the other texts before the Commission. First, it included in its first three articles the words "without any discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, nationality, birth, property status, language or religion". That she could not regard as necessary. The world was becoming increasingly conscious of the evils of discrimination on those grounds, and the Commission had heard from the New Zealand representative of the successful solution of the racial problem in that country, a success akin to that achieved in Brazil. It was of interest, incidentally, that in Brazil the slaves had been emancipated during the two regencies of a Princess. The suggested exemption from discrimination on grounds of nationality could not, she felt, in any case be granted in the present state of the world. The right to vote in elections, and to stand for election to positions up to that of Head of a State, could only be recognized for nationals of the State concerned.

The Commission on the Status of Women, which had been set up as the result

of a Brazilian proposal, had one task and one task only: that was, to eliminate discrimination against women as women. It should not try, like Atlas, to take on its shoulders all the problems of the entire world. If it played its own part adequately, it could confidently leave others in the appropriate United Nations bodies to deal with discrimination that was not based on sex.

With regard to the special provision proposed by the Soviet Union representative, namely, that signatory States should undertake to extend the provisions of the convention to women in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, her experience led her to believe that the authorities responsible for administering such territories already appreciated the importance of keeping the status of the women in those territories at least no lower than that of the men, since otherwise the men were ultimately dragged down to the level of the women. She had heard statements to that effect made by representatives of administering authorities at the 27th International Labour Conference in 1944.

Another radical difference between the Soviet Union proposal and the others lay in the inclusion of the words "central and local" in Article 2. She considered that expression to be objectionable, in that it implied the existence of a highly centralized State administration instead of the democratic system of vesting control in the rank and file. Furthermore, it might cause difficulties for Federal States, where public and national bodies could be either municipal, state or federal, none of which was specifically central.

Finally, the Soviet Union proposal proposed the inclusion of a fourth article providing for an obligation on contracting parties to introduce legislative measures to implement the convention. It would perhaps be wise to seek the opinion of the International Law Commission before considering that point further.

The representatives of Iran, Lebanon and the Netherlands had all spoken in favour of the text adopted by the Commission at its fifth session. She would not oppose the adoption of that text, provided it were given priority over all the amendments proposed during the present session.

Mrs. GOLDMAN (United States of America) declared her willingness to withdraw her own proposal (E/CN.6/L.61) in favour of the original text, which had the support of the representatives of Iran and Lebanon, both of whom believed that the convention would help them to secure in their own countries recognition of the



political rights of women. She would, however, have to abstain from voting on the question of the appointment of women to public office, for reasons which she had already explained.

Mrs. ROMNICIANO (International Association of Penal Law and International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said that she had witnessed with great satisfaction an attempt at compromise whereby the Commission would revert to the text it had adopted at its fifth session. Since that text had been very carefully drafted by the Commission, was extremely clear and concise, and corresponded exactly to the aim of the Commission, it would, she considered, be in the general interest if it were retained.

The CHAIRMAN wished to comment, as representative of France, on the three proposals that were still before the Commission, and on the proposal made jointly by the representatives of Iran and the Lebanon.

She approved of the spirit in which the Brazilian delegation's proposal (E/CN.6/L.58) had been drafted; she could not support it, however, because it reproduced the terms of the Bogota Convention. Following the lengthy discussion to which that issue had given rise at the Commission's fifth session, she had voted for a text of wider scope, and she could not now cast a vote which conflicted with her previous one.

With regard to the Chilean proposal (E/CN.6/L.59), she thought it differed very little from the text adopted by the Commission at its fifth session, but had the advantage of being shorter.

Referring to the amendments which the Chilean representative proposed to make to the Chilean text, she observed that, although she thought it possible to incorporate in that text the amendment moved by the Netherlands delegation, she found it more difficult to agree to the amendment based on the Soviet Union proposal. The reference to central and local bodies added little to the text, and might create difficulties for Federal States; hence it did not seem desirable to include it.

Nor could she support the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union delegation (E/CN.6/L.60), because it mentioned discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, nationality, birth, property status, language or religion. She thought that the Commission must confine itself to discrimination on grounds of sex.

In addition, Article 4 of the Soviet Union proposal was pointless, since any State that signed and ratified a convention without reservation, implicitly undertook to adopt all legislative measures to ensure its implementation.

As to Article 5 of the Soviet Union proposal, she thought that that, too, related to a question outside the Commission's competence. She might add that she intended to revert to the question of the status of women in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories when item 3(c) of the agenda was discussed; for, in view of the results achieved in that field - to which she had devoted a good deal of her time - she thought that the Soviet Union representative's information must now be out of date.

She wished to stress the importance of including in the draft convention on political rights of women a provision to the effect that women should have access to any public office on equal terms with men. It was undoubtedly possible to approach the drafting of the convention from two different and equally defensible standpoints. The United States representative, for her part, considered that the Commission should endeavour to draw up as simple a text as possible in order to enable those women who did not as yet enjoy the right to vote and to stand for election to secure those rights without delay. While she (the Chairman) fully appreciated that attitude, she thought that the Commission should not overlook the fact that its object was to ensure the enjoyment of full political rights by all women; and access to public office on equal terms with men was one of those rights.

A further reason, in her opinion, for drawing up forthwith as comprehensive a convention as possible was the fact that a new convention on political rights of women would undoubtedly not be contemplated for a long time to come. She thought, furthermore, that the Commission should set an example by firmly adhering to the principles it advocated in order to avoid giving other United Nations bodies any excuse for sacrificing part of those principles.

The inclusion of a provision ensuring right of access to all public functions on equal terms with men might, it was true, create difficulties for governments anxious to accede to the convention. The French Government itself might experience such difficulties; but she considered that it was her duty as a member of the Commission to adhere to the views she had just expressed on that subject.

Moreover, still in her capacity as representative of France, she would be prepared to agree to the suggestion put forward by the representatives of Iran and Lebanon, which had already been supported by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United States of America. That solution would have the advantage of saving the Commission from having to go back on a decision taken at its fifth session, and might well, if the other proposals before the Commission failed to command a majority, provide a basis for unanimous agreement.

Miss LUTZ (Brazil), speaking to a point of order, asked for a ruling from the Chair on the order in which the Commission's original text and the amendments thereto would be put to the vote. If the Commission's text were voted on first, she would withdraw her own proposal (E/CN.6/L.58).

The CHAIRMAN explained that the United Nations had no procedure that applied specifically to the present situation. There were two possible courses: the Commission could first take a decision on the three proposals still before it (E/CN.6/L.58, E/CN.6/L.59 and E/CN.6/L.60); then, if none of those texts commanded a majority, it could take a decision on the proposal put forward by the representatives of Iran and Lebanon. Alternatively, the Commission could take decisions on all the proposals before it, including that of the Iranian and Lebanese representatives, and adopt the one that commanded most votes.

Miss LUTZ (Brazil) suggested that a vote should be taken on whether the Commission wished to vote first on the original text, or on the three substitute texts proposed by the representatives of the Soviet Union, Brazil and Chile respectively.

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) wished to state, in reply to the Soviet Union representative's remarks, that she believed her argument to have been consistent, but would not take up the Commission's time in further explanation. In reply to that representative's question concerning her views on the new Article 4 in the Soviet Union proposal, she said that she did not think that the inclusion of such an article would make any real difference to the implementation of the convention.

She regretted that the representative of Brazil should have construed her criticism of the Brazilian proposal as an attack, but suggested that they should agree to differ.

With regard to voting procedure, she suggested that the suggestion made by

the representatives of Iran and Lebanon should be regarded as a proposal to amend the Chilean proposal (E/CN.6/L.59). Article 1 in the Chilean text was identical with Article 1 of the Commission's draft; and she would accept Articles 2 and 3 of the Commission's draft in place of Article 2 in her own proposal. The remaining divergencies were of minor importance. If the Commission adopted her proposal, an introductory sentence noting the comments of governments on the text approved at the Commission's fifth session, and a reference to General Assembly resolution 56 (I), neither of which was, of course, included in the first draft, would have to be added.

Mrs. GOLDMAN (United States of America) suggested that rule 60 of the rules of procedure would show which proposal should be voted on first. She pointed out that she had withdrawn her own proposal in favour of the suggestion made by the representatives of two countries where women did not yet have the vote, and not in favour of the Chilean proposal.

Mrs. POPOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the proposals under discussion should be referred to the Committee on Resolutions, which could report the next day, probably with an agreed text that could be put to the vote.

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) supported that suggestion.

Miss LUTZ (Brazil) could not agree to the procedure suggested by the Chilean representative. If any one proposal might be regarded as an amendment to any other, the process could be continued indefinitely. She hoped that the Commission would agree to vote first on the draft agreed upon at the fifth session, either out of regard for the proposal made by the delegations of Iran and Lebanon, or on the grounds that, as an agreed decision of the Commission, it had higher priority than any proposal put forward by a single member of the Commission.

Mrs. de l'OFFICIAL (Dominican Republic) asked whether the position was not covered by rule 60 of the rules of procedure, as suggested by the United States representative.

The CHAIRMAN said that in her opinion rule 60 did not apply to the case in point.

As it was an extremely important question, which had just given rise to exhaustive discussions in the Commission, she thought it might be advisable to

adopt the Soviet Union representative's suggestion, and to refer all the texts to the Committee on Resolutions, which would endeavour, in collaboration with the sponsors of the various proposals, to draft a compromise text. Such a text would probably succeed in commanding a larger majority, a matter of some importance.

If the Committee on Resolutions succeeded in drawing up an agreed text, she would put it to the vote at the next meeting, without re-opening the discussion on the substantive issue. Otherwise, the Commission would have to take votes on all the various proposals before it.

The Soviet Union suggestion that all the texts before the Commission should be referred to the Committee on Resolutions was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.