



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL  
E/CN.6/SR.69  
22 May 1950  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Fourth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Wednesday, 10 May 1950, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Nationality of married women

- (b) Suggestions as to articles of a convention on the nationality of married women (E/CN.6/L.4/Rev.2, E/CN.6/L.5) (continued)

Addition of new items to the agenda

Statement by Mrs. Myrdal, Director of the Department of Social Affairs, concerning activities of the Social Commission likely to be of direct interest to the Commission on the Status of Women

Chairman: Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX France

<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mrs. JURDAK KHOURY	Lebanon
<u>Members:</u>	Miss McCORKINDALE	Australia
	Miss SIEU-LIN ZUNG	China
	Miss PEDERSEN	Denmark
	Mrs. TSALDARIS	Greece
	Mrs. GUERY	Haiti
	Mrs. SEN	India
	Mrs. CASTILLO LEDON	Mexico
	Mrs. PEKTAS	Turkey
	Miss SUTHERLAND	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mrs. NASON	United States of America
	Mrs. URDANETA	Venezuela

Representative of a specialized agency:

Miss FAIRCHILD	International Labour Organisation (ILO)
----------------	--

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category B:

Miss RYDH	}	International Alliance of Women
Mrs. BAKER VAN DEN BERG		
Mrs. CARTER		International Council of Women
Miss TOMLINSON		International Federation of Business and Professional Women
Miss ARNOLD		World's Young Women's Christian Association
Mrs. FREEMAN		Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations

Secretariat:

Mrs. MYRDAL	Director of the Department of Social Affairs
Mr. LIN MOUSHENG	Human Rights Division
Mrs. MENON	Secretary of the Commission

/NATIONALITY

## NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

(b) Suggestions as to articles of a convention on the nationality of married women (E/CN.6/L.4/Rev.2, E/CN.6/L.5) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee to introduce the Committee's draft resolution on the nationality of married women.

2. Mrs. URDANETA (Venezuela), Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, said the Committee had thought it logical that the title of the draft should retain the words "nationality of married women" which had always been used in the reports. She then read the draft resolution which later appeared as document E/CN.6/L.4/Rev.2.

3. Miss SUTHERLAND (United Kingdom), speaking on the order of the last two paragraphs in the French text of the draft, said paragraph 3 dealt with the same subject as paragraph 1 and hence should logically immediately follow paragraph 1. Paragraph 2, by contrast, dealt with the distinct question of the transmission of nationality to a child and hence should come at the end of the draft.\*

That proposal was adopted.

4. Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark), speaking on paragraph 3, proposed that the reference to jus sanguinis should be dropped as unnecessary, and proposed the following wording: "Requests the Economic and Social Council to instruct the appropriate bodies of the United Nations to give further consideration to the problem of the transmission to a child of the nationality of either spouse". Furthermore, paragraph 2 referred to "the principles stated in paragraph 1 above" whereas in paragraph 1 the Commission was suggesting a certain "content" for the articles relating to the nationality of married women. She felt that the same language should be employed in both paragraphs.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the Danish representative's suggestion could easily be met by using the word "principles" in both paragraphs.

---

\* Note: This does not affect the English text

6. Miss SIEU-LIN ZUNG (China) pointed out that the order of the two paragraphs in document E/CN.6/L.4/Rev.2 was such that the words "stated in paragraph 1 above" were redundant, as it was quite clear which paragraph was meant; hence the words in question should be deleted.

That proposal was adopted.

7. The CHAIRMAN asked for the Commission's views on the new wording proposed by the Danish representative for paragraph 3.

8. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) thought that the Danish representative's proposed text for paragraph 3 should be supplemented by stating that the problem, which the Economic and Social Council directed the appropriate bodies of the United Nations to consider, was the transmission of the nationality of either spouse to a child "on the basis of equality".

9. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the United States representative's proposal. The Danish representative's text had not given sufficient prominence to the principle of the equality of rights of both parents in so far as the transmission of their respective nationalities to the child was concerned.

10. Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) said that her delegation was agreeable to the United States representative's proposal. The current discussion concerned only the form of the draft resolution, and her delegation, while making certain drafting suggestions, reserved the right to speak on the substance of the draft later.

11. The CHAIRMAN asked members whether they were prepared to adopt the draft, as amended, at once.

12. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) said she still had some misgivings about the form of the draft, particularly the form of paragraph 3.

13. The CHAIRMAN

13. The CHAIRMAN proposed that in view of the importance of the question, the Commission should defer a vote until members had had an opportunity of seeing the text, as amended, in writing.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

#### ADDITION OF NEW ITEMS TO THE AGENDA

14. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission should not revert to item 3 of the agenda (political rights of women) at once, as the Commission had not yet received a definite answer from the Commission on Human Rights regarding that matter; the Commission on Human Rights had not yet decided whether it would consider fresh proposals to amend to the draft Covenant on Human Rights.

15. Accordingly she proposed that the Commission should consider the addition of new items to the agenda.

16. Miss SUTHERLAND (United Kingdom) recalled that the Economic and Social Council had endorsed a resolution adopted at the second session of the Commission on the Status of Women asking the Secretary-General to keep the Commission informed of progress in subjects under consideration by the Social Commission, likely to be of direct interest to the Commission on the Status of Women. But at its third session the Commission had received only a short and relatively incomplete statement. The Social Commission had held two sessions since then. The Commission might therefore hear a statement from the Director of the Department of Social Affairs concerning the activities of the Social Commission, which were directly related to its own. That would require the addition of a new item to the agenda.

17. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) supported the United Kingdom representative's suggestion, for she was sure the Social Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women had a large number of points of common interest.

18. Mr. LIN MOUSHENG (Division of Human Rights) said that, if the Commission wished, the Director of the Department of Social Affairs or her representative could be asked to make a statement on the work of the Social Commission.

/19. Mrs. TSALDARIS

19. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) supported that suggestion; it seemed to her that it would be easier to co-ordinate the work of the Social Commission and that of the Commission on the Status of Women in the light of such a statement.

20. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, while there was nothing to prevent the Commission from asking Mrs. Myrdal to make a statement, it should be clearly understood that the Commission could not intervene in the work of the Social Commission and was not qualified to take any decision on the matter. After hearing the statement, the Commission would be in a position to decide whether the Department of Social Affairs should be asked to submit an annual report in writing on the activities of the Social Commission.

21. She accordingly proposed that the following item should be added to the provisional agenda: "Statement by the Secretariat concerning the different activities of United Nations organs which may be of direct interest to the Commission on the Status of Women".

22. Miss SUTHERLAND (United Kingdom), while approving the Chairman's suggestion in principle, said the Commission should proceed with caution lest it was inundated with information which had no direct bearing on its work. In her opinion, it should limit its request for information to the activities of the Social Commission, which, at the moment, was the one whose activities were most closely related to the work of the Commission on the Status of Women.

23. Nor need the Commission consider the whole of the Social Commission's report; all it needed was information concerning aspects of the Social Commission's work of direct interest to the Commission on the Status of Women; it would then be possible to co-ordinate the efforts of both Commissions with a consequent saving of time and personnel for the Secretariat.

24. The CHAIRMAN thought that, in order to meet the view of the United Kingdom representative, the additional item of the agenda should be worded as follows: "Statement by the Secretariat on the questions under consideration by the Social Commission which may be of direct interest to the Commission on the Status of Women."

/25. Miss McCORKINDALE

25. Miss McCORKINDALE (Australia) agreed with the United Kingdom representative's view and thought that the new item on the agenda should be placed immediately before item 8 on the existing agenda (E/CN.6/128) (application of penal law to women).

26. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that when the Commission came to adopt its report, it could decide the order of the items on its agenda with a view to making the report as coherent as possible. The Australian representative's suggestion could be taken up again then.

27. Mr. LIN MOUSHENG (Division of Human Rights) said that, in his opinion, a statement on the work of the Social Commission need not form the subject of an additional item on the agenda, as the Secretariat was always at the disposal of the Commission whenever a statement of that kind was required.

28. Mrs. URDANETA (Venezuela) and Mrs. PEKTAS (Turkey) considered that Mrs. Myrdal should simply be invited to present a statement on activities of the Social Commission which might be of direct interest to the Commission on the Status of Women.

It was so decided.

29. Mrs. SEN (India) enquired if the Status of Women Section could not prepare a concise annual report on aspects of the work of the different United Nations organs which might be of direct interest to the Commission. That section was undoubtedly in the best position to decide what those aspects were. Moreover, her delegation felt that the Commission should consider the possible reorganization of the section, which should contain a larger number of staff qualified to prepare a report of the kind asked for; several members of the Commission had recognized the need for such a report, which should be submitted to the Commission before the opening of each session.

30. Members of the Commission had had the experience of receiving a large number of documents, which should have reached them at a much earlier date, too late to study them fully or too late to ask their Governments for instructions. The delay was solely due to the fact that the existing staff of the section was inadequate. If the Commission on the Status of Women was to carry out its proper  
/functions,

functions, the section must be enlarged, possibly made into a division of the Secretariat. The expanded section could then undertake the production of an annual bulletin on the progress achieved by women in countries in which their position was still unsatisfactory.

31. She therefore formally proposed the addition of the following item to the agenda: "Reorganization of the Status of Women Section".

32. The CHAIRMAN said the subject under consideration was the addition of new items to the agenda; points of substance should not therefore be raised.

33. Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) said the Indian representative's proposal conveyed the impression that the section in question was completely disorganized. It would be preferable to speak of the "organization" of the Status of Women Section.

34. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) agreed with the representative of India that the Status of Women Section, if strengthened, would be able to give more effective help to the women of the whole world in obtaining their full political rights.

35. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) thought it was quite natural for the members of the Commission to be anxious to obtain effective assistance for the Status of Women Section. However, the Commission is interested primarily in giving effect to its programme of work. It would thus be more logical to describe the additional item of the agenda as "programme of work for the Commission". That item should be placed immediately before the item: "adoption of the Commission's report, which would then become item 14.

36. Mrs. SEN (India) said she could not agree to the Danish representative's suggestion that the word "reorganization" in her proposal should be replaced by the word "organization". The Secretariat was already organized but that organization should be improved in certain directions.

37. Her intention was certainly not to criticize the Status of Women Section or Mrs. Menon, of whose keenness and competence she was well aware. On the contrary she wished to give that section of the Secretariat the facilities which would enable it to make a greater contribution to the work of the Commission on the Status of Women.

38. She did not consider the United States proposal satisfactory either and that she therefore urged the Commission to include the following item on its agenda: "Reorganization of the Secretariat".

39. Mrs. JURDAK KHOURY (Lebanon) agreed with the representative of India on the necessity for reorganizing the Status of Women Section. The Commission would be in a better position to give an opinion on that question nearer the end of its session by which time it would have decided what questions and problems it proposed to deal with at the next session and consequently would know what work would have to be carried out by the Status of Women Section. That section should have sufficient staff to be able to prepare and present in good time all the documentary material relating to the various items on the Commission's agenda.

40. Miss SUTHERLAND (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of Lebanon that the Commission would be able to express itself more definitely on this question when it had decided on its work programme for 1951. The proposal of the United States representative put the matter logically. If the Commission wished to place the item suggested by the representative of India on its agenda it should follow the procedure indicated by the representative of the United States; and it should merely stress, with reference to its work programme, that it was necessary for the Secretariat to have sufficient staff to carry out all the preparatory work.

41. She wished to point out, however, that when the Commission on the Status of Women had transmitted a resolution dealing with the same subject to the Economic and Social Council the previous year, the Council had stated that the organization of the Secretariat was a matter for the Secretary-General. The Council would almost certainly again adopt the same attitude.

/42. Mrs. JURDAK KHOURY

42. Mrs. JURDAK KHOURY (Lebanon), while appreciating that Secretariat matters were questions for the Secretary-General, pointed out that he had always been very anxious to hear the Commission's views. She reminded the Commission that in the past its requests in that connexion had been met when it had voiced them.

43. Mrs. CASTILLO LEDON (Mexico) seconded the Indian representative's proposal as originally formulated.

44. Miss McCORKINDALE (Australia) thought that the Indian and United States proposals should be combined. The Commission should include the question of its work programme on the agenda and that question should be examined from the point of view of the work to be done by the Secretariat and also from the point of view of co-ordination with the specialized agencies. If the Commission adopted that procedure, it would avoid giving the impression that it was criticizing the way in which the Secretariat was organized.

45. The CHAIRMAN did not think it advisable to mention the specialized agencies explicitly in the agenda. If the Commission agreed that the United States and Indian proposals should be combined, it might perhaps adopt the following text:

"Work programme and organization of the Secretariat".

46. Mrs. URDENATA (Venezuela) and Mrs. SEN (India) supported the Chairman's proposal.

It was decided that an item entitled "Work programme and organization of the Secretariat" should be placed on the Commission's agenda.

47. The CHAIRMAN stated that in her opinion it would be preferable to leave open the question of the order of the various items on the Commission's agenda. It would be preferable to leave the Rapporteur free, in his report, to arrange the various questions studied in the order which he considered most logical and coherent.

It was so agreed.

48. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) proposed the addition of the following two items to the Commission's agenda:

1. "Problem of the Greek mothers whose children have not yet been repatriated";
2. "Consideration of the provisions of civil law concerning women generally".

49. She explained that she was asking for the inclusion of the second item because she wanted the Commission to request the Secretariat to prepare a report on the question and to submit it to the next session.

50. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the representative of Greece had already submitted a draft resolution (E/CN.6/L.2) in connexion with item 6 on the Commission's agenda "Property rights of married women" and that the subject dealt with in that resolution was similar to the second item which the Greek delegation had just proposed. She asked whether the representative of Greece would prefer the Commission to examine that question together with item 6 or whether she would like it to form a separate item on the Commission's agenda, in which case it could be considered from a more general point of view.

51. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said she would agree to whatever the Commission decided.

52. The CHAIRMAN said the item proposed by the representative of Greece was very important. Indeed the Commission had never undertaken a general examination of the status of women as affected by civil law.

53. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) said she would prefer to refer the question to the Committee on Questionnaires.

54. The CHAIRMAN thought that that might be the best solution, since the questionnaire itself would form the only basis for such a study. The Commission would accordingly deal with the question when it came to consider the report of the Committee on the Questionnaire.

55. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) agreed to that procedure.

It was decided to place the following item on the agenda: "Problem of the Greek mothers whose children have not yet been repatriated."

The item: "Consideration of the provisions of civil law concerning women generally" was referred to the Committee on the Questionnaire."

56. Mrs. CASTILLO LEDON (Mexico) proposed the addition of the following two items to the Commission's agenda:

1. "Statement by the representative of the Inter-American Commission on Women;
2. "Report by the representative of the Commission on the Status of Women on the Commission on Human Rights".

57. The CHAIRMAN was sure that the Commission would be very happy to hear the representative of the Inter-American Commission on Women and also to hear the annual report of its own representative on the Commission on Human Rights, as was its annual practice.

58. She pointed out moreover that the Commission should also hear the report of its representative on the Sub-Commission for the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities.

The Mexican representative's proposals and the Chairman's own suggestion were adopted.

59. Mrs. JURDAK KHOURY (Lebanon) recalled that the choice of Beirut as the meeting place for the third session of the Commission on the Status of Women had produced excellent results, and she thought that the Commission should bear in mind the possibility of holding its fifth session away from the United Nations Headquarters area.

60. Mrs. URDANETA (Venezuela), supporting the Lebanese representative's suggestion, said it had been mentioned that one of the Latin American States might invite the Commission for its next session.

/61. The CHAIRMAN

61. The CHAIRMAN said she gathered that the Commission was prepared to agree to the Lebanese representative's proposal; still, it was not advisable to make that question a separate item on the Commission's agenda and accordingly she suggested that it should be considered under the heading "work programme".

It was so agreed.

62. The CHAIRMAN said she also wished to add an item to the Commission's agenda. It was a rather specialized item which several women's organizations had asked her to bring before the Commission on the Status of Women. It concerned the women (few of whom had survived) who had been deported to nazi concentration camps and had been used for so-called scientific experiments. They did not receive any assistance whatsoever and it was desirable that international action should be taken on their behalf. That question might be considered after the item proposed by Greece concerning women whose children had not yet been repatriated.

It was decided to place the question proposed by the Chairman on the Commission's agenda.

63. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the item "other questions" had been deleted from the provisional agenda at the request of the United Kingdom representative. The list of questions to be dealt with by the Commission during its current session should therefore be considered closed.

#### NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

(b) Suggestions as to articles of a convention on the nationality of married women (E/CN.6/L.5) (continued)

64. The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the revised draft resolution proposed by the Resolutions Committee (E/CN.6/L.5).

65. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) said it had seemed advisable to retain the reference to "jus sanguinis" in paragraph 3. A child's nationality could be determined either by its place of birth (in the case of a country which accepted the principle of jus soli), or by the nationality of its parents (in the case of a country where the doctrine of jus sanguinis applied). In the

/case of

case of jus soli the father and the mother had equal rights. The question of unequal rights only arose in the case of jus sanguinis, and that was what should be stressed in the draft resolution.

66. Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) was still convinced that it was inadvisable to use words "jus sanguinis", which were not sufficiently precise in meaning. She would not press that point, however, since in any case her delegation considered that the problem of the transmission of nationality to children should not be raised in connexion with a convention dealing with the nationality of married women.

67. Miss McCORKENDALE (Australia) did not think it advisable to retain the words "under the doctrine of jus sanguinis" as it was quite clear from the context that the question at issue in the paragraph was the transmission of nationality by the parents.

68. The CHAIRMAN accordingly proposed that the words "under the doctrine of jus sanguinis" should be deleted.

69. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) and Mrs. URDANETA (Venezuela) agreed to the deletion of those words.

70. Mrs. de CASTILLO LEDON (Mexico) also agreed to the Chairman's proposal. She pointed out that the question might be re-examined when the convention came to be prepared.

71. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) proposed that the words "shall leave either spouse without nationality" should be substituted for the words "shall affect the nationality of either spouse" in sub-paragraph (b).

72. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) considered that that principle was in any case implicit in sub-paragraph (b). Loss of nationality was in fact one of the possible consequences of marriage or its dissolution on the nationality of either spouse.

73. Moreover,

73. Moreover, the Montevideo Convention on Nationality, which a number of countries had already signed and ratified, contained a provision similar to that in sub-paragraph (b). Accordingly it was preferable to allow the first sentence of the sub-paragraph to stand unchanged.

74. Mrs. CASTILLO LEDON (Mexico) concurred with the United States representative. The amendment proposed by the Greek representative would unduly restrict the scope of sub-paragraph (b), which had a much broader and more general meaning as it stood.

75. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said that, in that case, she would be obliged to abstain from voting on sub-paragraph (b), as she had not received instructions from her Government.

76. Mrs. Tsaldaris wondered whether it was wise to use the expression "embodying" in the English text of paragraph 2. The Commission, by using that word, would appear to be prejudging the Council's decision on the contents of the future convention. Perhaps the words "taking into account" might be more apposite.

77. Mrs. URDANETA (Venezuela) thought that the difficulty to which the Greek representative had drawn attention could be met by using the word "recommends" in place of "requests".

78. Miss SUTHERLAND (United Kingdom) pointed out that in its previous resolutions the Commission had used various expressions such as "recommends", "requests", etc. There seemed to be no reason why the Commission should not use any of those expressions as it was open to the Council to accept, reject or amend the Commission's decisions.

79. Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) enquired what was the scope of the Commission's competence in that direction: was it competent to make recommendations and suggestions to the Economic and Social Council or could it request the Council to give effect to the one or other of its decisions?

/ 80. Mr. LIN MOUSHENG

80. Mr. LIN MOUSHENG (Secretariat) replied that in United Nations terminology the words "recommendations, suggestions and request" were used more or less indiscriminately. The draft resolution before the Commission was fully acceptable as to form and the Commission was definitely entitled to request the Economic and Social Council to take the steps contemplated in the draft.

81. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) drew the Commission's attention to a discrepancy between the English and French texts. Paragraph 2 of the French text stated that the convention "sera basée" ("based") on the principles stated in paragraph 1, whereas the English text used the word "embodying".

82. Miss SUTHERLAND (United Kingdom) thought that the word "embodying" meant that those principles would be incorporated in the convention, while the French expression "basée sur" ("based on") meant that the convention would be based on those principles although they were not necessarily <sup>complete</sup> expressed in the convention.

83. The words "taking into account" might be used in the English text to which the words "prenant en considération" would correspond in the French text.

84. The CHAIRMAN remarked that she was entirely satisfied with the French text.

85. Mrs. NASON (United States of America) explained that, not being a representative of the United States but only an alternate, she would not be able to vote. The United States representative had been unable to attend that afternoon but would be present the following day. Still, though unable to vote on the draft resolution if it was put to the vote, she was authorized to say that her Government supported the draft resolution.

86. Mrs. SEN (India) hoped that the vote would be postponed as she expected to receive, before the next day's meeting her Government's detailed instructions, which would enable her to reach a decision concerning the draft resolution.

87. The CHAIRMAN stated that in that case the draft resolution would not be put to the vote until the afternoon meeting of Thursday, 11 May.

It was so decided.

STATEMENT BY MRS. MYRDAL (DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS) ON THE WORK OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION WHICH MIGHT BE OF DIRECT INTEREST TO THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

88. Mrs. MYRDAL (Secretariat) said that the Social Commission's activity covered the entire social field and hence the activities of a number of separate commissions and specialized agencies. In the early days of the United Nations, the Department of Social Affairs had had to deal with a great number of problems which had since become subjects of study for different commissions or specialized agencies.

89. The Social Commission was responsible for the co-ordination of the various aspects of the work and reported to the Economic and Social Council on the manner and results of that co-ordination.

90. In certain respects the Social Commission's work was so similar to that of other bodies that it was difficult to draw a hard and fast line between their various activities. So far as points of common interest to the Social Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women, in particular, were concerned, certain questions on the Social Commission's agenda had not been studied very thoroughly as that Commission felt that they were essentially matters for the Commission on the Status of Women. Thus, a draft resolution intended to draw the "welfare of women" into the purview of the Social Commission had been withdrawn after discussion.

91. A perusal of the Social Commission's report (E/CN.5/L.113) showed that the work programme contained one operational part, under the heading Advisory Social Welfare Services, and one general part covering the social areas open for international action.

92. Social services to be rendered directly to Governments were of several kinds: the first was direct assistance to Governments; that term covered the vast programme of technical assistance which was financed by an operational budget and under which, in particular, consultant experts were sent to the various countries on their request to advise on the teaching of new social techniques; further, it covered the establishment of fellowships and seminars and the supply of technical publications and films.

93. The work programme for the Social Activities Division also included the preparation of a programme of technical information through the establishment of a technical reference centre covering all social questions, and through the publication of periodical information bulletins and a legislative series.

94. The Commission on the Status of Women might, to a certain extent, take advantage of those various services and might also suggest the use of similar methods in solving the special problems with which it dealt.

95. The fields of action were divided into the following categories:

(1) Study of world living conditions. General studies on standards of living, particularly in underdeveloped areas, were continuing and developing. As part of those studies, preliminary inquiries might be made in the countries which applied to the United Nations for technical assistance before such assistance was rendered to them. There was also under preparation a general survey of the world's social conditions. The Commission on the Status of Women would doubtless find that some special aspects of those studies were of particular interest to it.

(2) Planning, organization and administration of social services. The Social Commission had studies under way on the administration of social services, as well as on the training of social welfare staff. That aspect of the Social Commission's work was only of indirect interest to the Commission on the Status of Women.

(3) Community, family and child welfare. The Social Commission had considered that topic in three parts:

a) Economic: The Social Commission had given much attention to the question of studying what economic measures are available to families in order to offset the extra costs to them in bringing up their children. Family allowances (with which the ILO was dealing more particularly), and school meals, were among the numerous measures considered.

/b) Social:

b) Social: The Social Commission had given its attention to the question of certain groups of persons such as the aged, migrants, needy foreigners and refugees. The situation of children was of especial interest to the Commission. The Social Commission had stressed the problem of physically and mentally handicapped children as well as homeless children, both of these tasks to be carried out in co-operation with the specialized agencies. The special problem of UNICEF had also been considered and participation in some UNICEF projects organized.

c) Legal: The previous day, she had submitted a list of child welfare studies showing the scope and type of questions with which the Social Commission had dealt, as those were the closest of all to the interest of the Commission on the Status of Women.

(4) Social Defence. That topic included the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, and prostitution. The League of Nations had given much attention to the question of prostitution and drawn up a convention which had recently been revised and amended, and the General Assembly at its fourth session had adopted a new convention for the suppression of the traffic in persons and of the exploitation of the prostitution of others. That whole field of social defence was certainly a matter of interest to the Commission on the Status of Women, for it required the study of a number of questions such as systems of parole, juvenile delinquency, probation and rehabilitation where women might be directly concerned.

(5) Social rehabilitation of the physically handicapped: That topic had been included on the work programme recently. It was unlikely to be of more than indirect interest to the Commission on the Status of Women.

(6) Housing and town and country planning. Certain aspects, such as improvement of amenities in rural housing and the consideration of children's needs in town planning, might be of interest to the Commission on the Status of Women. The Section was publishing a bulletin, and maintaining a technical reference centre.

96. In conclusion she said that owing to the short time at her disposal she had been unable to prepare a written statement or to make a considered selection from among the questions dealt with by the Social Commission of those that could truly be said to be of special interest to the Commission on the Status of women, but that she hoped the review had indicated certain points of possible collaboration.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mrs. Myrdal for her survey which had given the Commission a clear idea of those problems dealt with by the Social Commission which might be of interest to the Commission on the Status of Women.

Miss SUTHERLAND (United Kingdom) also thanked Mrs. Myrdal and said that she was glad to have at her disposal such clear and accurate information; it was essential that the Commission on the Status of Women should be able to determine how far it could use the work already accomplished by the Social Commission. The Commission on the Status of Women might with advantage regularly receive a general survey of the kind it had just heard from Mrs. Myrdal.

Mrs. JURDAK KHOURY (Lebanon) also thanked Mrs. Myrdal and enquired what means the Social Commission had of giving effect to its decisions.

Mrs. MYRDAL (Secretariat), in reply, said that the Social Commission's decisions were submitted to the Economic and Social Council and then to the General Assembly. The same Department in the Secretariat was responsible for carrying out the decisions of both the Social Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women. Accordingly close co-operation between the two Commissions would be attainable in the Secretariat without any need for official action. The Social Commission had many different methods of executing its decisions; it made general recommendations, drafted conventions, published annual reports; a different method was that employed by the Social Commission in connexion with child welfare for which it had prepared a draft declaration on the rights of the child.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.