

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

E/AC.7/SR.39
2 March 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Sixth Session

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York
Friday, 27 February 1948, at 2.45 p.m.

Present:

Chairman: Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)

Australia	Mr. JOCKEL
Brazil	Mr. de SOUZA-GOMEZ
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. URALOVA
Canada	Mr. CURRY
Chile	Mr. LARRAIN
China	Mr. WU
Denmark	Mr. DICK
France	Miss LABEYRIE
Lebanon	Mr. AZKOUL
Netherlands	Mr. van der MANDELE
New Zealand	Mr. SUTCH
	Mr. LENDRUM
Peru	Mr. LABARTHER
Turkey	Mr. KURAL
United Kingdom	Mr. MAYHEW
	Mr. MORGAN
United States of America	Mr. STINEBOWER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BORISOV
Venezuela	Mr. PEREZ PEROZO

Also Present:

Mrs. COSMA

Rapporteur, Status of
Women Commission

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization Mr. METALL

NOTE: Corrections of this summary record provided for in the rules of procedure should be submitted in writing within the prescribed period to Mr. Delavanay, Director, Editorial Division, Room CC-87, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter written on headed notepaper and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent" and bearing the appropriate symbol number.

RECEIVED

3 MAR 1948

UNITED NATIONS

Secretariat

Sir Raphael CILENTO	Director, Social Activities Division
Mr. SCHWELB	Assistant Director, Division of Human Rights
Mr. HERMAN	Deputy Director, Conference Co-ordination Division
Mr. MESSING-MIERZEJEWSKI	Secretary of the Committee

CONTINUATION OF THE DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN: RESOLUTIONS FOR URGENT CONSIDERATION (Documents E/615, E/615/Add.1, E/615/Add.2, E/615/Corr.1, E/615/Corr.2, E/AC.7/W.19, E/AC.7/W.19/Add.1 and E/AC.7/W.19/Corr.1)

The

The CHAIRMAN reported that, in his capacity as Chairman of the Social Committee, he had consulted with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with members of the Secretariat with respect to the procedural difficulties which had arisen at the previous meeting. The conclusion reached was that the meeting had been conducted strictly in accordance with the Council's rules of procedure, and that all the decisions taken were legal.

Resolution 2, Educational Opportunities for Women (document E/AC.7/W.19)

Mrs. URALOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that, as a representative of her country, she had been fully entitled to propose amendments to the resolution in question. Nevertheless, in order to help resolve the procedural difficulty in which the Committee found itself, she withdrew her amendment to resolution 2, while reserving the right to present it at the seventh session of the Council.

Mr. CURRY (Canada) expressed his gratitude to the Byelorussian representative for her action.

Miss LABAYRIE (France) joined Mr. Curry in thanking the Byelorussian representative, who had had the right to present her amendment.

/She was equally

She was equally grateful to the Rapporteur of the Commission on the Status of Women for having selected the most urgent items in the Commission's report and having brought them to the Council's attention. She hoped, however, that in the future the Council would insist upon the strict observance of the six weeks rule.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) also wished to express his gratitude to the Byelorussian representative. As he had said before, the difficulty in which the Committee had found itself had been of a purely procedural nature; he was looking forward to a full discussion of the entire report of the Commission on the Status of Women at the next session of the Council.

Resolution 2 was approved, the USSR representative abstaining.

Resolution 3, Economic Rights of Women (document E/AC.7/W.19)

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) called attention to the fact that the next item on the agenda of the Committee dealt with the principle of equal pay for equal work for men and women, as did resolution 3.

It was decided to consider resolution 3 together with the next item on the agenda.

Resolution 4, International Bill of Human Rights (document E/AC.7/W.19)

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled the decision of the Council not to discuss any drafts of the International Bill of Human Rights at the present session. He therefore suggested that the Committee might take note of resolution 4, but should not approve it before it had been considered by the Commission on Human Rights and the Drafting Committee.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) supported the observations of the USSR representative. In that spirit, he suggested that the first paragraph should be amended to read: "Transmits to the Commission on Human Rights and its Drafting Committee suggestions of the Commission on the Status of Women for amendments to the draft International Declaration of Human Rights."

/Mr. BORISOV

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) approved the text suggested by the United States representative, understanding it to mean that the Council had not examined the substance of the amendments suggested by the Commission and did not express approval of them.

The first paragraph, as amended by the United States representative, was adopted.

Resolution 4 was adopted.

Resolution 5, Place of Meeting of the Third Session (documents E/AC.7/W.19, E/AC.7/W.19/Add.1, E/AC.7/69 and E/615/Add.2)

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) introduced his amended version of resolution 5 (document E/AC.7/69). As it had not appeared necessary to have a formal resolution to the effect that the Commission on the Status of Women should hold its next session in Lebanon, the second paragraph of the original resolution had been omitted. The second paragraph of the United States proposal contained the stipulation that the holding of the session away from headquarters must involve no additional expense to the United Nations. According to the estimate presented by the Secretary-General (document E/615/Add.2) there would be additional expense, which the Lebanese Government had offered to meet. The last paragraph of the United States proposal was merely a simplification of the original text.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) called attention to the fact that the United States proposal did not mention the length of the session; should that session be prolonged unduly, unforeseen expenses would arise for which his Government could not accept the responsibility. Moreover, the Lebanese Government had envisaged the figure of \$30,000; according to the Secretary-General's estimate, the additional cost of a three-week session would be about \$34,500. He was not sure whether his Government was prepared to make up that difference.

/As a matter of

As a matter of principle, the United Nations should not shirk from paying the extra cost of a session which it wished to be held away from headquarters. While he was greatly desirous that the next session of the Commission should be held in his country, Mr. Azkoul found himself unable to vote for the United States proposal; he hoped that the United States representative would suggest a compromise.

Mr. STINEBOWLER (United States of America) remarked that there was no difference of purpose between himself and the Lebanese representative. In order to limit the session, he accepted the insertion of the words "of not more than three weeks" after the words "the 1949 session" in the second paragraph of his proposal. He pointed out, however, that conferences were frequently prolonged beyond the time-limits set for them.

He recalled that the offer of the Lebanese Government to supply \$30,000 had been based on an informal estimate of additional expense amounting to that figure; the official estimate, however, was somewhat higher. As the same problem would undoubtedly arise in the future, he thought that, as a matter of general principle, additional expenses of sessions held away from Lake Success or Geneva should not be borne by the United Nations.

Mr. WU (China) inquired whether any administrative difficulties might arise if the next session of the Commission were held in Lebanon. He expressed the fear that the generous offer of the Lebanese Government might constitute a precedent for other Commissions to hold their sessions away from headquarters.

Mr. EBERMAN (Secretariat) stated that the figures in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's estimate (document E/615/Add.2) represented as accurate an estimate as was possible until the Lebanese Government had been consulted with respect to the staff and services which it intended to supply.

/As regards

As regards administrative problems, much would depend on the budgetary decisions of the next session of the General Assembly. While a certain loss of efficiency might be involved by sending staff away from headquarters, the exact amount was difficult to estimate at the present stage.

Mrs. URALOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that the Commission on the Status of Women was grateful for the invitation of the Lebanese Government, which would permit it to have a wider exchange of views with women from other countries. The previous sessions of the Commission had lasted only two weeks; the additional expense for that period was estimated at \$30,000, the figure offered by the Lebanese Government. She hoped that the Committee would approve the holding of the next session, which could be of two weeks' duration, in Lebanon.

For reasons of clarity, she preferred the original text of the Commission's resolution (document E/AC.7/W.19/Add.1) to the United States proposal (document E/AC.7/69).

The CHAIRMAN remarked that, as the United States proposal constituted an amendment to the original resolution, it would be put to the vote first.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) recalled that there were valid reasons to accept the invitation of the Lebanese Government. If the holding of the next session of the Commission in Lebanon resulted in benefit to the cause of the United Nations, the United Nations should be prepared to pay any expense over and above the sum of \$30,000 which the Lebanese Government, with its limited resources, had been able to offer. He pointed out that the United Nations would pay the total cost of holding the next session of the General Assembly in France.

/Miss LABEYRIE

Miss LABBYRIE (France) supported the remarks of the Lebanese representative. As the difference in question could not be great, there was no need to retain in the United States proposal the stipulation with regard to additional expense.

Mr. MAYHEW (United Kingdom) suggested that, as it was inappropriate for the Council to urge private organizations to take an action, the word "Urges" in the last paragraph of the United States proposal might be replaced by: "Takes note with satisfaction of the suggestion by the Commission".

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) accepted the United Kingdom amendment to his proposal.

Mr. KURAT (Turkey) stated that while in general his delegation was opposed to the holding of sessions away from headquarters because of the expense involved, the actual difference in cost in the present case was small. He felt that the Committee should not accept a proposal which might make it impossible for the Commission on the Status of Women to sit in Lebanon. In particular, he could not accept the second paragraph of the United States text.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) expressed appreciation of the Lebanese Government's invitation. Before the Committee came to a decision, it was necessary that it should know definitely what sums that decision involved. It should not adopt any decision which left the resulting cost to the United Nations indefinite.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) agreed that definite information was required. He pointed out that the estimates presented by the Secretary-General, of approximately \$30,000 for a two-week session or \$34,500 for a three-week session, did not include certain costs, such as those of conference rooms, offices, equipment and local transportation.

/He wondered

He wondered what the actual amount of those costs might be, and what part of them might be supplied by the Lebanese Government. Unless the total cost were known, there was no choice but to leave the total additional expense to the Lebanese Government.

Mr. BERMAN (Secretariat) remarked that the costs referred to by the United States representative as not being included in the estimates given by the Secretary-General were normally defrayed by host Governments.

Mr. KURAL (Turkey) suggested that the words "provided the holding... to the United Nations" should be deleted from the second paragraph of the United States amendment.

The proposal was rejected by nine votes to six, with two abstentions.

Mr. MAYHEW (United Kingdom) declared that his delegation had warmly welcomed the invitation of the Lebanese Government, but that it held, as it had in the past, that the United Nations should not be burdened with the extra costs arising from holding meetings away from headquarters and should particularly avoid making commitments of an indefinite character. To that end, he proposed to amend the United States document (E/AC.7/69) by adding after the words "in Lebanon" in the second paragraph, "provided that he should further consult the Council if the arrangements are found to involve substantial extra costs to the United Nations over those of a meeting at headquarters".

Mrs. LABEYRIE (France) thought that there might be an advantage in making a reference to European headquarters in the United Kingdom amendment because there might be no difference in cost between holding a meeting in Lebanon and holding one in Geneva. In that case the Council would have no grounds to object since the principle of decentralization had been firmly accepted by all.

/Mr. MAYHEW

Mr. MAYHEW (United Kingdom) thought that the French suggestion might be acceptable.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) pointed out that Mr. Mayhew's amendment did not serve to make the United Nations commitments any more definite, since the word "substantial" was open to various and subjective interpretations. Furthermore, it merely delegated the task of determining whether the additional costs were "substantial" to the Secretary-General and postponed final decision until the seventh session of the Council. He suggested that an actual figure should be used in the amendment.

Mr. MAYHEW (United Kingdom) observed that the Secretariat could always consult with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Matters.

Mr. CURRY (Canada) thought that a definite answer from the Lebanese representative concerning the readiness of his Government to assume the expenses for conference rooms, offices, and the other items enumerated on page 2 of document E/615/Add.2, might considerably hasten a decision of the Committee.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) considered that the Committee should decide in principle on the desirability of having the Commission on the Status of Women hold its next session in his country. Decisions on financial questions could be left for the seventh session of the Council; by that time, the Secretariat could have consulted with his government and received all the information it required.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) could not agree with the proposal to approve the Commission's meeting in Lebanon "in principle", while leaving all financial questions completely out of consideration. The procedure in his opinion should be quite the reverse.

/Mr. STINEBOWER

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) thought that the United Kingdom amendment met the wishes of the Lebanese representative and could satisfy the representative of New Zealand as well.

The words "requests the Secretary-General to make suitable arrangements" presupposed that a decision had been adopted; the further wording of the amendment specified that consultations would be carried on concerning the financial aspects of the question. He was ready to accept the United Kingdom amendment, but would suggest that the words "at its seventh session" should be added after the word "Council".

Referring to Mrs. Labeyrie's suggestion, he pointed out that in view of the geographic distribution of the members of the Commission on the Status of Women, the cost of holding a session in Geneva might be less than that of holding one at Lake Success. He suggested that the cost of a meeting at Lake Success should be the only basis for comparison.

Mrs. LABEYRIE (France) agreed, and withdrew her proposal.

The United Kingdom amendment, as modified by Mr. Stinebower, was adopted by fifteen votes, with two abstentions.

The proposed United States amendment (document E/AC.7/69) to the draft resolution in paragraph 34 of the Report of the Second Session of the Commission on the Status of Women, E/AC.7/W.19/Add.1) was adopted as amended by fourteen votes with three abstentions.

Resolution 6, Co-operation with the International Labour Organization (E/AC.7/W.19)

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the resolution was untimely and out of order.

The first paragraph evidently referred to the principle of equal pay for women, and could be discussed later by the Committee in connection with the other documents pertaining to that topic.

The last paragraph was completely unnecessary since under existing arrangements, United Nations Commissions had a right to participate without vote in the sessions of any Specialized Agency, including the ILO.

/Mr. STINEBOWER

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) fully agreed with the USSR representative. He wished to point out further that in accordance with existing procedure the resolutions referred to in paragraph 1 would ordinarily be referred to the Economic and Social Council which would then decide on the subsequent action in the matter.*

With respect to the second part of the resolution it would constitute an infringement on the authority of the Secretary-General to advise him to send a particular person or a particular group to represent the United Nations at the deliberations of any Specialized Agency.

Mr. METALL (International Labour Organization) felt that the USSR and United States representatives had very ably drawn attention to the difficulty which the International Labour Organization would face were the resolution to pass in the present drafting.

The ILO had concluded an agreement with the United Nations; it was therefore a matter of course that the United Nations would send its representatives to the ILO meetings. But the ILO could hardly single out one of the subsidiary organs for special consideration.

Mr. MORGAN (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that the resolution was not really necessary. That implied no adverse judgement of the Commission on the Status of Women, which had a very legitimate desire to continue its fruitful co-operation with ILO.

Referring to the observations made by Mr. Metall, he agreed that it would be highly inappropriate for one organization to make special provisions concerning a subordinate body of another organization, with which it had already concluded agreements.

/ Agreeing with

Agreeing with the Chairman's suggestion, the Committee decided not to adopt the resolution but to refer it to the Secretary-General to serve as a guide.

Resolution 7, Questionnaire

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) supported the first paragraph of resolution 7, but wondered why the Secretary-General was being requested to prepare the material contained in paragraph (b). In his opinion, the whole paragraph was unnecessary.

Mrs. COSMA (Rapporteur of the Commission on the Status of Women) explained that the question had arisen during one of the Commission's meetings, that it had been found that very little data was available, and that as a result, it had been decided to include the request to the Secretariat in the present resolution.

Mr. van der MANDELE (Netherlands) remarked that every commission had the right to request the Secretariat directly to prepare any material it might need; were this paragraph to be adopted with the rest of the resolution it might prejudice the right of other commissions to address themselves with such requests to the Secretariat in the future.

Mr. MORGAN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the Netherlands representative; it was important to prevent the Council from passing resolutions which were not absolutely indispensable.

Mr. SCHWELE (Secretariat) stated that the constant practice that requests for long-term research tasks are being given by the Council and not by its functional Commissions had its constitutional basis in Article 101(2) of the Charter which attaches appropriate staffs to the Council.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN asked whether there were objections to the deletion of paragraph (b)..

Paragraph (b) of resolution 7 was deleted.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) wished to draw attention to the fact that deletion of paragraph (b) implied no disapproval of its content: the Secretariat would still have to prepare the information requested by the Commission.

Resolution 7, as amended, was unanimously adopted.

PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK FOR MEN AND WOMEN WORKERS (Documents E/627, E/627/Add.1, Add.2, Add.3, Add.4; E/615 paragraph 25, E/615/Add.1, E/650, E/657, E/659/Rev.1, E/AC.7/W.19 Resolution 3, E/AC.7/67, E/SR.138,139)

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the number and similarity of the proposals which had been submitted, a drafting committee should be formed to attempt to reconcile the differences between the various proposals and evolve a single text.

Mr. van der MANDELE (Netherlands) expressed his readiness to withdraw his own proposal in favour of the new French redraft (E/659/Rev.1), which he would accept with a few minor alterations.

He inquired whether the representative of Denmark would not agree to do the same, since the Danish proposal had many points in common with the original French draft resolution.

Mr. DICK (Denmark) saw many points of difference between his proposal and that of France, and could not agree to withdraw it. He wished to substitute the word "Governments" for the word "Council" in the penultimate line of his resolution, and expressed full support for the Chairman's proposal.

/Mr. van der MANDELE

Mr. van der MANDELE (Netherlands) said that he wished to reinstate his proposal and would like to take part in the drafting committee's work.

The CHAIRMAN requested the authors of the draft resolutions to constitute a drafting committee, and assured any other members of the committee who might want to participate of their full right to do so.

After a reading of document E/AC.7/66, Legal Opinion on the Question Whether Spain has Ceased to be a Member of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, by the Committee's Secretary, it was decided, at the suggestion of the New Zealand and USSR representatives, to postpone its further consideration to the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.