

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/AC.7/SR.244
12 August 1953

ENGLISH
Original: ENGLISH and FRENCH

Dual distribution

Sixteenth Session
SOCIAL COMMITTEE
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOURTH MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 14 July 1953, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Report of the Commission on the Status of Women
(seventh session) (item 18 of the Council's
agenda) (E/2401).

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina)

Members:

Argentina	Mrs. FLOURET
Australia	Mr. BRENNAN
Belgium	Mrs. CISELET
China	Mr. TSAO
Cuba	Miss MANAS
Egypt	Mr. AZMI
France	Miss LISSAC
India	Mr. VIRA
Philippines	Mr. INGLÉS
Poland	Mr. ZDANOWSKI
Sweden	Mr. MICHAŃEK
Turkey	Mr. TUNCEL
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. ORLOVSKY
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. OVERTON Mr. BROWN
United States of America	Mr. KOTSCHNIG Mrs. HEFFELFINGER
Uruguay	Mr. PEROTTI
Venezuela	Mr. RIVAS
Yugoslavia	Mr. PLEIĆ

Observer:

Dominican Republic	Miss BERNARDINO
--------------------	-----------------

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. BLAMONT
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)	Mr. TERENCE

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

International Federation of Christian Trade Unions

Mr. EGGERMANN

Category B and Register

Catholic International Union for Social Service

Miss HERTOEGHE

International Alliance of Women - Equal Rights,
Equal Responsibilities

Mrs. SPILLER

International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic
in Persons

Miss HARRIS

International Council of Women

Mrs. CARTER

International Federation of Friends of Young Women

Mrs. BERTHOUD van
WERVEKE

International Federation of University Women

Miss DUBOIS
Mrs. FIECHTER
Mrs. NANTET de SERRANT

International Union for Child Welfare

Mrs. SMALL

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Mrs. BAER

World's Young Women's Christian Association

Miss ARNOLD

Secretariat:

Mr. Humphrey

Acting Principal
Director,
Department of Social
Affairs

Mr. Martinez-Cabanas

Deputy Director-General,
Technical Assistance
Administration

Mrs. Tenison-Woods

Chief, Status of
Women Section,
Division of Human
Rights

Mr. Messing-Mierzejewski

Secretary to the
Committee

REPORT ON THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN (SEVENTH SESSION) (item 18 of the Council's agenda) (E/2401) (continued)

Draft resolution B (nationality of married women) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to continue its discussion of draft resolution B (nationality of married women), submitted to the Council in Annex 1 to the report on the seventh session of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/2401), and the amendments thereto submitted by the delegations of Egypt⁽¹⁾ and the Philippines⁽²⁾. He also drew attention to the joint amendment submitted by the delegations of the Philippines, the United Kingdom and Venezuela⁽³⁾, which had just been circulated.

Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) asked whether the United Kingdom representative could agree to the deletion of the phrase "including comments on the desirability of such a Convention" from the joint amendment; at the time when the amendment had been drafted, he had not understood that that phrase was to be included.

Mr. AZMI (Egypt) felt that the joint amendment reconciled the various views rather skilfully; the Egyptian delegation would be prepared to withdraw its own amendment provided the Venezuelan representative did not press the suggestion he had just made.

(1) See summary record of the 241st meeting (E/AC.7/SR.241), page 8.

(2) The revised Philippine amendment read:

"Add a new article to the "Convention on the Nationality of Married Persons" to read as follows:

'The provisions of the present Convention shall extend to or be applicable equally to a contracting metropolitan State and to all the territories, be they non-self-governing, trust or colonial territories which are being administered or governed by such metropolitan State' "

(3) The joint amendment read:

"Replace the operative part of draft resolution B by the following:

'Requests the Secretary-General to circulate to the Governments of Member States, for their comments, the following text of a draft Convention on Nationality of Married Persons, the substance of which the Council has not considered, together with the records of the discussions and amendments submitted at the sixteenth session, with the request that such comments, including comments on the desirability of such a Convention, be sent to the Secretary-General by 1 January 1954, to be made available to the Commission on the Status of Women for consideration at its eighth session' "

Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) wondered what was the precise scope of the words "for their comments" in the second line of the joint amendment. Did they mean that the comments of governments should cover both the draft convention on the nationality of married persons and the texts of the amendments submitted to draft resolution B? In his view the two sets of documents were quite distinct, and should be dealt with differently.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was clear from the text of the joint amendment that governments were being requested to comment on both the draft convention and the amendments thereto.

Miss MANAS (Cuba) supported the proposal made by the Venezuelan representative. The fact that the records of the discussions in the Committee were to be circulated with the draft convention would make it quite clear to governments what comments were required.

Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) felt that the word "considered" in the fourth line of the original (English) text of the joint amendment ought to have been translated into the other working languages more literally.

After an exchange of views, in which Miss LISSAC (France), Mrs. CISELET (Belgium), Mr. AZMI (Egypt) and Mr. PEROTTI (Uruguay) took part, about the French and Spanish translations of the word quoted by the Venezuelan representative,

it was decided that it should be rendered in Spanish by considerado and in French by examiné.

Mr. AZMI (Egypt) also pointed out that the words "reproduit ci-après" following the word "convention" in the second and third lines of the French text should properly come after the words "le texte" in the second line.

Miss MANAS (Cuba) asked that a separate vote be taken on the phrase "including comments on the desirability of such a Convention" in the joint amendment.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote separately the phrase quoted by the Cuban representative.

The phrase was rejected, 4 votes being cast in favour of its being retained, and 4 against, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. PEROTTI (Uruguay) and Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) wished it to be placed on record that they had voted against the retention of the phrase in question.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint amendment submitted by the Philippine, United Kingdom and Venezuelan delegations, thus amended.

• The joint amendment was adopted, as amended, by 15 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution B (nationality of married women), as amended.

Draft resolution B, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the relevant amendments submitted by the delegations of Egypt and the Philippines would be circulated to governments in accordance with the terms of the resolution just adopted.

Draft resolution C (status of women in private law)

Mr. VIRA (India) introduced the draft resolution⁽¹⁾ submitted by his delegation to replace draft resolution C.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the word "covenant" should be substituted for the word "Convention" in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Indian draft resolution.

Mr. AZMI (Egypt) wished, as Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, to draw the Indian representative's attention to the possible consequences of paragraph 3 of his proposal, which might well set in motion an entirely new process that would ultimately raise yet once more the issue already disposed of by the Commission on Human Rights when it had adopted article 22 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights. He wondered whether that would really be desirable, seeing that it had been decided that the Commission on Human Rights should confine itself to certain specific questions at its following session, which was to last only four weeks.

(1) The Indian draft resolution read:

"Replace draft resolution C by the following:

'The Economic and Social Council

1. Takes note of the recommendation contained in paragraph 30 of the report of the seventh session of the Commission on the Status of Women.
2. Draws the attention of the Commission on the Status of Women to Art. 22 of the draft convention on civil and political rights included in the report of the ninth session of the Commission on Human Rights.
3. Suggests to the Commission on the Status of Women to reconsider their recommendation in the light of the provisions contained in Article 22 of the draft convention on civil and political rights'".

Mr. MICHAEL (Sweden) agreed with the Egyptian representative.

Miss LISSAC (France) recalled the fact that the Commission on Human Rights, having considered the question during its ninth session at the request of the Commission on the Status of Women, had agreed, after a long discussion, on a text which the French delegation had helped to draft, and which, on adoption, had become article 22 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights. That being so, the French delegation did not think it advisable to re-open discussion on that text, which in any event was in no way final, since it was to be submitted to the General Assembly which would be entirely free to improve it - if it deemed necessary - taking due account of the wishes of the Commission on the Status of Women and the views expressed by members of the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. VIRA (India) explained that it was precisely because article 22 of the draft covenant had not yet been given its final form that the Indian delegation had felt that the Commission on the Status of Women ought to be given an opportunity of reconsidering its views on the subject, and of making them known to the Council.

Mr. PLEIĆ (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the Commission on Human Rights had adopted article 22 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights only by the narrow margin of 10 votes to 7, one member having been absent.

The Commission on the Status of Women, on the other hand, had adopted the text of draft resolution C by a substantially larger majority, namely, 12 votes to 5. Those figures plainly showed that the question was decidedly controversial. Since the Committee had decided to recommend that the text of the covenants be sent back to the Commission on Human Rights to enable the latter to smooth out certain discrepancies which had emerged, there would seem to be nothing unusual in the text of article 22 likewise being referred to the Commission on the Status of Women. The Yugoslav delegation would accordingly vote for the alternative draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation.

Mr. AZMI (Egypt) asked that a separate vote be taken on paragraph 3 of the Indian proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote separately paragraphs 1 and 2 and paragraph 3 of the Indian draft resolution, before putting the proposal to the vote as a whole.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 together were adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

The Indian draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution D (status of women in private law)

Mr. AZMI (Egypt), introducing his delegation's amendment⁽¹⁾ to draft resolution D, said that the question of equality of rights and duties of husband and wife in family matters raised some difficult problems, since what was really involved was the concept of personal status, which varied from country to country. In some countries the concept of personal status was based on ideas expressed in the form of dogmas, which those countries did not wish to modify and which in any case could not be abruptly changed. That was why the Egyptian delegation had submitted an amendment embodying the idea of the direction in which the measures should tend. Since the formula had already been accepted by the Commission on Human Rights, a text could be evolved which, not being worded imperatively, would give States subscribing to the covenant on civil and political rights time to bring their legislation gradually into line.

Replying to an observation by Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) that the Egyptian draft amendment did not appreciably change the sense of draft resolution D, he agreed that the criticism was justified, because the English text of the amendment mistakenly kept the word "ensuring", the very term which his proposal sought to eliminate. He hoped that that explanation would enable the Australian representative to support the amendment.

Mr. TUNCEL (TURKEY) said that on the strength of experience in Turkey, where it had been found possible by introducing suitable legislative reforms to overcome the obstacles in the way of improving the status of women, the Turkish delegation could support draft resolution D. The Social Committee should take a definite stand on the question of the status of women in private law, and champion any resolution which reflected that favourable attitude, it being understood, of course, that governments should be completely free in respect of the implementation

(1) The Egyptian amendment read:

"Replace paragraph (a) in the operative part of the resolution by the following text:

'(a) Direct all the possible measures towards ensuring equality of rights and duties of husband and wife in family matters' "

of any such resolution that might be adopted. The Turkish delegation would accordingly be unable to vote for the Egyptian amendment.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) still thought, even after hearing the Egyptian representative's explanation, that there was no substantial difference between the Egyptian amendment and the relevant paragraph of draft resolution D. In particular, the use of the word "possible" in the latter to qualify the word "measures" would seem to meet the Egyptian representative's requirements.

The word "the" should in any case be deleted from the amendment.

Mrs. HEFFELFINGER (United States of America), congratulating the Commission on the Status of Women and its Chairman on their work, said she had been very glad to hear the high opinions of women's abilities expressed by representatives during the discussion, which, she hoped, might inspire further efforts to make sex equality a reality.

In the United States of America, where each State had its own marriage laws, existing legislation and practice corresponded in general with the recommendations made in draft resolution D. Equality in marriage was not, however, regarded in her country as entailing identity of treatment; rights and duties in marriage were considered to be reciprocal rather than identical, being based on the partners' different functions in the marriage union. The husband was in general responsible for the material support of the household, and the wife for the care of the children and home. At the same time, the partners' individual rights were protected. Married women were free to take up occupations outside the home without the husband's consent, had control of their own property, and possessed certain rights regarding the disposal of the home. The aim was to preserve the family while leaving the partners the rights necessary to them as individuals. A certain amount still remained to be done to achieve full sex equality, but fresh laws on the subject were constantly being enacted.

She pointed out that the practical example of equality provided in the United States of America by husband and wife sharing the household tasks was of great value to the children.

The dangerous effect of the rapidly changing conditions of modern life on the family made the work of the Commission on the Status of women of particular importance.

The United States delegation would accordingly vote for draft resolution D.

Miss MANAS (Cuba) said that in Cuba the unity of the family was regarded as essential to the stability of society. According to the amendments introduced into the Cuban Civil Code in 1950, husband and wife had equal rights over and duties towards the children, and women had a place in the family council.

She had been glad to hear the Egyptian representative say that his Government proposed to introduce reforms aimed at ensuring equality of rights and duties in marriage. She could not, however, vote for the Egyptian amendment. The Commission had adopted draft resolution D unanimously, and she did not feel that its members would unanimously support the amendment.

Mr. ORLOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although it appreciated the reasons which had led the Egyptian representative to submit his amendment, his delegation could not accept it because it would weaken the draft resolution. The Soviet Union delegation felt that the Council should make strong recommendations to governments on the subject of sex equality.

Miss LISSAC (France) said that in view of the French law governing the status of women in private law, her delegation had no objection to draft resolution D. Its wording, however, might perhaps be made more flexible so as to allow for circumstances existing in certain other countries. The main thing was to adopt resolutions which would work, that was, which would prove acceptable to the greatest possible number of States. For that reason, the French delegation would vote for the Egyptian amendment and for draft resolution D thus amended.

Mr. PEROTTI (Uruguay) and Mrs. FLOURET (Argentina) said that they would vote for draft resolution D, and against the Egyptian amendment, for the reason given by the Cuban representative.

Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) observed that in his country husband and wife had equal responsibility for the children, except in the case of dispute, when the decision lay with the husband. In addition, the wife had control of her earnings and inherited property.

He felt that the recommendation to States in draft resolution D was rather too strong, but would abstain from voting on the Egyptian amendment.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Egyptian amendment to draft resolution D.
The Egyptian amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution D.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. MICHAÑEK (Sweden) explained that he had voted for the Egyptian amendment because it seemed to him more important to make the resolution acceptable to those States where its objectives had not yet been fully realized than to make it acceptable to those where little remained to be done.

Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) explained that, although the Philippine delegation had no objection in principle to draft resolution D as submitted by the Commission, it had voted for the Egyptian amendment for the practical reasons already given by other speakers. He thought that the resolution was not quite so peremptory as might appear at first glance, and that the recommendation to governments "to take all possible measures to ensure equality" did not entail that absolute obligation to ensure immediate equality in respect of the rights and duties of husband and wife which seemed to certain delegations impracticable.

Mr. ZDANOWSKI (Poland) thought that it was the duty of the Social Committee to adopt resolutions representing an advance towards improved status for women generally and their status in private law in particular. He fully appreciated the reasons that had prompted the Egyptian delegation to introduce its amendment, but had thought that, if adopted, it would weaken draft resolution D. Hence his adverse vote.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that he had abstained from the vote on the Egyptian amendment, believing that, if adopted, it would have made no substantive difference to the sense of paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution D. He regretted that the rejection of the amendment should have obliged the Egyptian representative to abstain from the vote on the resolution itself, and hoped that, when it came before the Council, the Egyptian representative would find that he could after all support it.

Mr. VIRA (India) explained that he had abstained from the vote on the Egyptian amendment because although he sympathized with its purpose, he believed that its adoption would have weakened the resolution, and that the expression "all possible measures" used in the draft resolution itself already provided adequate safeguards for particular governments. He warmly supported the hope just expressed by the Australian representative.

Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) said that she had already explained why the Belgian delegation preferred the draft resolution as submitted by the Commission on the Status of Women. There was nothing mandatory about it, and it did not require governments to take measures forthwith to ensure equal rights for husband and wife in family matters. She had, however, refrained from voting against the Egyptian amendment, because she felt that its adoption might have helped to simplify the task of certain governments.

Mr. AZMI (Egypt) regretted his inability to satisfy the hopes expressed by the Australian and Indian representatives.

He gathered from the statements made by certain representatives in explanation of their vote that they regarded his amendment as designed to restrict women's rights. He reiterated that such was not the case; on the contrary, the purpose of his proposal was to safeguard the privileges enjoyed by Moslem women in marriage, which he had described at length at the 241st meeting.

Draft resolution E (Political rights of women)

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that, although his delegation was in favour of the principle laid down in draft resolution E, he wished to abstain from the vote on the fourth paragraph, and accordingly requested that that paragraph be put to the vote separately.

Mr. ORLOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since it was evident that political discrimination against women still existed in a number of States Members of the United Nations, the Soviet Union delegation regarded the Convention on Political Rights of Women, despite certain shortcomings, as a useful step along the path towards equality. Considering that the Convention had so far secured the signatures of only a small number of States -

mainly those in which women already possessed full political rights - he regarded the recommendation that the General Assembly should invite further ratifications and accessions as a useful one, and would vote for the draft resolution. He urged, however, that the Commission on the Status of Women should be careful not to relax its efforts to devise further means of eradicating discrimination against women in respect of political rights.

Miss LISSAC (France) recalled that she had already had occasion to point out that the French delegation was keenly interested in draft resolution E, which constituted one of the great triumphs of the Commission on the Status of Women. The French Government had signed the Convention on Political Rights of Women, and Parliament was preparing to ratify it. The French delegation particularly liked the text of the fourth paragraph, but was puzzled by the wording of the last paragraph. As drafted, it seemed to mean that States Parties to the Convention would have to report every two years to the Economic and Social Council on the measures taken by them to implement its provisions, which might be interpreted as reflecting distrust of the very countries which had been the first to sign the instrument. Obviously, accession by a country to international instruments drawn up by the United Nations should not have the effect of calling the good faith of that country in question by measures which might be described as discriminatory, since there was no suggestion that countries which had not signed the Convention should be asked why they had not done so. Moreover, the growing number of questionnaires which governments were asked to complete clearly imposed a heavy burden on the government departments concerned, and impeded their constructive work. It would be unfortunate if the vast number of enquiries and questionnaires resulting from accession to international conventions were to make well-intentioned countries reluctant to accede to such instruments. The French delegation requested that the last paragraph of draft resolution E be put to the vote separately.

Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that in his country political equality as between men and women was absolute; moreover, the Constitution made no distinction on grounds of sex in respect of any public office requiring Venezuelan citizenship. He would vote for draft resolution E.

Mrs. FLOURET (Argentina) said her country had already signed the Convention on Political Rights of women, and she would be glad to vote for the draft resolution.

Mr. PEROTTI (Uruguay) said that universal suffrage existed in Uruguay, that an alien woman who acquired Uruguayan citizenship enjoyed the same rights as other women, and that, indeed, the principle of non-discrimination was so widely applied that, under Article 78 of the Constitution, even persons not having Uruguayan citizenship but having certain residence and property qualifications enjoyed political rights. He would vote for the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution E to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

The first paragraph was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The second paragraph was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The third paragraph was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The fifth paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution E as a whole.

Draft resolution E as a whole was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution F (political rights of women)

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution F.

Draft resolution F was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution G (equal pay for equal work)

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution G.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 15 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution H (educational opportunities for women)

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint amendment submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Cuba, France and the United States of America⁽¹⁾, which was intended to replace draft resolution H submitted by the Commission on the Status of Women.

The joint amendment was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution I (Educational opportunities for women)

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution I

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution J (technical assistance programmes in relation to the status of women)

Mr. MARTINEZ-CABANAS (Technical Assistance Administration) referred to the question raised by the Chinese representative at the 242nd meeting⁽²⁾, whether the services mentioned in paragraph 3 of the operative part of draft resolution J were not already covered by the existing programmes of technical assistance. He explained that, when adopting draft resolution J, the Commission on the Status of Women, had had before it a report on technical assistance in relation to the status of women prepared at its request by the Secretary-General (E/CN.6/189/Add.1). The report had dealt with the three main sectors of the United Nations programmes of technical assistance - economic development, public administration and advisory social welfare services - and with questions relating particularly to the status of women. In it, it had been pointed out that neither the regular programme nor the expanded programme of technical assistance was directed specifically to the needs of men or women, but to those of the population as a whole. Attention had also been drawn to the Secretary-General's progress reports on the United Nations

(1) See summary record of the 241st meeting (E/AC.7/SR.241), page 13.

(2) See summary record of the 242nd meeting (E/AC.7/SR.242), page 15.

programme of technical assistance, which covered not only activities under the expanded programme set up by Council resolution 222 A (IX), but also those financed out of the regular United Nations budget under General Assembly resolutions 200 (III), 246 (III) and 418(V). Resolution 418(V) was concerned with advisory social welfare services, but those services did not embrace questions relating to human rights in general or to many aspects of the status of women. The Secretary-General had explained in his report to the Commission on the Status of Women that technical assistance in improving the status of women might be provided in response to requests from governments in specific cases where such assistance fell within the framework of the various programmes of technical assistance for economic development.

He would say, therefore, that draft resolution J, if adopted, would entail no overlapping with existing technical assistance programmes, but was designed to make additional services available in the circumstances mentioned in paragraph 3 of the operative part thereof.

Mr. TSAO (China), thanking the representative of the Technical Assistance Administration for his explanation, remarked that, according to his (Mr. Tsao's) understanding, Council resolution 222 A (IX) authorized technical assistance to be given, if not to particular groups, at least to that very large section - perhaps one half - of the world's population which was under-privileged and in need of social improvement. Perhaps the expanded programme of technical assistance could be regarded as extending in the same broad sense to that half of the population made up of the female sex.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation considered that draft resolution J, which was designed to make available new types of technical assistance, deserved the support of all those interested in improving the status of women throughout the world and in winning equal rights for them. Although the General Assembly had given special authorization covering three general types of technical assistance, none of those types covered assistance in the drafting of such legislation as was mentioned in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, since, strictly speaking, it was neither social nor economic, nor pertained to public administration. None the less, he believed that it was a type of assistance

which might prove of the greatest value, for the effect of draft resolution J, if its principle were accepted by the General Assembly, would be to authorize the Secretary-General to provide expert advice in the promotion of equal rights for women. The additional expense involved, at least at the outset, might well be small, and could probably be carried on the existing budget.

Miss LISSAC (France) thought that the Committee should not consider draft resolution J. The technical assistance programmes formed a coherent whole administered by a combination of specialized organs on which were represented governments, the specialized agencies and the United Nations. The administrative machinery thus set up in the light of experience was part of a move towards better co-ordination - the need for which had long been felt that was beginning to bear fruit. The French delegation, therefore, regarded any dispersal of effort in that field as undesirable, especially in view of the need for making the best of the limited financial resources available for the carrying out of the technical assistance programmes. The very manner in which paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution J was framed provided, she thought, some justification for her delegation's attitude. The draft resolution, furthermore, did not take sufficiently into account the basic principle governing technical assistance programmes which was that assistance could be provided only at the formal request of governments. All things considered, the French delegation thought that the best thing would be to refer the draft resolution to the Technical Assistance Committee for consideration and further elaboration.

Mrs. CISELET (Belgium), agreeing with the French representative, supported her proposal.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) regretted that he was obliged to differ from the two last speakers. As United States representative on the Technical Assistance Committee, he could say that the resolution was completely outside the competence of that Committee, which was, indeed, precluded by Council resolution 222 A (IX) from dealing with such an issue.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that further discussion of draft resolution J be deferred.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.