



CONTENTS

	Page
Question raised by the representative of Poland regarding the participation of several representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions in the work of the Council ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	51
Commission on the Status of Women ( <i>continued</i> ): (a) Report of the Commission on the Status of Women (sixth session) (E/2208, E/2208/Add.1, E/L.322, E/L.327, E/L.334) ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	53
Commission on the Status of Women ( <i>continued</i> ): (b) General Assembly resolution 532 A (VI) (E/L.335) .....	55

*President:* Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

*Present:* The representatives of the following countries:

Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Observers from the following countries:

Chile, Netherlands.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

**Question raised by the representative of Poland regarding the participation of several representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions in the work of the Council (*continued*)**

1. The PRESIDENT asked the Secretary of the Council to furnish the information which had been requested at the 578th meeting regarding the failure of several representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions, who were to have attended the current session of the Council, to obtain visas.

2. Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Council) first pointed out that with a view to the application of the provisions of article IV, section 11, of the Headquarters Agreement administrative arrangements had been made between the United Nations and the United States Government. Under those arrangements, all non-governmental organizations in consultative status, wishing to be represented at the Council's sessions, had been requested by the Secretariat to advise it, at least

seven days in advance of the proposed date of departure, of the names and addresses of their representatives and of the consulate at which they would apply for entry visas to the United States.

3. In the case before the Council the Secretariat had been advised by cable, on 6 May, of the appointment of Mr. Eskandary and Mr. Santi as representatives of the WFTU to the Council's fourteenth session, and had been informed by cable, received on 7 May, of the appointment of Mr. di Vittorio. The United States authorities had been immediately notified. On 8 May the Secretariat had asked the WFTU for the addresses of the representatives and the names of the United States consulates at which the applications for visas would be made. The requested particulars had been received on 10 May and immediately transmitted to the United States authorities.

4. On 17 May the representative of the WFTU in New York had telephoned the Secretariat to say that she had received a cable, from her organization's headquarters in Vienna, informing her that the competent United States authorities in Vienna had refused to issue visas to Mr. di Vittorio and Mr. Santi because they were not in possession of invitations from the United Nations Secretariat. The Secretariat had informed the representative of the WFTU that the procedure agreed upon jointly by the United Nations and the United States Government did not require the issuance of invitations. The Secretariat had not been informed by the WFTU that applications had been made, or refused, for visas for those two representatives.

5. In regard to Mr. Eskandary, he read a letter which had been received by the United Nations Secretariat on 22 May from the representative of the WFTU in

New York in which the latter had disputed the information which the Non-Governmental Organisations Section of the Secretariat had received from the United States Permanent Delegation to the effect that the United States Consulate at Geneva had no record of a visa application by Mr. Eskandary; the representative of the WFTU had stated that Mr. Louis Saillant, Secretary-General of the WFTU, had informed her by cable, on 12 May, that such an application had been filed. She had also communicated to the Secretariat the following cable sent from Geneva on 21 May:

"American Consul Geneva not willing to deliver visa stating necessity of special permission from Attorney General to waive existing US laws. He cabled for this purpose to Washington. Raise immediately protest with United Nations Secretariat and cable back information available. (Signed) Eskandary."

6. The United Nations Secretariat had at once got in touch with the United States authorities and on 23 May had received the following reply:

"The Department of State has been informed by the United States Consul General at Geneva that Mr. Eskandary initiated his visa application on 21 May 1952 and that, on 23 May, he submitted to the Geneva Consulate certain additional information required in connexion with his application."

7. The Secretariat had conveyed that reply to the WFTU the same day.

8. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) said that the information given by the Secretariat coincided with the information he had himself given the Council at the 578th meeting and confirmed the existence of a deliberate manoeuvre to prevent the representatives of the WFTU from taking part in the Council's work. He was sure that the members of the Council appreciated the gravity of the blow which had been aimed at the authority and independence of the Council and that they would not tolerate such interference with the proper conduct of its business. He hoped that the President would take energetic steps, on behalf of the entire Council, to ensure that in future members of delegations accredited to the Council would not be exposed to such administrative and police sharp practice.

9. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thanked the Secretary of the Council for having replied so promptly to the request for information which he had made at the morning meeting. The information given disposed of the allegations intended to impugn the good faith of the United States consular service and proved that the organization concerned was more interested in deliberately confusing for its own propaganda purposes and in delaying and interfering with the work of the Council than in being represented on that body.

10. The procedure adopted for facilitating the entry into the United States of representatives of non-governmental organizations in consultative status was designed to avoid delays and misunderstandings, but if that purpose was to be achieved the organizations concerned must comply with the required formalities, which the WFTU consistently refused to do. The

letter of 22 May 1952 from the WFTU representative definitely proved the bad faith of the organization and contained several slanted or untrue statements. Thus, the United States Government had not refused to consider Mr. Eskandary's application. It had been ascertained that Mr. Eskandary had not applied for an entry visa until 21 May—after the Council had begun—and on 23 May he had been asked to furnish additional particulars. The matter was being given active attention in Washington. As the Council had originally decided to meet on 13 May, it was significant that the WFTU had not taken steps earlier to ensure the presence of its representatives in New York. With regard to Mr. di Vittorio, no application on his behalf had so far been submitted; the United States Government could therefore hardly be blamed for not having granted him a visa.

11. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that it was not the first time that representatives of democratic organizations had suffered from the hostility of State Department officials. The time had come to put an end to that state of affairs. During the thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council, at Geneva, the USSR delegation had vainly protested against what it considered to be a veritable conspiracy to compel the Council to hold all future sessions in New York; it had been convinced that the better working conditions at Geneva were being sacrificed to the certainty that in New York it would be easier to prevent certain organizations which were regarded as undesirable from being represented at the Council. Those fears had evidently been well founded.

12. On 26 May, when the Council had already been in session for more than a week, the WFTU representatives had still not arrived in New York. That was an intolerable situation, and the USSR delegation endorsed the Polish representative's request that the President should immediately take the necessary steps.

13. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) asked the USSR representative whether he seriously contended that the United States Government, or any other government, should grant a visa to a person who had not applied for one.

14. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no point in continuing to discuss a question on which ample light had been thrown by the Polish representative's statement, the information given by the Secretariat and more particularly the letter of 22 May from the WFTU representative.

15. He reiterated that the officials of the State Department would have no difficulty in exercising delaying tactics if they chose to do so; the Council should therefore take vigorous action.

16. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) said that the United States representative had followed his usual practice in trying to put the blame on the WFTU instead of on the State Department, which was undoubtedly responsible. The facts were clear and indisputable and Mr. Kotschnig's arguments were unconvincing.

17. He again appealed to the President to uphold the independence and the authority of the Council.

18. Lord SELKIRK (United Kingdom) moved the closure of the debate in accordance with rule 52 of the rules of procedure.

*There being no objections, the motion for the closure of the debate was adopted.*

**Commission on the Status of Women (continued):**

**(a) Report of the Commission on the Status of Women (sixth session) (E/2208, E/2208/Add.1, E/L.322, E/L.327, E/L.334) (continued)**

[Agenda item 17(a)]

19. Lord SELKIRK (United Kingdom) recalled that at the 578th meeting the Cuban, Chinese and Belgian delegations had submitted proposals and counter proposals for amendments to draft resolution C concerning the status of women in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories (E/2208, annex). Since then the United Kingdom delegation had been trying to get those delegations to agree on a single text which might be unanimously adopted by the Council. The drafting was not yet completed, however, and he proposed that the consideration of draft resolution C should be postponed to the following day.

20. In reply to a question by Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay), the PRESIDENT confirmed that the United Kingdom representative's proposal was in effect a motion to adjourn the debate on draft resolution C, it being of course understood that delegations would be able to submit any amendments they desired to the new text to be submitted.

*There being no objections, the United Kingdom representative's proposal was adopted.*

21. The PRESIDENT asked whether the Council wished also to postpone to the following meeting the vote on the USSR draft resolution (E/L.322).

22. Mr. KAYSER (France) and Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) felt that, as the draft resolution dealt with questions which the Council had already discussed at length, there was no reason for postponing the vote.

23. With the agreement of Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the PRESIDENT called on the Council to consider the USSR draft resolution (E/L.322).

24. Mr. KAYSER (France) asked the Secretary-General's representative to what extent the various questions referred to in the draft resolution were already being dealt with by the Commission on the Status of Women or other United Nations bodies. That information would give the members of the Council a clearer idea of the scope of the USSR delegation's proposals.

25. Mrs. TENISON-WOODS (Representative of the Secretary-General) read out paragraph 1 of resolution 48 (IV), dated 29 March 1947, which defined the functions of the Commission on the Status of Women. Referring to the questions raised in subparagraphs (b), (c), (d) and (f) of the draft resolution, she observed that every year the Commission

studied Secretariat documents on those subjects, including *inter alia* the annual note by the Secretary-General on the political rights of women, which contained information on the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, reports on vocational training and guidance, comparative analyses in the field of private law on family and property rights, and all the supplementary information furnished by governments on public law, including information on the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

26. The questions referred to in sub-paragraph (e) were matters for the Social Commission. Sub-paragraph (a) raised a question which the Commission on the Status of Women had discussed at its most recent session; a draft resolution placing the matter on the Commission's agenda had been submitted and the Commission had decided that the subject was outside its terms of reference.

27. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was not satisfied with the way in which the Commission on the Status of Women had gone about its work. It seemed that the Commission had found it convenient to refer certain important studies to the specialized agencies and had thus failed in its duty by neglecting serious problems which it had been instructed to deal with itself. The specialized agencies had not taken any practical steps and their studies had not had any definite results.

28. The Commission should concentrate its efforts on studying steps to ensure that women were provided with facilities for education, free medical services, protection in employment and social insurance. The draft resolution submitted by the USSR (E/L.322) was based on those considerations.

29. His delegation hoped that the Commission on the Status of Women would make a study of the participation of women in the fight for peace and international security. At a time when certain countries were actively preparing for a new war, the Commission on the Status of Women could not ignore the problem of peace and international security and remain deaf to the appeal which the Women's International Democratic Federation, with its 130 million members, had made to the Economic and Social Council. The USSR delegation accordingly proposed, in its draft resolution, that the question of the participation of women in the fight for peace and international security should have first place in the programme of work of the Commission on the Status of Women. He requested that his delegation's draft resolution should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph at the appropriate time.

30. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported the USSR representative's statement. The Czechoslovak delegation had already explained its position. There was no point in talking of equal rights for men and women if the economic and social aspects of the problem were not borne in mind. It was not sufficient to proclaim that men and women should have equal rights. Women must be provided with medical care. Provision must be made for maternity and child welfare and for the protection of women workers who should be eligible for unemployment insurance and social security benefits.

31. That, unfortunately, was not the case in most capitalist countries. In that connexion he quoted a statement from a British publication, *Times, Rates of Wages and Hours of Labour*, dated 1 October 1951, and figures from the *Manchester Guardian* of 27 March 1952. That state of affairs would continue until a halt was called to the armaments race undertaken in many countries under United States pressure. The Czechoslovak delegation welcomed the USSR draft resolution, in particular the recommendation that the participation of women in the fight for peace and international security should be included in the programme of work of the Commission on the Status of Women.

32. As the maintenance of peace and international security was the principal task imposed on the United Nations by the Charter, it was essential that the Council should adopt the USSR draft resolution (E/L.322), which his delegation fully supported.

33. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that the question under consideration was one of the most important on the Council's agenda. The Council had before it a draft resolution amending the terms of reference of the Commission on the Status of Women. It would be unwise to amend the terms of reference to include questions such as that of equal pay, which were already within the competence of other United Nations organs. There was no need to adopt a resolution on measures to promote the effective exercise of political rights by women since that question was already covered by the convention on the political rights of women adopted by the Council (578th meeting). It was undesirable to overload the Commission on the Status of Women by referring to it a series of problems which it would be unable to deal with satisfactorily in a few months.

34. He did not categorically oppose the USSR draft resolution, the aims of which were commendable, but he thought that it would be better not to extend the Commission's terms of reference. It was essential that the Commission should be able to carry on the work it was doing at present; the Council could draw its attention to specific important subjects, but should be careful not to overload it.

35. AZMI Bey (Egypt) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution B submitted to the Council by the Commission on the Status of Women (E/220<sup>2</sup>, annex), and would adopt the same attitude with regard to the USSR draft resolution (E/L.322).

36. The draft dealt with subjects which had already been covered by Council resolutions. The draft covenant on economic and social rights, for example, already dealt with the principle of equal pay for equal work and the right of all to education and medical assistance. The same remark applied to measures to improve the status of women in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Commission on Human Rights had approved an article<sup>1</sup> on the right of peoples to self-determination and had recognized the principle of the equality of the sexes in metropolitan countries

as well as in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. Sub-paragraphs (b) to (f) of the draft resolution did not contain anything new.

37. As regards sub-paragraph (a), in his view all mankind should fight for peace and international security, and there was therefore no reason why the Commission on the Status of Women should be specially entrusted with the study of the participation of women in that fight.

38. He would abstain from voting for the reasons he had given.

39. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) thought that it was the Council's duty to judge the work done by the Commission on the Status of Women and to give directives to that body. The Commission had reached a stage where it was necessary to take further steps to achieve equal rights for men and women. That equality was already guaranteed by law in some countries but it was not yet a reality. A new step forward was necessary, and the USSR draft resolution would enable the Council to take it.

40. As regards sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part of the draft resolution, the sufferings endured by women during the Second World War had given them the right to participate in the fight for peace and international security. By adopting the resolution in question the Council would enable the Commission on the Status of Women to take part in the effort to construct a better world. He trusted that the USSR draft resolution would be adopted.

41. Lord SELKIRK (United Kingdom) recalled that a proposal identical to that submitted by the USSR delegation had been laid before the Council at its previous session. It was in his view undesirable to modify the programme carefully drawn up by the Commission on the Status of Women itself. He moved that, in accordance with rule 65 of the rules of procedure, the Council should decide not to vote on the USSR proposal.

42. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that rule 65 of the rules of procedure did not apply to the case under consideration as there was only one proposal before the Council, the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the USSR.

43. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed with the United Kingdom representative and proposed that the Council should decide not to take action on the USSR draft resolution. The Commission on the Status of Women on two occasions had had two proposals before it similar to that contained in sub-paragraph (a) of document E/L.322 and had rejected both by a large majority. The Commission was properly aware of the limits of its terms of reference and it might be recalled, in that connexion, that there were in the United Nations special organs responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council would therefore be well-advised not to vote on the USSR draft.

44. Mr. STERNER (Sweden), while recognizing the value of the principles set forth in the USSR proposal, felt that it served no useful purpose. He had

<sup>1</sup> See documents E/CN.4/SR.660, E/CN.4/SR.661 and E/CN.4/663.



already drawn the Council's attention to the danger of a multiplicity of resolutions. The Swedish delegation would vote for the United Kingdom motion that the Council should not vote on the USSR draft.

45. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was not at all surprised to find the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the United States of America resorting to a procedural manoeuvre to set aside his delegation's draft resolution. The tactic of side-tracking the discussion and preventing the Economic and Social Council from considering serious problems was a familiar one. Public opinion would pass judgment on the position taken by the delegations of the United Kingdom and of the United States of America. For its part, the USSR delegation was prepared to face the bar of history.

46. Mr. KAYSER (France) said that his delegation would base its position on considerations of efficiency. The Commission on the Status of Women had formulated a lengthy programme of work in which priority, continuing and less-urgent tasks were separated. The programme was both clear and carefully prepared. The Commission on the Status of Women had, moreover, already rejected a draft resolution couched in the same terms as the USSR proposal. There appeared to be no reason to amend the programme drafted by the Commission. The Secretariat had in fact initiated surveys for which provision had been made in that programme. The French delegation would therefore vote in favour of the United Kingdom proposal that the Council should take no decision on document E/L.322.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that it was open to members of the Council to submit whatever proposals they chose, including motions to set a proposal aside.

48. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) felt that the Council should be extremely cautious in making use of the provisions of rule 65 of the rules of procedure. The rule would only apply if the Council had no competence. The best course would be for the United Kingdom representative to submit a draft amendment which would simply nullify the USSR draft resolution. In the absence of an amendment of that kind, the Argentine delegation would abstain from voting.

49. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected to the attitude of some of his fellow representatives who were attempting to lead the debate into a procedural maze. No delegation had the right, even for procedural reasons, to prevent the Council from taking a vote on a proposal. Rule 65 did not apply because the USSR proposal did not involve matters of substance. The USSR delegation had merely drafted an outline for the work of the Commission on the Status of Women.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom motion that no decision should be taken on the USSR proposal (E/L.322).

*The United Kingdom motion was adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

51. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the result of the vote provided a striking illustration of the way in which the group under the influence of the United Kingdom and the United

States, bent on undermining the work of the Council, exerted its influence within that organ.

52. It had not even been deemed necessary to consider thoroughly the serious and important USSR proposal. Instead, the cynical attitude of ignoring the proposal had been adopted. That provided a clear indication of what could be expected of the Council's objectivity. It also showed that some delegations did not wish the Council's work to lead to practical results.

53. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) expressed surprise at the USSR representative's charge that some delegations had resorted to machinations in refusing to give thorough consideration to the substance of his proposal.

54. A few minutes previously the USSR representative had, in fact, pointed out that his draft resolution did not involve matters of substance. The United States delegation agreed with him on that point since it believed that the USSR delegation had submitted the draft resolution purely for propaganda purposes. It had for that very reason voted against consideration of the draft.

55. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) stated again that his delegation favoured the principles set forth in the USSR draft resolution and that its attitude should not be taken to imply opposition to that proposal. As he had indicated earlier, however, he had felt that the Council would not be acting properly if it appeared to solve problems of such importance to mankind when in fact it would merely be enumerating them. That was the reason for the negative vote of the Uruguayan delegation.

56. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) denounced the manoeuvre through which the USSR draft resolution had been set aside. It had been stated that the proposal set forth no new principle and would serve no useful purpose. It was easy to justify refusal to consider a proposal by stating that it would serve no purpose.

57. The fact of the matter was that the delegations of the United Kingdom, the United States and other countries were afraid of the resolution because it proposed concrete measures which would bring about equal rights for men and women and ensure that the Commission on the Status of Women started to work seriously and effectively towards that goal.

58. It would not have been possible to vote against the draft resolution and therefore a procedural manoeuvre had been resorted to in order to make it unnecessary for the Council to take a decision on the draft.

**Commission on the Status of Women (continued):  
(b) General Assembly resolution 532 A (VI)  
(E/L.335)**

[Agenda item 17 (b)]

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the Council to consider the draft resolution submitted by the Cuban delegation (E/L.335) which, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 532 A (VI), provided that the Council should continue to convene the Commission on the Status of Women for one session every year.

60. Miss MAÑAS (Cuba) said that the Cuban delegation, after participating in the Council's debate on the work of the Commission on the Status of Women, was convinced that it was essential to enable the Commission to continue its work, the significance of which was shown by the programme contained in its report (E/2208, para. 101).

61. The General Assembly had recognized the value of the Commission's work and it was moreover obvious that the principle of equal rights for men and women had not as yet gained universal recognition and that, in many countries, women were still subject to discriminatory measures.

62. The reasons put forward by the General Assembly were sufficient to justify reconsideration of the decision the Council had taken at its thirteenth session and the Cuban delegation was therefore submitting its draft resolution (E/L.335).

63. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Cuban draft resolution (E/L.335).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.