United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ELEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 707th MEETING

Tuesday, 11 December 1956, at 10.45 a.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Chairman: **Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).**

AGENDA ITEM 33

Draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women (Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX), A/2944, A/3059, A/3154, chap. VII section IX, para. 541, A/3193, A/C.3/L.527/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.529) (*concluded*)

ARTICLE 7 (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on article 7 of the draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women as it appeared in the report of the Working Party (A/C.3/L.527/Rev.1, para. 4). He suggested that the Committee could vote first on paragraph 1, then on the first part of paragraph 2, as far as the words "any State Party to the Convention", then on the remainder of paragraph 2, and finally on paragraph 3.

It was so decided.

2. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote article 7, paragraph 1, of the draft Convention.

At the request of the representative of Cuba, the vote was taken by roll call.

Indonesia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India.

Abstaining: Iran, Italy, Morocco, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Yemen, Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Finland, Haiti.

The paragraph was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

3. The CHAIRMAN put the first part of paragraph 2 of the draft Convention to the vote.

The first part of the paragraph was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

4. The CHAIRMAN put the second part of paragraph 2 of the draft Convention to the vote.

The second part of the paragraph was adopted by 36 votes to 1, with 25 abstentions.

5. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 3 of the draft Convention to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

6. The CHAIRMAN put article 7 of the draft Convention to the vote, as a whole.

The article as a whole was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

7. Mr. MARMOL (Venezuela) suggested that the words *"a contarse"* in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Spanish text should be replaced by the more correct word *"contados"*, and that a synonym should be used for that verb a little later in the text, in order to avoid repetition.

DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTION (A/C.3/L.529) (*concluded*)

8. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) introduced a joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529), which she said was purely procedural and was identical with the text that had been presented at the tenth session of the General Assembly. She hoped that the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women would be signed and ratified by the majority of States at the current session.

9. Mr. MESSADI (Tunisia) asked that his country be added to the list of sponsors of that draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529).[1]

10. Ato Solomon TEKLE (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had followed the debate on the important question of the draft Convention with great interest. He hoped that the conflicting views that had been expressed with regard to some of the articles would subsequently be reconciled. As Ethiopian nationality law was in the process of formulation, the Ethiopian Government would be unable to ratify the Convention immediately.

11. His delegation would support the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529).

12. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) pointed out that the English text of the first paragraph of the preamble should be brought into line with the French text, by eliminating the reference to time, which he thought

[1] The addition of Tunisia to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution was indicated in document A/C.3/L.529/Add.1.

unnecessary. He accordingly proposed that the phrase "considering that the time is appropriate" should be replaced by the words "considering that it is appropriate".

13. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) observed that the text had originally been drafted in Spanish.

14. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the English and French texts should be brought into line with the Spanish text.

It was so decided.

15. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529).

16. Mr. TSAO (China) observed that it would be more logical to vote first on the draft Convention as a whole.

17. The CHAIRMAN, supported by Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), considered that there was no need to vote on the draft Convention as a whole if the draft resolution was put to the vote.

18. Mr. TSAO (China) said that he had not proposed that a vote should be taken on the draft Convention as a whole; he had simply meant that if the Committee intended to take such a vote, it would be better to put the draft Convention to the vote before the draft resolution.

19. Mr. MARRIOTT (Australia), supported by Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom), suggested that a vote should be taken on all the final clauses (articles 4 to 11), which the Committee had considered at the current session of the General Assembly.

20. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that his delegation would be unable to vote on those articles as a whole, because it had not taken the same attitude towards all of them. If the Australian and United Kingdom proposal were adopted, he would be obliged to ask for a vote article by article.

21. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) could see no reason for voting on those articles again. All that was necessary was that delegations which intended to vote against the draft Convention should not vote in favour of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. MARRIOTT (Australia) and Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) withdrew their proposal.

23. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) said that her delegation would abstain—though with the greatest regret—in the vote on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529) because the Committee had decided not to include a territorial clause in the draft Convention. There had been much talk of opposing such a clause as a matter of principle. The United Kingdom delegation was concerned with principle too: the inclusion of a territorial application clause would have enabled the United Kingdom Government to respect the views and the laws of the territories which it administered and of those which were now responsible for the conduct of their internal affairs. The United Kingdom Government had always followed the practice of consulting the Governments of those territories, rather than that of imposing decisions upon them; it had no intention of going back on that practice.

24. It was in order to hold such consultations with those Governments before acceding to any convention on their behalf that the United Kingdom delegation always sought to have an article on territorial application included in any such instrument. Many delegations, especially the Indian delegation, had understood those reasons. The Saudi Arabian representative, however, had described them as "technical" (702nd meeting) and had asked that they should be disregarded; in other words, he wanted the United Kingdom Government to withdraw the measure of self-government it had granted, so that the territories concerned would be denied the substance and left only the shadow of self-government. The United Kingdom Government had always tried to bring the territories under its administration to autonomy and independence gradually; but for obvious political, economic and social reasons, it could not abandon all its responsibilities towards them.

25. It had often been said that the absence of a territorial application clause would make it easier for certain States to accede to the Convention. The Syrian representative, in particular, had said (703rd meeting) that his Government would be more willing to take a favourable view of the Convention if it did not contain such a clause. Similar statements had been made during the discussion of the Convention on the Political Rights of Women. However, of the thirty-two States which had opposed the insertion of the territorial clause in the draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, only twenty had so far ratified the Convention on the Political Rights of Women. Accordingly, the absence of a territorial clause had not had the expected result and had not facilitated accession by a large number of countries.

26. Other delegations had invoked the principle of universality. It seemed, on the contrary, that the absence of a territorial application clause would prevent metropolitan States not only from acceding to the Convention on behalf of the territories they administered, but even from acceding to it themselves. The United Kingdom Government, for its part, would be unable to sign or ratify the Convention in its existing form in the foreseeable future.

27. She wished to set the record straight with regard to the Saudi Arabian representative's remarks concerning the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery. It was true that the United Kingdom delegation at the Geneva Conference had not pressed for the adoption of that article 3, on the right of search, in its original form because it had realized that the adoption of that article would discourage a number of States from acceding to the Convention. That seemed a perfectly honourable motive. Other delegations, in the same spirit of compromise, had decided to drop their opposition to the territorial application clause, which formed the subject of article 12. There was nothing nefarious or even unusual in that; it was the normal process of negotiation, without which no international instrument could be agreed upon.

28. In the light of those considerations, the United Kingdom delegation appealed to the delegations which had opposed the insertion of a territorial clause in the draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women to reconsider their attitude, so that an article on the lines either of the article adopted by a large majority for the Supplementary Convention on Slavery, or of the amendment presented by Peru, Chile and Mexico (A/C.3/L.523/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.523/Add.1 and 2) might be inserted in the Convention under discussion

at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly. Only by so doing would the Assembly be serving the interests of women throughout the world.

29. Furthermore, the opponents of the territorial clause should decide whether they were for or against the measure of self-government which the United Kingdom granted to the territories for which it was responsible. If they were for it, they must realize that self-government must be respected in all cases and that those territories must be consulted. Consequently, they must recognize the need to include in every Convention a clause permitting such consultation. If they were against it, they should explain their reasons in detail so that the administering Powers might know where they stood.

30. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529).

The draft resolution was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

31. Mr. PAULUS (India) wished to explain his delegation's attitude towards the various articles of the draft Convention. He reminded the Committee that at the tenth session of the General Assembly, India had voted for the three substantive articles. It agreed with the authors of the Convention that a woman should not become stateless through her marriage to a foreigner. Since that time India had enacted the Indian Citizenship Act of 1955, which indirectly embodied the principle that a woman's nationality was independent of that of her husband. The terms of the Convention had accordingly been met in Indian law.

32. With regard to article 4, the Indian delegation had voted for the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.518), as that text was closest to the fundamental principle of universality. It had abstained from voting on the Australian amendment (Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX), annex A) because it had, to its regret, found that text to be comparatively restrictive in character.

33. India was opposed to the introduction of a territorial clause in a convention of that nature; it had accordingly voted against the three-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.523/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.523/Add. 1 and 2), which had not been couched in sufficiently clear and specific terms.

34. With regard to article 7, on reservations, India had supported the Cuban amendment (A/C.3/L.520), which it considered as having a definite value, and had abstained from voting on the other amendments. It had, however, voted for the very acceptable text submitted by the Working Party (A/C.3/L.527/Rev.1).

35. With regard to article 9, he said that in his Government's view a dispute could not be referred to the International Court of Justice without the consent of all the parties concerned. He had agreed to the retention of article 9 solely on account of the humanitarian character of the Convention, and he remained opposed in principle to the Court's being seized of a dispute at the request of only one of the parties.

36. He said that, bearing those considerations in mind, he was fully in accord with the purposes and text of the draft Convention and that he had been happy to lend his support to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529).

37. Mr. GREENBAUM (United States of America) said that there had been no change in his Government's attitude concerning the nationality of married women. Ever since the question had been taken up in the Commission on the Status of Women, it had consistently maintained that the nationality of married women should be considered only within the framework of the whole question of nationality and that the entire problem should be referred for study to the International Law Commission. In those circumstances, his delegation had been obliged to refrain from taking part in the debate.

38. The draft Convention under consideration did not measure up to the standards of full equality set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Thus, article 3 agreed to specially privileged naturalization procedures for the alien wife of one of a country's nationals, but such procedures might prove a disadvantage to an alien husband. It would be a mistake to assume that legislations which made it more difficult for men to become naturalized were *ipso facto* advantageous to women. Countries such as the United States of America, which granted uniform privileges with respect to naturalization of the spouse, whether husband or wife, of a national, could hardly be expected to approve such a provision. Furthermore, it should be noted that some members of the Commission on the Status of Women had gone so far as to admit that the text did not establish absolute equality since, in the existing state of their legislation, too few countries would be able to accept it.

39. His delegation was not indifferent to the problem of the nationality of married women. In view of the importance it attached to the principle of equality, especially in that field, it had submitted to the Economic and Social Council at its eighteenth session a draft resolution recommending States to refrain from conferring nationality on an alien wife except as a result of her expressed wish.[2] The United States had felt compelled to abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529), and did not intend to become a party to the Convention. His delegation was convinced that the women of all countries would some day enjoy full equality of rights with respect to nationality as the result of changes in national legislation.

40. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that one of the tasks of the United Nations was the preparation of multilateral conventions to improve the lot of women and to abolish the inequality of rights from which they so often suffered. For that task international co-operation was essential; it had already brought results, as the Convention on the Political Rights of Women had been adopted. The draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women was a further step forward: the Convention would promote more effectively the respect for individual rights, without distinction as to sex, required under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

41. Pointing out that Soviet law—article 5 of the Nationality Act of 1938, for instance—was in conformity with the provisions of the draft Convention, she explained that she had voted for all proposals designed to render the Convention more progressive

[2] See E/CN.6/L.120/Rev.1 and Economic and Social Council resolution 547 D (XVIII).

and against texts which would have narrowed its scope.

42. She regretted the adoption of article 4 as it would prevent important States like the People's Republic of China from becoming parties to the Convention. The Committee's decision in the matter seemed to her contrary to the spirit and the principles of the Charter. Although she recognized the need to make the Convention as effective as possible, she could only deplore the Committee's decision to limit the right of States to make reservations; that was one of the essential prerogatives of any sovereign State. She also thought that, contrary to the terms of article 9, a dispute could not be referred to the International Court of Justice except at the request of all the parties concerned.

43. Despite the defects in the draft Convention, her delegation had voted for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529) which opened the instrument for signature and ratification; it had done so because the adoption of the Convention might help to abolish inequalities between men and women with regard to nationality.

44. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that he had abstained from voting on the various articles and on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529) alike because Haitian law, which conferred Haitian nationality on an alien woman who married a Haitian, was contrary to article 1 of the draft Convention. Although Haiti considered the Convention to be very important, it could not sign that instrument until its legislation had been amended. He wished to point out that if States were able to make reservations to the substantive articles of conventions which, like the instrument under discussion, were designed to eliminate conflicts in law, such conventions would not achieve their purpose.

45. Mr. THIERRY (France) explained that the French delegation had abstained from voting on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529) not because French legislation was at variance with the substantive articles of the draft Convention—French law was based on the same principles and in certain respects was more advanced—but because the draft Convention was not quite what his delegation would have wished it to be. Some decisions had been taken on the basis of considerations altogether alien to juridical practice. The territorial clause was a case in point. On that question he fully endorsed the observations made by the United Kingdom representative.

46. Mr. AMATYAKUL (Thailand) had abstained from voting on most of the articles and on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529) because the Thai legislative authorities had not yet been able to examine the text of the draft Convention in detail. The principles upon which the draft Convention was based corresponded in some respects to the principles underlying the Thai law on nationality, which had enabled many problems of nationality to be solved in a satisfactory manner.

47. Mr. TSAO (China) had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529) because women throughout the world ought to reap the benefit of the provisions of the Convention as soon as possible. He wished to make it clear that his affirmative vote did not place the Chinese Government under any obligation to sign or to ratify the Convention. It would first have to make a detailed study. In that connexion, he requested that the Chinese version of the Convention should be made available as soon as possible.

48. He regretted that the USSR had felt obliged to make a political statement. He would merely point out, in reply, that the recent events in Hungary had revealed the true nature of all the satellite countries.

49. Mrs. KRASSOWSKA (Poland) recalled that she had voted in favour of the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.518) to article 4 of the draft Convention and had abstained from voting on the Australian amendment, which did not respect the principle of universality as closely as would have been desirable. She had also abstained from voting on articles 7 and 9 of the draft Convention, which did not correspond to the principles applied by Poland in the field of international relations. It was unfortunate to restrict the right of States to make reservations and to agree that a dispute could be brought before the International Court of Justice at the request of only one of the parties. The Polish delegation had also voted against the colonial clause.

50. Despite its objections to certain provisions of the draft Convention, Poland had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529), because the draft Convention embodied a progressive trend and could contribute to the full recognition of the rights of women in States in which women did not already enjoy complete equality.

51. She noted in conclusion that Polish legislation on nationality was based on the principles underlying the draft Convention.

52. Mr. BRATANOV (Bulgaria) had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529) because he considered that the draft Convention constituted an important step forward and that the Convention would, by its profoundly humanitarian and progressive character, help to improve the status of women. He noted that Bulgarian legislation on nationality made no distinction as between spouses. The various statutory provisions, and article 4 of the Act of 1948 in particular, referred in general terms to "persons" of Bulgarian or foreign nationality without specifying whether they were male or female. The Bulgarian delegation had stressed during the discussion that the Convention should be applied as widely as possible regardless of the status of the territory of which the persons concerned were inhabitants. It regretted that the wording of articles 4 and 5 prevented certain States from signing the Convention or adhering to it. Despite its objections to those articles and to article 9, which related to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, it firmly believed that the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women would play a positive role.

53. Mrs. BILAI (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) thought that the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women would help to secure equality of men and women in public life. She recalled that in 1953 the World Congress of Women had asked for equality between the sexes. That equality was affirmed in the special field of nationality in article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. She also recalled that in the Ukrainian SSR there was no discrimination on grounds of sex and that article 102 of the Constitution guaranteed equality between men and women. The nationality of wives was completely independent of that of their husbands.

54. Although some of the provisions of the draft Convention were open to criticism—articles 7 and 9,

for example, were liable to impair the sovereignty of States—she felt that it would have the advantage of introducing a certain unity into domestic legislation and would help to give women their proper role. The Ukrainian delegation had accordingly voted in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529).

55. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution in order to emphasize his delegation's interest in the success of the Convention. He had thus not followed his first inclination—which would have been to propose that the final clauses should be submitted to the Sixth Committee—because most of the provisions of the draft Convention were satisfactory and seemed to be in accordance with the juridical practice of the United Nations. In order to be sure, it might perhaps be advisable to submit the text to the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat; the consultation would concern only the form and would not in any way affect the text voted upon.

56. He wished to point out that the representative of the United Kingdom was hardly in a position to say whether it was now easier or more difficult for the Syrian Government to adhere to the Convention. In declaring that the absence of a territorial clause would facilitate its adherence, the Syrian delegation had based itself on reasons arising out of the general policy of Syria, which desired that all the people of all territories should, without any discrimination, be able to benefit from the humanitarian provisions of the Convention.

57. Mr. STEWART (New Zealand) had abstained from voting on the joint draft resolution. It was not that he disagreed with the terms or the provisions of the Convention, but he considered that it was incomplete owing to the absence of a territorial clause.

58. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) was grateful to all the delegations which had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution. The adoption of the Convention would be one more victory for women under the auspices of the United Nations. It was also a tribute to the efforts made by the Commission on the Status of Women to raise that status to the level of dignity which women were fully entitled to enjoy.

59. Mr. MARRIOTT (Australia) found himself obliged, in order to explain his delegation's abstention, to refer once more to the Committee's decision not to insert a territorial clause into the Convention. That decision had been taken on the affirmative vote of thirty-two delegations. At the seventh session of the General Assembly, a similar decision had been taken in regard to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women. Of the fifteen States which had opposed the territorial clause in both cases, eight had not yet ratified the first Convention although four years had elapsed since its signature and although they had stated forcefully that its application should be immediate and universal. He did not wish to suggest that in not signing the Convention any Government might have failed in its obligations. He simply wished to point out that, since it had been clearly shown that the Conventions could only be applied immediately in a small number of Member States, it was absolutely illogical for a majority of delegations to insist that they should be applied without delay in all the Non-Self-Governing Territories, some of which had achieved relatively little advancement, while at the same time they could not be applied in certain independent States. He asked how it could be ascertained whether certain territories, similar in that regard to independent States represented on the Committee, might prefer not to accept the provisions of the Convention, owing to their traditional attachment to religious principles or to principles such as family unity and why metropolitan Governments should be automatically penalized because of the perfectly legitimate reservations on the part of their territories. Those questions had so far gone unanswered.

60. The rejection of the territorial clause would not mean an appreciable increase in the number of signatories but on the contrary would have the opposite effect. To suggest that such a decision was in the interest of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories was tantamount to saying that their interests would have been better served if the provisions of Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the United Nations Charter had been rejected. Those provisions recognized the existence of Non-Self-Governing Territories, and the territorial clauses did the same. If recognition of the existence of certain circumstances was to be regarded as tacit approval of their continuation, the text of most conventions would have to stop at the final paragraph of the preamble.

61. The Australian Government approved of the basic provisions of the draft Convention and was ready to extend them to its non-metropolitan territories. However, the elimination of the territorial clause caused it the keenest misgivings and obliged it to consider the Convention in a new light. That fact had compelled the Australian delegation, to its very great regret, to abstain on the joint draft resolution and to reserve its position pending reconsideration of the question in the plenary Assembly.

62. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) said that if the draft Convention as a whole had been put to the vote, according to the usual United Nations practice, his delegation would have had to abstain because the provisions concerning reservations interfered, in certain cases, with the free operation of the domestic law of States. However, the Peruvian delegation had voted for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529), because it considered most of the provisions of the draft Convention unsatisfactory. Great progress was being made with regard to the recognition of women's rights in Peru, but certain constitutional provisions, which the Peruvian Government hoped soon to amend, prevented it, for the time being, from accepting some of the principles laid down in the draft Convention. Thus, Peru would not have been able to accept either article 1 or article 3. Referring to article 9, he pointed out once more that, in his delegation's view, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice was not compulsory. Article 36 of the Statute of the Court could apply only to States which accepted the Court's jurisdiction. In spite of its reservations, the Peruvian delegation had nevertheless shown its willingness to help make the Convention a success, by proposing, for example, a compromise solution with regard to the territorial clause.

63. In general, the question of reservations was closely linked to the development of international law. That consideration had obviously been the reason for the adoption of General Assembly resolution 598 (VI). In the Peruvian delegation's opinion, the practice of excluding the State making reservations could only

slow down the development of international law. Law progressed by stages; its development was linked to that of the legal conscience. The law worked out by specialized international bodies reached its highest point when it became an integral part of the body of domestic law of the various States. It was useless to adopt more or less general formulæ if they were to be negated by the sovereignty of States. No real progress could be made in that way. The Peruvian delegation had been obliged to abstain on article 7, because it considered that the power to make reservations was a step in the right direction.

64. Mr. ANEGAY (Morocco) said that, as a result of certain provisions concerning Moroccan nationality contained in the Madrid Convention of 1880 and the Act of Algeciras of 1906, his Government was not at present able to sign the Convention, although it found the substantive articles satisfactory. Pending the revision of the international agreements in question, the Moroccan delegation had preferred to abstain in the voting.

65. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) said that, by voting for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.529), her delegation had wished to indicate its full support for the draft Convention. That was a reversal of its policy at the tenth session of the General Assembly, when it had been obliged, for technical reasons, to abstain on the substantive articles. Those articles were in full conformity with Israel legislation on nationality. Israel intended to sign and ratify the Convention.

66. Mr. MUFTI (Syria), replying to some observations made in the course of the debate, said that it was certainly not to the credit of countries which were in favour of universality that they had not yet signed certain conventions. The countries which wished to introduce a territorial clause and thus exercise some degree of discrimination in the application of conventions would be in a stronger moral position for criticizing if they first signed and ratified those conventions. The General Assembly was striving to establish high standards of conduct for States, and all Member States should try to measure up to those standards. They would obviously not do so if they adopted discriminatory measures, and they should therefore endeavour to eliminate such measures whenever possible.

67. Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that the Convention was intended to help the millions of women who were still deprived of their nationality rights. Although those rights were fully respected in her country, her delegation had wished to contribute to the work of the Committee by giving the Convention a more progressive character; that, for instance, had been the aim of the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.518), providing that the States to which the Convention was open for signature should include States that were not yet Members of the United Nations or members of a specialized agency. Her delegation had been unable to support the United Kingdom proposal (A/C.3/L.522), under which the Convention would not have been immediately applicable to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Such a decision would have run counter to the progress which had been accomplished in recent years. She had likewise been unable to support the amendment (A/C.3/L.520) restricting the right of States to make reservations. Nevertheless, her delegation had supported the draft Convention as a whole, for it was a starting-point for progress towards the absolute equality of men and women.

AGENDA ITEM 31

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (E/2573, annexes I, II and III, A/2907 and Add.1 and 2, A/2910 and Add.1 to 6, A/2929, A/3077, A/C.3/L.460, A/3149, A/C.3/L.528) (*continued*)

Procedure for consideration of the draft Covenants (A/C.3/L.528) (*concluded*)

68. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider his suggestions (A/C.3/L.528) concerning the procedure for the consideration of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights (E/2573, annex I).

69. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) fully supported the suggestions and thanked the Chairman for introducing them. If they were adopted, the Committee should round them out by deciding how many meetings it intended to devote to the consideration of the draft Covenants. Some of the articles had already been adopted. If the Committee could not adopt the draft Covenants in their entirety at the current session of the General Assembly, it should at least adopt a large part of them. At all events, the Committee should bend every effort to the task in order to meet the wishes of the General Assembly and the hopes of all those who were impatiently waiting for the Covenants to come into force. In such circumstances, the Committee might do well to forgo consideration of items 32 (Recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination) and 60 (Interim measures, pending entry into force of the Covenants on Human Rights, to be taken with respect to violations of the human rights set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights) of the agenda of the General Assembly, which were not so pressing. In that case, all that would be left on its agenda, apart from the draft Covenants, would be item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council), which should not require much time. The Afghan delegation might submit a formal proposal along those lines.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal, contained in his statement (A/C.3/L.528), that the Third Committee should, at the current session of the General Assembly, begin with the substantive articles of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and continue with the substantive articles of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and that when the substantive articles of both draft Covenants had been adopted the Committee should then take up the general provisions in part II of each of the draft Covenants.

The proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

Printed in U.S.A. M—77301—February 1957—2,150