

Wednesday, 9 October 1957,
at 3.5 p. m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 12:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters VI and VII) (continued)	
Draft resolution on the development of international co-operation in the field of science, culture and education (concluded)	77
Draft resolution on seminars on the status of women	79

Chairman: Mrs. Aase LIONAES (Norway).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. López (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters VI and VII) (A/3613, A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.612, A/C.3/L.613) (continued)

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF SCIENCE, CULTURE AND EDUCATION (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) (concluded)

1. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) expressed the hope that the Committee would bear in mind the principles on which his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.615) to the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.1) had been based, although it no longer had any purpose.

2. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) fully endorsed the purposes of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2), which were the same as those of General Assembly resolution 1043 (XI). Israel had fully complied with the recommendations in the Assembly resolution by undertaking cultural exchanges with all countries on a basis of complete reciprocity. The attitude of the Soviet Union, however, had been somewhat disappointing. Israel was indeed receptive to Soviet culture and very large numbers of books, newspapers and gramophone records were imported from the USSR to an amount exceeding 100,000 Israel pounds in 1955. In fact, the USSR was its third largest source of imported books, coming after the United States of America and the United Kingdom. But there was unfortunately no reciprocity, and negotiations with the Soviet Union with a view to familiarizing the people of that country with the cultural heritage of Israel had come to nothing. The Israel Government hoped that effect would soon be given to the principles on which the Czechoslovak draft resolution was based. For its own part, it would try as in the past to intensify cultural relations with all the countries of the world.

3. She congratulated the Czechoslovak delegation on the noteworthy spirit of conciliation which it had shown by incorporating in its draft all the amendments that had been proposed.

4. Mr. NELSON HIMIOB (Venezuela) said he did not share the views of delegations which regarded the Czechoslovak draft resolution as unsatisfactory because it restated ideas expressed in General Assembly resolution 1043 (XI). On the contrary, the Venezuelan delegation considered it wise to reiterate certain principles in order to promote their application. The principle of international co-operation in culture and science was particularly important because it was one of the fundamental factors of human progress. The experience of the countries of America convincingly showed the usefulness of such exchanges, which they could undertake either through or outside the Organization of American States. Venezuela and the other American countries did not hesitate to request or provide information and the spirit of those exchanges made the Organization of American States an example of international co-operation. The cultural and social relations which Venezuela maintained with other States had brought it considerable advantages and had helped it to attain a high standard of living. Many technicians in the petroleum industry had been trained in the United States and many veterinary surgeons in Uruguay. Information and training centres had been established in his country and students from all countries came to Venezuela to attend the anti-malaria courses.

5. The Venezuelan delegation supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) and the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.616) unreservedly.

6. Mr. MEANY (United States of America) supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution and the Chilean amendment.

7. At the 776th meeting, the USSR representative had made a statement which called for some clarification. She had alleged that the trade-union movement in the United States was the tool of the ruling class and that it oppressed the workers and did not respect human rights. He stressed the fact that trade unions in the United States were entirely independent; they were not under the control of any political party and could criticize the Government, rightly or wrongly, as much as they wished. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, under the amended Constitution of 1936, the trade-union activities of factory and office workers were placed under the direction of the Communist Party. That concept of trade-unionism was somewhat reminiscent of the organization of the Hitlerite labour front.

8. Workers in the United States were free to exercise their right to strike without any restrictions, but Soviet workers were apparently so happy that they had no reason to strike. That heaven on earth was also reminiscent of the "strength through joy" of the Nazi régime.

9. In the United States, the workers themselves fixed their wages. In the USSR, however, according to an

article published two years previously in *Trud*, the official organ of the trade-union movement, the officials of the economic services alone were responsible for establishing wage scales, production norms and so forth.

10. Returning to the question of class inequality and the alleged abolition of that inequality in the Soviet Union, he referred to the recent report of a parliamentary delegation from Ceylon, which stated that a large number of Soviet workers earned 350 roubles a month, while certain grades earned ten times or even forty times as much. Such a difference did not exist in any capitalist countries.

11. He stressed the fact that 54 million workers in seventy-two countries, members of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, had unanimously decided to oppose the exchange of delegations with the trade unions of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies because they represented Governments rather than workers and were not in any sense real trade unions. It was noteworthy, moreover, that all the revolts that had broken out behind the "iron curtain" had been led by the "happy" workers of the countries concerned.

12. At the 775th meeting he had spoken of the obstacles to international co-operation raised by the policy of totalitarian countries; he had not mentioned either the Soviet Union or the peoples' democracies. In replying as it had done, the USSR delegation had shown that it acknowledged the allusion.

Mrs. Lionaes (Norway) took the Chair.

13. Mr. Francisco LIMA (El Salvador) pointed out that the latest version of paragraph 2 of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) was better than the previous text, in which various types of exchange had been listed. Such enumerations could not be exhaustive; for example, it would have been regrettable not to mention the exchanges of workers in which the Government of El Salvador was particularly interested and which were very useful both for under-developed and for industrialized countries.

14. The Salvadorian delegation would vote in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution and the Chilean amendment.

15. Mr. D'SOUZA (India) expressed his approval of the idea on which the draft resolution was based and congratulated the Czechoslovak delegation on the spirit of conciliation it had shown.

16. Cultural and scientific co-operation, which had an age-old history, had always been a means of bringing peoples together, despite their political and commercial rivalries. Throughout its history, India had been the meeting-place of many intellectual currents.

17. He was glad that the Chilean amendment referred to the specialized agencies, for India was in a position to appreciate the excellent work done by them. Nevertheless, he was of the opinion that to address the resolution only to States Members of the United Nations family would run counter to the principle of universality which should govern international co-operation and he could not therefore, vote for the amendment.

18. He stressed that brief exchanges for specific purposes could have but a limited scope. It was by perseverance and establishing permanent contacts

which would enable peoples to know each other better that a real contribution could be made to the strengthening of peace.

19. Mr. TEJERA (Uruguay) said he did not believe that the procedural point raised by the Chinese representative [776th meeting] when discussing the Czechoslovak draft resolution should prevent the Third Committee from dealing with a question which obviously fell within its competence.

20. He thanked the Czechoslovak delegation for the spirit of conciliation that it had shown and would vote in favour of the revised text (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2), provided that operative paragraph 2 was amended in the manner proposed by the Chilean representative.

21. Uruguay had always been fully aware of the importance of international co-operation in science, culture and education. Uruguayan universities counted many young people from other American countries among their students, and young Uruguayans went abroad to study. He regretted the attitude of some countries which had led the Israel representative to speak of a lack of reciprocity.

22. As he had mentioned during the general debate, his country cherished individual freedom. That freedom was manifest in trade-union activities. Trade unions in Uruguay were controlled neither by the employers nor by the State and were entirely free in political matters, as was shown by the fact that there existed both Communist trade unions and trade unions affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

23. Mr. EFFENDI NUR (Indonesia) whole-heartedly supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution, the author of which had shown a commendable spirit of conciliation. The text was in full accord with the spirit of the United Nations Charter, and also with that of the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung in 1955, whose final communiqué had stressed the need to strengthen cultural co-operation. He shared the Indian representative's view on the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.616) to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2).

24. Mrs. TOLBERT (Liberia) said she would vote for the Czechoslovak draft resolution if it was amended along the lines indicated by the Chilean representative. She hoped that the principles set forth in it would be fully applied.

25. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took exception to the tone of the United States representative's remarks. His insinuations, which deceived nobody, were not in harmony with the spirit of cordiality that had always prevailed in the Third Committee. He was once again seeking to employ the old propaganda device of claiming, when things were bad at home, that they were worse elsewhere. Such efforts were of no avail, however, and he would be unable to conceal the fact that in the socialist countries all the achievements of peaceful creative labour were for the benefit of the people and went to raise the level of living of the workers. It would be far better for the United Nations and for the American people if Mr. Meany selected some other place in which to indulge his demagogic eloquence. The USSR delegation was confident that all attempts to disturb the atmosphere of business-like co-operation in the Committee would fail.

26. Begum JEHAN-MURSHID (Pakistan) said she had listened with great interest to the statement made by the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) at the preceding meeting.

27. She hoped that the Czechoslovak delegation would find it possible to replace the words "all States" in operative paragraph 2 by the words "all States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies", as that would make its text acceptable to a large majority. Her country had a profound respect for Article 1, paragraph 3, and Articles 13 and 55 of the United Nations Charter.

28. Mr. IZAWA (Japan) was convinced that the Czechoslovak draft resolution would help the nations to draw closer together. He would therefore support it, provided that the Chilean amendment were adopted.

29. Mr. PETER (Hungary) regretted that the United Kingdom and the United States delegations had seen fit to disturb the serene atmosphere of the Committee by their statements. He hoped that in future the Committee would devote itself wholly to the humanitarian, social and cultural questions with which it was competent to deal. He would vote for the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

30. Mr. EPINAT (France) remarked that he supported the principles set forth in the Czechoslovak draft resolution and would therefore vote for it. The exchanges mentioned in the text were subject to certain conditions and he hoped that in future exchanges the Governments of countries which were represented in the Third Committee or which were members of the specialized agencies would be able to lay aside all political considerations.

31. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) stated that he would vote for the Czechoslovak draft resolution, if the Chilean amendment were taken into account. He hoped that the amendment withdrawn by the Philippine representative (A/C.3/L.615) was implied in the broader drafting of the new text. Greece, whose broadcasts were jammed in some parts of the world, attached a very great importance to freedom of information.

32. Mr. Hermes LIMA (Brazil) congratulated the Czechoslovak delegation on its spirit of conciliation. He supported the revised text (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) and would also vote for the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.616), which covered the same ground as one of the points of the joint amendments (A/C.3/L.614), of which Brazil was one of the sponsors. Co-operation in science, culture and education should be as wide as possible, and that was why UNESCO had admitted countries which were not Members of the United Nations.

33. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) recalled that operative paragraph 2 of the first revised text of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.1) began with the word "Invites". The Czechoslovak representative, no doubt convinced by the Chilean representative's arguments, had replaced it, in the second revised text, by the stronger word "Urges". As the body speaking was the General Assembly, it was natural that its pressing appeal should be addressed only to the Members of the United Nations or the members of the specialized agencies, specially since the new text spoke of the "fundamental purposes of the United Nations", which the old text had not done. For those

reasons, he would vote for the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.616).

34. Mr. FARRA (Syria) said he would vote for the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2), but against the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.616), he understood that the purpose of the draft resolution was to promote co-operation among all States, and the Committee should therefore repeat the language used in General Assembly resolution 1043 (XI).

35. Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) also thought that the draft resolution should remain universal in character, and preferred it without the Chilean amendment.

36. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala) stated that she would vote both for the Czechoslovak draft resolution and for the Chilean amendment. She welcomed operative paragraph 3, which offered UNESCO an opportunity to report any of its difficulties, since difficulties must be known before they could be solved.

37. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) felt there were good grounds for suspecting that the word "Urges" disguised political intentions; he would strongly prefer the original term, "Invites".

38. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to vote on the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.616), which called for the insertion of the words "Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies" after the words "all States" in operative paragraph 2 of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2).

The amendment was adopted by 40 votes to 26, with 5 abstentions.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

40. Mrs. LEFLEROVA (Czechoslovakia) thanked the members of the Committee for the spirit of co-operation they had shown in adopting the draft resolution submitted by her country. She was particularly grateful to the delegations which had shown their interest in that text by presenting amendments to it.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON SEMINARS ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN (A/C.3/L.612)

41. Mrs. TOLBERT (Liberia) said that her delegation would vote for the draft resolution on seminars on the status of women (A/C.3/L.612).

42. The important part which women could play in public life could not be too strongly emphasized and in every country women must recognize their responsibilities, which were moral, financial and material. Women had already made great strides towards equality with men but they still had far to go. In order to help them, it was necessary to encourage them to acquire sound professional and technical training.

43. The right to vote was a fundamental right of women; it was being extended to women ever more widely and the women of Liberia had acquired that right in 1947. At the current time, women were taking an active part in Liberian life; they held many important posts and were ready to play their part in international matters.

44. Mr. TSAO (China) said that he was generally in agreement with the purpose of the eight-Power draft

resolution. In his view, it would be preferable to organize regional seminars to discuss specific questions rather than to organize world-wide seminars to discuss general principles. Furthermore, world-wide seminars would duplicate the work of the Commission on the Status of Women, UNESCO and the International Labour Organisation, and would be harmful to their prestige.

45. The appropriation for the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights was limited and it might not be sufficient for the organization of regular seminars on the status of women. Such seminars accounted for only one kind of activities under that programme. The General Assembly should take the other activities into account. It would therefore be preferable to replace the words "will be held regularly", in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.612), by the words "will continue to be held in future".

46. Mr. CALAMARI (Panama) said that his country had always taken a deep interest in the work of the Commission on the Status of Women and he welcomed the results it had achieved. The Constitution of Panama guaranteed women full equality with men, with regard to the vote, access to public office, employment and education. The women of Panama were well prepared to exercise their rights and assume the responsibilities such rights implied.

47. The outstanding success of the Bangkok seminar had clearly proved the importance of such meetings, which his delegation hoped would be held regularly under the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights. He would vote for the draft resolution.

48. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) recalled that, in one of its resolutions, the Commission on the Status of Women had expressed the hope that seminars would be organized each year, preferably on a regional but also on an international basis.^{1/} It might be wise to conform to the usual practice of consistency and follow that precedent. The word "regularly" might be replaced by the word "annually", in that case. The meetings were sufficiently important to justify their being held so frequently. If the appropriation for advisory services in human rights was not adequate, an increase might possibly be considered.

49. She did not share the view of the representative of China; it would be inadvisable to restrict the scope of seminars by organizing them only on a regional basis.

50. Mr. Francisco LIMA (El Salvador) supported the draft resolution though he felt that it would be more courteous and logical to address it to the Economic and Social Council rather than to one of its functional commissions.

51. Begum JEHAN-MURSHID (Pakistan) considered that the importance of the proposed seminars could not be over-estimated. As the Bangkok seminar had clearly shown, meetings of that kind demonstrated the part which women could play in the life of their country. In Pakistan, women's rights had their place in the Constitution but women did not yet benefit by them

because of other problems, which the Government and all the people of Pakistan were striving to solve.

52. Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) concurred in the view of the Salvadorian representative that it was inappropriate in the General Assembly to address a recommendation direct to the Commission on the Status of Women. That Commission had no executive power and could only formulate recommendations. It might be preferable to invite it to "pursue its studies" and "submit recommendations".

53. His delegation, like the delegation of Israel, hoped that the seminars would be held annually.

54. The CHAIRMAN stated that the time limit for the submission of amendments had expired.

55. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that he was puzzled about the purpose of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. In fact, the Commission on the Status of Women was, as all agreed, one of the most active and energetic of the functional commissions; it was therefore unnecessary and inappropriate to urge it to continue what it was already doing. Furthermore, it was inadvisable to use the words "in accordance with its terms of reference", as they gave the impression that it had exceeded them.

56. Turning to operative paragraph 2, he said that seminars on the status of women were not the only ones to be organized under the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights. Such questions as that of safeguards for personal freedom to be discussed at the Manila meeting, were also very important. It was for those in charge of the programme to decide which seminars should be held, bearing in mind the requests from Governments and the possibilities available. The whole programme was still in an experimental stage and there were as yet no "regular" seminars in any field. To provide for "regular" seminars in that field would be to give women special treatment instead of equality with men, and to hamper the good administration of the programme. For that reason, he proposed that the words "will be held regularly" should be replaced either by the wording suggested by the Chinese representative or by the words "will be held as frequently as possible".

57. He asked the Chairman to allow delegations to submit oral amendments. There were so many draft resolutions that representatives did not always have time to study them with proper care before the expiry of the time limit.

58. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) thanked the Polish representative for his suggestions. It should be easy to reach agreement on operative paragraph 1. However, the comments on operative paragraph 2 were so important that it was difficult for the sponsors of the draft resolution to reply until they had had time to discuss them.

59. Mrs. HENSMAN (India) felt that special seminars on the status of women might not be the best method to adopt. If, in the course of a seminar on more general subjects, one whole day was devoted to the consideration of the status of women throughout the world, both men and women would participate in the debates and progress would be greater and more rapid.

60. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) supported the draft resolution unreservedly. She would be

^{1/} See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 3, para. 230, resolution 10 (XI).

grateful if the Secretariat would indicate the cost of organizing a seminar.

61. She also asked whether it was in order for the General Assembly to address recommendations direct to one of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council.

62. Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said that, on the basis of the experience already acquired, \$26,000 must be set aside for the organization of the seminar itself and \$7,000 for the preparatory working group, making \$33,000 altogether.

63. Mr. VAKIL (Secretary of the Committee) said that, at its resumed session, the Council devoted part of its time every year to a consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, which were generally addressed direct to it. However, the Assembly did occasionally make recommendations direct to one of the functional commissions; in that case, the Secretariat informed the Council, which then addressed its own recommendations to the commission concerned.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.