UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.6/SR.673
16 December 1976

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Resumed Twenty-sixth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 673rd MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 14 December 1976, at 3.05 p.m.

Chairman: Mrs. GONZALEZ de CUADROS (Colombia)

CONTENTS

GE.76-92185

INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS RELATING TO THE STATUS OF WOMEN (agenda item 3) (continued)

(a) DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (E/CN.6/591 and Add.1; E/CN.6/L.701 and L.715; E/CN.6/NGO/272 and Add.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider the suggested new version of article 21 (E/CN.6/L.715) paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1

2. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections she would take it that the Commission adopted paragraph 1 by consensus.

3. It was so decided.

Paragraph 2(a)

4. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, she would take it that the Commission adopted paragraph 2(a) by consensus.

5. It was so decided.

Paragraph 2(b)

6. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the delegation of Mexico had proposed the addition of the words "the most representative" before the words "national non-governmental organizations".

7. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) suggested that the words "including women's organizations" should be deleted and that the subparagraph should simply end with the words "the appropriate national non-governmental organizations".

8. Mrs. FREDGARD (Sweden) withdrew the amendment submitted earlier by her delegation, and supported the Canadian amendment.

9. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) proposed that the text should be made clearer by amending the end of the subparagraph to read: "national non-governmental organizations concerned with the achievement of equality between women and men".

10. Miss TYABJI (India) supported the Iranian amendment; the term "the most representative" was too vague and ambiguous.

11. Begum FARIDI (Pakistan) proposed the following wording: "national non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the United Nations".

12. Mrs. TALLAWY (Egypt), supported by Miss TYABJI (India), did not think it was relevant in the present context whether such organizations had consultative status.

13. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) agreed that it would be better not to refer to consultative status because some countries had no non-governmental organization with that status.

14. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) recalled that the expression "the most representative non-governmental organizations" had caused problems for the ILO, and suggested replacing it by the term "the competent national non-governmental organizations".

15. Mr. VALLARTA (Mexico) doubted whether replacement of the words "the most representative" by "competent" would improve the text. There were large numbers of competent organizations, but Governments could not consult them all. They had to choose those which they considered to be the most representative. Admittedly, it was a difficult choice to make, as the ILO had discovered, but the Commission should take care not to adopt a text that might restrict the freedom of Governments.

16. Mrs. TALLAWY (Egypt) suggested that both the Canadian and the Iranian amendments should be maintained and the following text adopted: "... the appropriate national non-governmental organizations concerned with the achievement of equality among women and men".

17. Begum FARIDI (Pakistan) withdrew her proposal, and endorsed the Canadian amendment. The change suggested by the Iranian delegation was too restrictive, because the convention was concerned not only with equality between women and men but also with the social and economic aspects of the status of women.

18. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) agreed with the comments of the representative of Pakistan on the Iranian amendment.

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the delegations of Canada, Egypt, Hungary, India, Iran and Mexico to form a working group and draft a generally acceptable text.

20. The meeting was adjourned at 3.30 p.m. and resumed at 3.35 p.m.

21. Mrs. TALLAWY (Egypt) announced that the working group had agreed upon the Canadian amendment, which added the word "appropriate" before the words "national non-governmental organizations", as it left Governments completely free to choose the organizations in question.

22. The Canadian amendment was adopted by consensus.

23. Paragraph 2(b) was adopted as amended by consensus.

Paragraph 2(c)

24. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark) proposed that the words "by the ad hoc Group set up under this Article" should be inserted after the words "in accordance with a programme to be established".

25. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) supported by Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) suggested that the Danish representative's proposal should be amended to read: "by the ad hoc Group set up under paragraph 3 of this Article".

26. Mrs. HIRLEMANN (France) thought that the words "under this Article" were clear enough, but would not object if reference was made to paragraph 3.

27. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark) agreed that it did not matter whether the words "paragraph 3" were maintained or not.

28. The Danish amendment was adopted by consensus.

29. Paragraph 2(c) was adopted as amended by consensus.

30. Paragraph 2, as a whole was adopted as amended by consensus.

Paragraph 3

31. Mr. VAN DUYSE (Belgium) suggested that consideration of paragraph 3 should be deferred until the other paragraphs of article 21 had been adopted.

32. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark) and Miss TYABJI (India) supported that proposal, which would save time.

33. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary), Mrs. HIRLEMANN (France) and Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that it would be illogical to follow that procedure; the paragraph relating to the formation of an ad hoc group should be adopted before the group's terms of reference were considered.

34. Mr. VAN DUYSE (Belgium) withdrew his proposal because it had failed to attract unanimous support.

35. The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the amendments to paragraph 3 (E/CN.6/SR.672) submitted by the delegation of Canada, the Soviet Union and the United States at the previous meeting.

36. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Secretary of the Commission) suggested that, in the interest of clarity, the end of paragraph 3 might be reworded to read: "... shall be elected for a two-year term".

37. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) accepted that amendment on behalf of the co-sponsors of document E/CN.6/L.715, who also agreed to the Canadian representative's proposal to amend the English text of the beginning of the last sentence to read: "Those elected to the Group...".

38. He appealed to the United States delegation to withdraw its amendment and simply to enter a reservation.

39. Begum FARIDI (Pakistan) did not consider that the members of the group should serve in a personal capacity; if a consensus was achieved on paragraph 3 she would enter a reservation on that point.

40. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the explanations given by the representative of Iran at the previous meeting, she withdrew her amendments to paragraph 3 with the exception of her proposal to add, in the Russian text, the words "to the Convention" after the words "States Parties", in order to make good an omission.

41. Mrs. TALLAWY (Egypt) also appealed to the United States delegation to withdraw its amendment; the text under consideration was a compromise that reflected major concessions on the part of many delegations.

42. The draft article provided for an organic link between the Commission on the Status of Women and the ad hoc group to review the progress made in the implementation of the convention. The link was indispensible because a number of delegations, including her own, were afraid that the establishment of a monitoring committee that was entirely independant of the Commission on the Status of Women would eventually lead to the abolition of the Commission. Their fears were justified, because the possibility of doing away with the Commission had already been raised in the United Nations report on the restructuring of the United Nations system.

43. There were precedents for the proposal made in paragraph 3; the application of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was monitored by the Economic and Social Council itself, which had proposed setting up a small working group for the purpose. Moreover, the task of monitoring the application of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid had been assigned to a small group of members of the Commission on Human Rights.

44. She emphasized that the Commission on the Status of Women must not give the impression that it was divided over article 21 by proposing alternative versions to the Economic and Social Council. It was an important question on which the Commission should reach a consensus and submit a single text to the Council for approval.

45. Mrs. COCKCROFT (United Kingdom) moved the closure of the debate.

46. The motion was adopted.

47. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Secretary of the Commission) said that, under rule 28 of the rules of procedure, the Secretariat was required to estimate the financial implications for the United Nations of the proposal made in paragraph 3 of Article 21. Unfortunately, she had not yet received information from New York enabling her to give an estimate of the expenditure it would entail. It would consist mainly of travel and per diem expenses for 10 to 15 members of the ad hoc group; there would also be expenditure on documentation and, possibly, Secretariat services.

48. The CHAIRMAN put the United States amendment to the vote.

49. The amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 8.

50. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 3, as amended, to the vote.

51. Paragraph 3 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

52. Mr. VALLARTA (Mexico) said he had voted against the United States amendment not because it was unacceptable to his delegation but because the praiseworthy efforts made by the co-sponsors of document E/CN.6/L.715 deserved recognition and because, if the future system for monitoring the application of the convention was to prove efficient, it needed a broad measure of support. Such support would be enjoyed by the system provided for in paragraph 3, as adopted, but not by the one proposed by the United States.

53. Mrs. HIRLEMANN (France) would have liked paragraph 3 adopted by consensus. She had voted for the United States amendment, which she preferred, but as it had been rejected she had voted for the original text of paragraph 3 because the two texts were not contradictory in any way and because she wished to take note of the efforts made by the co-sponsors of document E/CN.6/L.715.

54. Begum FARIDI (Pakistan) would also have preferred a consensus. She had accepted paragraph 3 in principle but confirmed her reservation with respect to the words "serve in their personal capacity".

55. Mrs. VENEZI-COSMETATOS (Greece) and Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) said that their votes had been based on the same reasoning as that of the French representative.

56. Mrs. COCKCROFT (United Kingdom) said that, as the United States amendment had been rejected, she had abstained from the vote on paragraph 3, with respect to which she wished to enter a reservation.

57. Mr. VAN DUYSE (Belgium) also had reservations with respect to paragraph 3.

Paragraph 4

58. The CHAIRMAN recalled that no specific proposals had been made with regard to that paragraph in the course of the general debate.

59. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark) thought it would be better to delete the last part of the paragraph, beginning with the words "and submit its report ...", because it was stated at the beginning of paragraph 5 that the ad hoc group would report on its activities to the Commission.

60. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) supported the Danish representative's suggestion.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, she would take it that paragraph 4, together with the change requested by the representative of Denmark was adopted by consensus.

62. It was so decided.

Paragraph 5

63. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Soviet delegation had submitted amendments to paragraph 5.

64. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation had withdrawn its amendments in view of the comments which had been made. The Russian text was not satisfactory, and the purpose of her amendments had been to bring it into line with the original.

65. The CHAIRMAN said that in the circumstances she would assume that, in the absence of objections, paragraph 5 was adopted by consensus.

66. It was so decided.

Paragraph 6

67. Mrs. JANJIC (International Labour Organisation) suggested that the words "various stages of the" should be inserted between the words "the" and "consideration" in the first line.

68. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, if there were no objections, the Commission should adopt paragraph 6, as amended by the ILO representative, by consensus.

69. It was so decided.

Paragraph 7

70. Mrs. AHRLAND (Sweden) considered that, in the first line, it would be better to say "The Economic and Social Council shall submit" rather than "may submit".

71. Mrs. HIRLEMANN (France) felt that the words "from time to time" in the first line were too vague.

72. Mrs. BRUCE (Deputy Director, Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) explained that in English the phrase "from time to time" was part of United Nations jargon; none the less, the word "periodically" might be preferable.

73. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said he could accept the word "periodically".

74. Mr. VALLARTA (Mexico), referring to the amendment proposed by the Swedish representative, did not consider it appropriate for the Commission to impose an obligation on the Economic and Social Council. It would be better to say "may submit".

75. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) pointed out that, from a legal standpoint, the use of the future tense at the beginning of the paragraph caused no difficulty: if the draft text under consideration was eventually approved by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, in accordance with normal procedure, there was nothing to prevent an obligation being imposed on the Economic and Social Council.

76. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark) considered that the words "general observance" in the last two lines weakened the text; it would be better to say merely "in achieving observance of the rights ...".

77. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said that the word "general" had not been used to weaken the sense of the paragraph; what was meant was respect, by all countries or Member States, of the rights recognized in the convention. He did not, however, have any strong feelings on the subject.

78. Mrs. HIRLEMANN (France) agreed with the representative of Iran that the word "general" strengthened the meaning of the paragraph.

79. Mrs. COCKCROFT (United Kingdom) said that the word "world-wide" could be used in the English text.

80. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) observed that the word "world-wide" would imply that all States would be forced to become parties to the Convention; in point of fact, paragraph 7 applied only to States parties, and that was what the word "general" suggested.

81. Mrs. HUSSEIN (Egypt) suggested the word "widespread".

82. Miss TYABJI (India) said that she, too, felt that the word "general" should be deleted.

83. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) said that difficulties due to shades of meaning could be overcome by using the words "full observance of ...".

84. The CHAIRMAN felt that replacement of the word "general" by the word "full", as suggested by the representative of Hungary, might satisfy the Commission. If so, and if there were no other objections, she would consider that the Commission adopted paragraph 7 by consensus.

85. It was so decided.

Paragraph 8

86. The CHAIRMAN recalled that no comments had been made on paragraph 8 during the general debate. Unless delegations raised objections, she would propose that the paragraph should be adopted by consensus.

87. It was so decided.

88. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the text of article 21 as a whole proposed in document E/CN.6/L.715, as amended, should be adopted by consensus.

89. Article 21 was adopted as amended by consensus.

90. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark), explaining his delegation's vote, said it was pleased to have been able to support the text of article 21, and had noted with satisfaction that certain basic points it had raised had been taken into consideration. He recalled, however, that his delegation had voted for the text of paragraph 3 proposed by the United States, and said that certain points in the final text of that paragraph caused it some difficulties.

91. Mrs. HUTAR (United States of America) said she was gratified that article 21 as a whole had been adopted by consensus, but regretted that the amendment submitted by her delegation to paragraph 3 had not been adopted. Under that amendment it would have been possible to establish an ad hoc group broadly representative of States parties, which would have better served the Commission. Her delegation wished, therefore, to enter a reservation, which should be placed on record, concerning that article. She none the less commended the work of all delegations which had participated in the preparation of article 21.

92. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of the United States that her delegation's reservation would be noted.

Proposal for an article 21 bis

93. Mrs. COENE (Belgium) said she was gratified that it had been possible to adopt article 21 as a whole by consensus, particularly as it constituted an important part of the convention. The Commission had just devoted more than four weeks' work to defining women's rights and drawing up measures to be adopted to eliminate discrimination against them; for Belgium, however, the convention would remain incomplete unless provision was made for other effective means of monitoring its implementation and noting infringements. At the end of the first part of the session her delegation had asked members to reflect on that question. The approach mentioned in article 21, namely, verification in the form of reports, was a "minimalist" solution. In conventions setting forth rights in any area, provision was made for procedures whereby individuals could, in the event of the violation of those rights, lodge a complaint with international bodies after they had exhausted the remedies available under domestic legislation. That had been done in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocol and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Commission should use such precedents as a point of departure; Belgium considered that in any case the convention on the elimination of discrimination against women should not lag behind such precedents.

94. The Commission no longer had the time, at its current session, to consider recourse procedures in detail. There should, however, be an undertaking that, as soon as the convention entered into force, consideration would be given, in the Commission, to the possibility of establishing procedures for the implementation of the convention with a view to enabling States parties and their nationals to address themselves to the ad hoc group for the establishment of which provision had been made. To that end, her delegation wished to submit a draft article 21 bis, which would read:

> "As soon as this Convention enters into force, the States Parties undertake to examine, in the Commission on the Status of Women, the possibility of establishing procedures for the implementation of this Convention with a view to enabling States Parties and their nationals to address themselves to the ad hoc Group."

95. The CHAIRMAN said that draft article 21 bis submitted by the representative of Belgium would be examined as soon as it was available in the various languages.

96. Mrs. HIRLEMANN (France) said that she could support the proposal; she would reaffirm that support when the text was discussed.

Proposal for an additional article on reservations (E/CN.6/L.701)

97. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark), whose delegation sponsored the proposal, recalled that its substance had already been discussed and that it had been decided to prepare an article on reservations along the lines of that contained in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. He wished to make two drafting changes in the text of the proposal as contained in document E/CN.6/L.701; firstly, the word "reservations" should not be underlined in the first paragraph of the English text; and, secondly, in paragraph 2, the word "Committee" should be replaced by the words "ad hoc Group".

98. Miss TYABJI (India) said that she could support the draft additional article, as amended.

99. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) considered that the words "the object and purpose" in the first line of paragraph 2 were unsatisfactory; the convention would not have just one object or purpose but many. It would be better to say "the main objectives and purposes".

100. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark) said that the expression "incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention" was the standard formula that appeared in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It was the customary expression used in the texts of conventions relating to reservations.

101. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) was still of the view that the words "the object and purpose of this Convention" were unsuitable, and that the first two nouns should be in the plural.

102. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) confirmed that the expression "incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention" was indeed taken from the text of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and that that text was based on an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice concerning reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. That opinion had been requested because, for years, the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Commission on Human Rights and all competent bodies had wondered what should be the criterion authorizing a reservation. The expression used in the Vienna Convention should therefore be reproduced word for word.

103. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said that, although he was not satisfied with the wording, he would not propose a formal amendment.

104. The draft proposal (E/CN.6/L.701) was adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution E/CN.6/L.712

105. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider draft resolution E/CN.6/L.712.

106. Mrs. COCKCROFT (United Kingdom) commended the sponsors of the draft resolution, which paid tribute to the work accomplished by the non-governmental organizations. Those organizations had played an important role in the formulation of the Declaration and the convention on the elimination of discrimination against women. It was to be hoped that the Commission would adopt the draft resolution and that its members would ensure its implementation.

107. Begum FARIDI (Pakistan) associated herself with the comments of the United Kingdom delegation. There was no doubt that, without the assistance of non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and the help of certain other organizations, the Commission would have been unable to carry out its task.

108. Mrs. HUTAR (United States of America) said that there were a great many non-governmental organizations in her country - a fact to which her Government attached considerable importance. The need for social changes was felt at the grass-roots level, and it was precisely those organizations which drew the attention of Governments to any needs that became apparent. Her delegation was therefore happy to be able to support draft resolution E/CN.6/L.712.

109. Mrs. VENEZI-COMETATOS (Greece) associated herself with the delegations which had expressed support for the draft resolution.

110. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) said she was aware how important the work of the non-governmental organizations was for the Commission, but would like some clarification of the exact meaning of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. She also wondered what was the nature of the machinery that would consider the reports of those organizations.

111. Miss TYABJI (India) thought that they could be considered by the ad hoc group which the Commission had just decided to set up.

112. Mrs. TALLAWY (Egypt) paid a tribute to the work of the non-governmental organizations, which was greatly appreciated in her country. However, paragraph 1 seemed to be in contradiction with the provisions of article 21 of the convention which the Commission had just adopted. That article did not request the ad hoc group to consider the reports of the non-governmental organizations, but merely indicated that those organizations would help in the preparation of reports submitted by Governments. It therefore seemed difficult to implement the provisions of paragraph 1. In addition, the connexion between paragraphs 1 and 2 was not very clear.

113. Mr. LEHMANN (Denmark) associated himself with the comments of the representatives of Canada and Egypt. The non-governmental organizations certainly played a role which was vitally important both for the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women. However, the adoption of paragraph 1 would make it necessary to insert, after article 21, a new article authorizing the non-governmental organizations to submit reports. He therefore wondered to whom those reports should be addressed; that question would create a great number of difficulties.

114. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said he understood the objectives of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but had to admit that he shared the concern of the delegations which had just spoken. Consideration of the reports of the non-governmental organizations would place an extremely heavy burden on the ad hoc group. In any event, those organizations were already authorized to transmit reports to the Commission. Moreover, a text had just been approved stating that the reports submitted by Governments would be prepared in consultation and in co-operation with the non-governmental organizations; paragraph 1 should therefore be amended.

115. Miss TYABJI (India) recognized that consideration of the reports of non-governmental organizations might impose an unduly heavy burden on the ad hoc group. However, the importance of the role played by those organizations must be stressed. Article 21 already enhanced the importance of that role, but it was necessary to go even further. Provision might perhaps be made for the Commission, when it followed up the implementation of the convention and the World Plan of Action, to examine the reports of the non-governmental organizations. In that case, the word "machinery" in paragraph 1 could simply be replaced by the word "commission". The sponsors of the draft resolution would be happy to take into consideration any specific proposal that might be submitted by delegations.

116. Mrs. FREDGARD (Sweden) said that there was no question that the useful work carried out by the non-governmental organizations was of value to the United Nations, but thought that the text of the draft resolution had to be studied more carefully. It would be preferable to suspend the consideration of the draft for a few moments to enable delegations to hold consultations and to find an acceptable formula.

117. Mrs. COENE (Belgium) said that her Government greatly appreciated the work of the non-governmental organizations, particularly those which were concerned with the status of women. The wording of paragraph 1 should be amended, however, and it should be possible to find an acceptable formula which would enable the Commission to adopt the draft resolution.

118. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed the important role played by women's organizations in a number of countries. She noted that the draft resolution had been submitted before the Commission had taken a decision on article 21 of the convention, which probably explained the difficulties raised by paragraph 1. The non-governmental organizations already had a well-defined status and could state their views in the Commission; some had already done so at the current session, for example. In her opinion, it was unrealistic to try to have their reports considered by the ad hoc group. The Commission should ponder the matter further in order to find a solution which would make it possible to retain the draft resolution.

119. Mrs. BRUCE (Deputy Director, Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) said she associated herself with the delegations which had paid tribute to the work done by the non-governmental organizations during the many years in which they had collaborated closely with various United Nations bodies.

120. In seeking to draft an acceptable text, delegations should take various factors into account. The machinery that would monitor the implementation of the convention was not the same as that provided for in the Plan of Action. The role of the non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Plan of Action was described in paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 3520 (XXX), which read as follows:

> "Urges non-governmental organizations, at the national and international levels, to take all possible measures to assist in the implementation of World Plan of Action and related resolutions of the Conference within their particular areas of interest and competence".

121. Consideration of reports on the implementation of the World Plan of Action submitted by States and competent bodies of the United Nations was the task of the Commission on the Status of Women, in accordance with paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 3490 (XXX). No provision had been made for the submission of reports by the non-governmental organizations on the implementation of the Plan of Action.

122. There were about 500 non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, and a great many of them, if not all, could well submit reports. The staff responsible for the consideration of reports would therefore have to be increased, and that would obviously have financial implications.

123. Referring to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, she said that it would be necessary to make clear which training and re-training bodies were meant.

124. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) asked whether the non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council were authorized, in general, to submit reports to the Commission.

125. Mrs. BRUCE (Deputy Director, Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) explained that non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council could make oral or written statements on items on the Commission's agenda, subject to certain conditions, in accordance with rule 76 of the Commission's rules of procedure.

126. Miss TYABJI (India) regretted that she was unable to consult the representative of Thailand, who was absent; however, she herself would willingly accept any suggestion that would make it possible to resolve the dilemma faced by the Commission.

127. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed to the following meeting in order to enable delegations to hold consultations.

128. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.