



COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Seventh Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Saturday, 28 April 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Pages

Draft International Covenant on Human Rights and
Measures of Implementation (item 3 of the agenda):

(b) Inclusion in the Covenant of provisions
concerning economic, social and cultural
rights (continued):

Special provisions on the right to work
(E/CN.4/537, E/CN.4/538/Rev.1, E/CN.4/539/
Rev.1, E/CN.4/547, E/CN.4/571, E/CN.4/AC.14/2,
Corr.1 and Add.1-2, E/CN.4/NGO/28)

4 - 19

Present:

Chairman: Mr. MALIK (Lebanon)

Members:

Australia	Mr. WHITLAM
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. YU
Denmark	Mr. SORENSEN
Egypt	AZMI Bey
France	Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU
Greece	Mr. EUSTATHADES
Guatemala	Mr. DUPONT-WALLEMIN
India	Mrs. MEHTA
Pakistan	Mr. WAHEED
Sweden	Mrs. ROSSEL
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. KOVALENKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROSOV
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Miss BOWIE
United States of America	Mr. SIMSARIAN
Uruguay	Mr. CIASULLO
Yugoslavia	Mr. JEVREMOVIC

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS) Governing Mr. JOUHAUX) Body of the Mr. BERGENSTRØM) International) Labour Office
	Mr. JENKS
	Mr. COX
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. THOMAS Mr. ELVIN Mr. SABA Mr. BARMATE
World Health Organization	Dr. BROCK CHISHOLM, Director General Mr. BERTRAND

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

World Federation of Trade Unions	Mr. FISCHER
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions	Miss SENDER Mr. PATTEET
International Federation of Christian Trade Unions	Mr. EGGERMAN

Category B and Register

Catholic International Union for Social Service	Miss de ROMER
Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations	Mr. BENTWICH
Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations	Mr. MOWSHOWITZ
International Council of Women	Miss van EEGHEN
International Federation of University Women	Miss ROBB
International League for the Rights of Man	Mr. de MADAY Mrs. SMALL
International Union for Child Welfare	
International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues	Miss de ROMER
Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations	Miss ROBB
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom	Miss BAER
World Jewish Congress	Mr. BIENENFELD Mr. REIGNER

Secretariat:

Mr. Humphrey
Mr. Das

Representing the Secretary-General
Secretary to the Commission

**DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION
(item 3 of the agenda):**

(b) INCLUSION IN THE COVENANT OF PROVISIONS CONCERNING ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (continued):

Special provisions on the right to work (E/CN.4/537, E/CN.4/538/Rev.1, E/CN.4/539/Rev.1, E/CN.4/547, E/CN.4/571, E/CN.4/AC.14/2, Corr.1 and Add.1-2, E/CN.4/NGO/28)

The CHAIRMAN requested representatives to continue their examination of the proposals relating to the right to work under item 3(b) of the agenda, and drew attention to the synoptic table (E/CN.4/AC.14/2) in which the various texts had been set out. The French proposal was contained in document E/CN.4/571, and the suggestion put forward by the International Labour Organisation was to be found in document E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.1.

Mr. FISCHER (World Federation of Trade Unions), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said he was anxious to speak briefly on the proposals put forward by the Federation (E/CN.4/NGO/28), which were based on the experience of the workers rather than on existing international texts.

Everyone knew that freedom meant nothing to a man haunted by uncertainty about the morrow; on the other hand, in the matter of economic and social rights the rights of the individual and the duties of the State were intimately bound up with one another. Those were the principles which underlay the first article of the proposals put forward by the World Federation of Trade Unions, which provided not only for the right to work and to free choice of occupation, but also for the right of access to all posts and appointments, within the limits of personal aptitude, and which laid down the obligations resting on the State, especially that of bringing about and maintaining "full productive employment of a peacetime character". The latter stipulation was intended to counteract the tendency prevalent in certain countries to achieve full employment through a war economy.

In the face of certain restrictive formulas, which would lay no clearly defined obligations on States, he felt it necessary to recall that already

one hundred years ago, in the French Constituent Assembly in 1848, the député Marrast had denounced a ruthless society which condemned thousands of decent able-bodied men who possessed nothing but their capacity for work to die of hunger for want of a livelihood.

He (Marrast) had thus expressed the still nebulous aspirations of the emergent proletariat. It was the duty of the Commission on Human Rights at the present day to meet the legitimate demands of the organized proletariat.

Mrs. RÖSSEL (Sweden) considered that a certain amount of confusion had arisen in the course of the previous day's discussions, because some representatives had been under the impression that they were dealing with the problem of obligations arising out of the recognition of the right to work, as well as with the definition of that right.

After informal consultations, the French delegation and her own had agreed that it would be best for the Commission to vote on an over-all clause before taking a decision on the International Labour Organisation's suggestion, which was excellent but certainly needed an introductory statement.

She was also prepared to support the United States proposal, subject to minor amendments. She would therefore move that paragraph 1 of the United States proposal (E/CN.4/539/Rev.1, and column 3 of E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.2 (page 2)), be amended to read as follows:

"Each State Party to this Covenant recognizes the following rights and undertakes, within the framework of its organisation, to promote, to the maximum compatible with its resources, conditions of economic, social and cultural progress and development with a view to securing their enjoyment by everyone".

She preferred the term "everyone" to Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans' formula "by all their nationals".

Her personal experience during the past eight years in the Swedish Board of Labour had enabled her to form a just appreciation of the valuable work done by the International Labour Organisation. She would consequently revert to the suggestion she had made earlier, namely, that the article on the right to work should be linked up with the principles applied by that Organisation.

Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) said that the French delegation, in company with the Swedish delegation, considered that if, in considering each individual right, there was to be any hope of avoiding difficulties when it came to the question of defining the obligations of the State, the Commission must take an immediate stand on principle concerning the inclusion of an over-all clause.

In that connexion, the United States proposal (E/CN.4/539.Rev.1) seemed somewhat weak. The expression "with due regard to its organization and resources" might be interpreted as a limitation of the obligations resting on States.

He would like, moreover, to supplement the text submitted by the Swedish delegation, with a view to achieving general recognition of all economic, social and cultural rights, present or future. The French delegation accordingly proposed the following text:

"As a first step towards the effective recognition of all the economic, social and cultural rights of man, the States Parties to this Covenant recognise the following rights and undertake, within the framework of their individual organization, to promote to the maximum compatible with their resources the establishment of the conditions of economic, social and cultural progress necessary to ensure the exercise of those rights."

He pointed out that, in proposing that that section of the Covenant should be preceded by a general text of the type he had just formulated, he was merely following the example of the procedure adopted when the first 18 articles of the draft Covenant had been drawn up.

The French delegation was not asking the Commission to vote on the text he had just submitted, for it would be difficult to adopt a final wording until all the various rights which were to be included in the Covenant had been considered. His delegation would, however, like to hear the views of the representatives of the specialized agencies on that text.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its third meeting, held the previous morning, the Working Group had adopted the Egyptian representative's proposal that consideration of the French proposal relating to an over-all clause be deferred. Technically, the French representative was in order in bringing that proposal before the Commission, but he would remind members that, in reporting to the Commission on the action taken by the Working Group, he (the Chairman) had conveyed the Group's general desire that the Commission should take over from the point where the Group had left off, and that, at his suggestion, the Commission had unanimously approved the Working Group's recommendations.¹⁾ That implied that the Commission should not now reverse the Working Group's decision. Consequently, he took the view that the French representative was out of order in submitting his proposal.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) did not in any way doubt the intentions of those delegations which wished an over-all clause to be inserted before the provisions relating to economic, social and cultural rights. Nevertheless, for the reasons given by the Chairman, the French proposal did not appear to be admissible.

With regard to substance, the Chilean delegation thought that such an over-all clause, no matter how well drafted, would inevitably have the semblance of a loophole permitting any State to evade its obligations. It would be a cruel stroke of irony if the Commission were to adopt, perhaps on Labour Day itself, a clause which would reduce to naught all its efforts to ensure the protection of the workers.

Without wishing to present an ultimatum, he must say that, if an introductory over-all clause of that nature were adopted, his delegation, in accordance with its instructions from the Chilean Government, would have to withdraw from the discussion on economic, social and cultural rights.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the French and Swedish representatives had been out of order in raising the question of the over-all clause.

1) See summary record of the 216th meeting (E/CN.4/SR.216), pages 4 and 5.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) supported the Chairmen's ruling, but wondered whether it would not be opportune for the Commission to avail itself of the presence at the meeting of the representatives of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to discuss with them, not only the right to work, but other rights also. She thought that to do so would in the long run save time.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission must first take a decision on the proposals relating to the right to work, since the discussion was sufficiently advanced to enable representatives to make up their minds. It would be unwise to deflect the course of the debate from that issue, which was of cardinal importance.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) said that she would withdraw her proposal for the time being, but reserved the right to revert to it if the discussion showed that representatives were not ready to adopt one or other of the texts before them.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) hesitated to agree with the Chairman that opinion in the Commission had crystallized sufficiently to enable proposals to be put to the vote. There was much to be said for the United Kingdom representative's suggestion, and if it were raised again and adopted at a later stage, he would advocate that all the cognate aspects of the problem of the right to work, such as just and favourable conditions, an adequate standard of living and the right to social security, should also be examined, in order that the Commission might get a general picture of the entire situation.

The CHAIRMAN, having recalled the various proposals set out in the documents, urged the several sponsors to consider whether they might not be prepared to withdraw their own texts with a view to enabling the Commission to make a final choice between two or three texts.

89

AZMI Bey (Egypt) was prepared to withdraw his amendment if the Commission could see its way to adopting a text combining the proposal of the International Labour Organisation (E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.1) and that of the French proposal (E/CN.4/571). The combined text would read:

- "Work being the basis of all human endeavour, the States party to the Covenant recognize the right to work, that is, the fundamental right of every person to have the opportunity of carrying on paid work freely".

The second sentence of the French proposal, concerning the obligations to be assumed by States, might be held over until the Commission had taken a decision on the insertion of an over-all clause.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Lebanon, was averse to the phrase in the French text: "Work being the basis of society". The assumption was not necessarily valid, and it could be argued that law and order, reason or language were equally at the basis of society. There was, to his mind, a touch of discrimination about the French formula. Nor was there any need to preface a definition of the right to work by a metaphysical declaration. The International Labour Organisation formula, that work was the fundamental basis of human endeavour, was wholly satisfactory and acceptable. In general, he was against the prevailing emphasis on what he would describe as the activist aspect of life. The present day tendency to glorify production, and production alone, was wrong.

Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) emphasized that it would be in the interests of the Commission to consider, while it still had the benefit of the presence of the representatives of the specialized agencies, a text, such as that proposed by the delegations of Sweden and France, which would contain an over-all clause and thus allow the structure of, and resources peculiar to, each State to be taken into account. That would enable time to be saved, as the same ideas would come up again as each article was considered.

With regard to the text proposed by the Egyptian representative, he thought that, in order to take in the observations of the Chairman, the formula might begin "Work being one of the bases of human society ...".

Moreover, the definition of the right to work might be rounded off by amending it to read: "... the fundamental right of every person to have, if he so desires, the opportunity ...".

Mr. CIASULLO (Uruguay) saw no point in saying at the beginning of the article that work was the basis of all human endeavour. He proposed the following words:

"The States party to the Covenant recognize that the right to work is fundamental. Accordingly, everyone shall have the right to do work of his own choice, useful to society".

That last point was not to be found in any of the proposals so far submitted.

The clause dealing with the obligations to be assumed by States should be held over for the moment, to obviate the necessity for discussing those obligations as each right defined came up for consideration.

Mr. SORENSEN (Denmark) said that, following the example of the Egyptian representative, he would withdraw his proposal, as set out in document E/CN.4/547.

Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was concerned about the concept of the right to work proposed by some delegations. He could not but agree with the statements made on behalf of the International Labour Organisation regarding the complexity of the problem. No phrase should be included in the draft Covenant if its meaning was unclear or capable of varying interpretations. It was essential that any suggestion of slave or forced labour be studiously avoided. He was aware that arguments on that particular point had been going on for some time, but the Commission had

great experience in drafting, and he would urge it to resist the temptation to include a general and insufficiently clear concept in the carefully drafted text represented by the draft Covenant.

If the right to work were, however, to be clearly defined, and thus inserted in the Covenant, some such phrase as the already proposed "who so desires" should be included in order to rule out any possible implication of forced or slave labour. For that reason, he also supported the Egyptian representative's use of the word "freely". It might perhaps be introduced together with the expression "who so desires", so as to provide a double safeguard against any implication of forced or slave labour.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Lebanon, agreed with the United States representative as to the importance of the phrase "who so desires", but drew his attention to the fact that paragraph 3(a) of article 5 of the draft Covenant read: "No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labour".

Mr. JEVREMOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) considered that the text suggested by the International Labour Organisation would prove generally acceptable. He was prepared to withdraw his own proposal (E/CN.4/538/Rev.1) in its favour, subject to a minor amendment to the French text. He had certain hesitations in accepting the phrase "d'avoir" and would propose that the following words be substituted for it; /à le droit/ q'on lui crée la possibilité ..." (E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.1).

He agreed with the Uruguayan representative that there was no need to specify explicitly that each State should recognize the right to work. Recognition would be implicit in the signature and ratification of the Covenant, article 1 of which fully covered the point.

The CHAIRMAN asked the United States representative whether his statement implied the withdrawal of his proposal in favour of the International Labour Organisation text.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) was prepared to withdraw the Australian proposal in favour of that submitted by the International Labour Organisation, on the understanding that the amendments and additions suggested in respect of the latter were still open to consideration. He pointed out that the original Australian proposal had included a phrase relating to useful work, which corresponded to the suggestion of the representative of Uruguay concerning work useful to society. He would be grateful if the representatives of the International Labour Organisation would indicate whether they considered an addition of that kind of value, or, if they did not, what objections they had to it. It was important that the views of the International Labour Organisation on that particular point should be put on record.

AZHI Bey (Egypt) regretted that the United States representative could not agree to the inclusion in the Covenant of the words "right to work". The objection founded on the fear that the expression of that right would open the door to the introduction of forced labour was baseless. No member of the Commission recognized forced labour, and the Egyptian proposal, which spoke of the opportunity for everyone to carry on his work freely seemingly ruled out that fear, which one was tempted to describe as hysterical.

Mr. YU (China) thought that one particular phrase in the International Labour Organisation text, namely, "to gain his living by work", was not particularly happy. When the right to work was under discussion, all types of work should be taken into account; and it should not be forgotten that people sometimes worked for pleasure, or because of their religious convictions, or because they were philanthropists. He therefore suggested that those words should be deleted.

He would also like to see references to freedom of choice of work and to the social value of work: it would be most undesirable to give an impression of encouraging the right to work of an anti-social kind. He urged the Commission not to limit the right to work in any way, and to draft a final text that would be

quite unequivocal, so that later there could be no danger of misinterpretation. He suggested that the ideal solution would be a text to the effect that, since work was the basis of all human endeavour, States Parties to the Covenant should recognize that anyone able to work, who so desired, and had the proper qualifications, should have the right to work of a kind useful to society. He thought it important to include a reference to ability and qualifications, on which the right to work must to some extent depend. On the other hand, the opportunity to gain a living need not be mentioned. In framing a general article, the wording should itself be general.

So far as procedure was concerned; he agreed with the Chairman that speed was desirable. At the same time, he shared the view of the representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Australia that it was highly desirable that the Commission should hear the views of the delegation from the International Labour Organisation on other rights than that at present under discussion. He would therefore prefer that a decision on the present article should be held over, if that would facilitate that process.

Mrs. MEHTA (India) was in favour of the International Labour Organisation text. She stressed the psychological importance of the words "right to work", and suggested that the final text should start with a reference to the right to work in general, followed by an explanation of what was meant by those words.

The CHAIRMAN fully agreed with that point of view.

Mr. JOHAUX (Workers' Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Organisation) said that, although he had agreed to the text submitted by the delegation of the International Labour Organisation, he maintained the personal standpoint he had described at a previous meeting, on the subject of the right to work and guarantees of the free choice of occupation.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that from the beginning of the meeting the adviser to the United States delegation had attacked the simple and precise form of words put forward by the Soviet Union

delegation to define the right to work. The statement by that adviser to the effect that the words "right to work" had a double meaning was of peculiar interest in the year 1951. He would remind the United States representative of the words of the French speaker in the nineteenth century, quoted earlier by the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions, to the effect that a society unable to provide work for its citizens was a bad society. There had been another Frenchman, Fourrier, who had pointed out that centuries had been spent in the struggle to establish various rights, but that no attention had been paid during that time to the most important right of all - the right to work. He (Mr. Morosov) could not see how the United States adviser could oppose a text like that of the Soviet Union, which meant life or death to millions of people. The observations of the United States adviser were simply an attempt to twist the meaning behind the plain words of the Soviet Union proposal and throw darkness, rather than light, on the problem before the Commission. Was it not time to put an end to those efforts to frighten members of the Commission, to have done with hysteria, and to stop suggesting that a clear text contained implications which its wording certainly would not bear? Would it not be simpler for the United States adviser to say that his country could not provide work for all its nationals, and therefore could not accept an article insisting on the right to work and imposing obligations on governments to provide it? If the United States representative were courageous enough to make a statement of that kind, it would correspond to the facts, as was clear from President Truman's message to Congress the previous year. In that message, sent on 6 April 1950, the President of the United States of America had said that business was bad, and growing worse, that unemployment was increasing, and that the unemployed had to spend more and more time in seeking new work. In 1950, over one million unemployed had needed fifteen weeks or more to find new jobs. In 1949 and 1948, only 420,000 and 330,000 unemployed respectively had been without work for that length of time. That information had come from the highest authority in the United States of America. It was only because the United States adviser would not admit that fact frankly that he was now attempting to twist the meaning of a perfectly straightforward text, and to read into it ideas which it certainly did not contain. It was utterly false to suggest that it was in any way possible to read into the right to work an implied recognition of forced

labour. In any case, as the Chairman had pointed out, article 5 of the draft Convention was categorical on that point: "No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labour". That was surely enough to allay any fears in that connexion.

Statements at earlier meetings by the United States adviser relieved him (Mr. Morosov) of any necessity to be polite, since that adviser had replied with disdain to his own observations. He would simply say that the United States interpretation of the words "right to work", as implying a possibility of forced labour, was pure calumny intended to mislead public opinion. The United States representative might succeed in hoodwinking some members of the Commission, but that did not mean that the vast mass of workers outside the Commission were unable to distinguish between truth and falsehood.

He asked the Commission to give careful consideration to the Soviet Union text, which corresponded with the views of the World Federation of Trade Unions. Its underlying principle was that the State must ensure for its nationals the right to work, and so put an end to the threat of death through hunger or inanition, attendant on unemployment. He would welcome criticism of his proposal, but it must be criticism of what the text contained; he was strongly opposed to any attempt to defeat a proposal by distorting its meaning. The whole purpose of his delegation's proposal was to reduce the mass unemployment prevalent in a number of countries, the result of which, for millions of workers, was hunger and exhaustion.

Amendments had been proposed to the effect that the right to work should be granted only to those who wished to exercise it. From the commonsense point of view, such additions seemed unnecessary and pointless; and the Soviet Union delegation was not alone in holding that opinion. Floods of words had been suggested to replace the simple Soviet Union text, but they would mislead no-one. In many countries and in many languages the rich had maintained that poverty was the result of laziness, and that the poor man was either a sluggard or a drunkard. The Soviet Union delegation categorically opposed that type of slander and such attempts to determine the causes of poverty.

The Soviet Union delegation saw no necessity whatsoever to include in the article on the right to work a reference to persons who "desired" to work, and opposed the addition of that reference.

Though its purpose - to defeat the Soviet Union proposal - was cleverly concealed, the United States statement would mislead no-one. The Soviet Union delegation had closely followed the debate, and firmly maintained its original proposal, because it felt that the text it had submitted was clear-cut, and imposed an obligation on States to take the measures necessary to ensure to everyone the right to work.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) said that he would first reply to a question put by the Australian representative, who had asked whether the International Labour Organisation delegation saw any objection to including the word "useful" to qualify "work". The proposal had been put forward in several drafts, and specifically by the Uruguayan representative earlier during the meeting. At first sight, that seemed an acceptable addition, but in fact he thought it highly dangerous. The Commission should never lose sight of the fact that the Covenant was imposing obligations on States. If it were insisted that work must be "useful", who would be judge of what was useful? It could only be the State. Hence there would be grave danger to the individual if the word "useful" was included. The same point had been made by the representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

He thought the time had come to take a decision, and suggested that the general weight of opinion in the Commission was in favour of a text on the lines of those put forward by France, Egypt and the International Labour Organisation. All three proposals were attempts to express the same idea. If the Commission agreed with his view, he thought it would not be difficult to arrive at a generally acceptable text.

In reply to the fear expressed by the United States representative with regard to the words "right to work", he agreed that the words used in isolation might be dangerous; but the French and Egyptian texts followed up the reference to the

right to work with an interpretation of what was meant by them. Provided those words were in fact followed by an explanation of that kind, the International Labour Organisation delegation could see no objection to them. It had been suggested that the introductory phrase referring to work as the basis of human endeavour, or the basis of society, was unnecessary. From a legal point of view he agreed, but psychologically he thought that a phrase of that kind would be of great value, and he would like to see it included in the article.

He then analysed the three texts to which he had referred, showing that they differed in wording rather than in substance. He preferred the French text, to the effect that everyone should be entitled to gain his living by work, to the Egyptian version, since it seemed simpler and more precise; but he would not oppose the Egyptian text if the Commission preferred it. He did, however, attach importance to the proposal of his delegation to add the words "if he so desires", and hoped that the Commission would be able to see its way to include them.

Both in the French and in the Egyptian texts there was a reference, after the definition of the right to work, to the obligations of governments in that matter. The Commission seemed undecided as to whether reference should be made to those obligations in each article, or whether there should be an overall article dealing with the obligations of governments. In any case, he thought that question would have to be discussed at some length, and that for the moment the Commission could decide simply on the wording of that part of the article which dealt with the right to work.

Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) regretted that the Soviet Union representative had again felt obliged to make distorted reference to facts in the United States of America and to statements by members of the United States Government. He would simply repeat that those allegations were misleading. He also regretted that both at the previous and at the current meeting the Soviet Union representative had thought fit to refer to him as the "adviser to the United States delegation". He would content himself with saying that he felt proud to have acted for four years as adviser to Mrs. Roosevelt, and with pointing out that he was sitting as a duly accredited alternate.

The United States delegation was prepared to hold over consideration of the first part of its proposal, which dealt with the obligations to be imposed on governments, until that question was under discussion by the Commission. It was prepared also to accept the International Labour Organisation's text to replace its own text appearing in paragraph (e) in column 3 on page 3 of E/CN.4/AC.14/2.

After a discussion between the CHAIRMAN and Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) as to the exact wording of the International Labour Organisation's text, Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) said that the United States representative had correctly interpreted the International Labour Organisation's view as put forward at the previous meeting, but that at the present meeting his delegation had been trying to reconcile differences of opinion in order to arrive at a common text. He repeated that his delegation had no objection to including the words "right to work", provided they were followed by an interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Commission was ready to vote on the texts before it.

Mr. JEVREMOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) did not wish to hold up the work of the Commission, but with so many texts before him, and with so many drafting amendments also to be taken into account, he must ask that the vote be deferred until he had seen the various texts in writing.

AZMI Bey (Egypt) expressed his willingness to accept the addition to his proposed text of the words "if he so desires", but was obliged to press for the retention of his formula "carrying on his work freely", which he considered preferable to the wording submitted by the French delegation in its proposal E/CN.4/571.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he too would find it impossible to vote on any of the texts, other than his own, until he had them before him in writing. To help forward the Commission's work, he would not insist on the 24-hour period of grace required by the rules of procedure. As the

texts were short, it might be possible to have them not only in the two working languages, but also in Russian.

Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) hoped that the Commission would have before it a French version of the International Labour Organisation's proposal drafted by Mr. Jouinaux himself, rather than a translation from the English.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the general debate be regarded as closed, and that the Commission meet in the afternoon and proceed at once to vote, since written texts would be available at the opening of the meeting.

Replying to a question by Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile), he said that the general debate was closed only on the first part of the article relating to the right to work, and that the second part, dealing with the obligations to be imposed on governments, would be discussed fully at a time to be decided by the Commission.

The Chairman's proposals were unanimously adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.